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

The relationship between teachers' knowledge on dyslexia, teaching efficacy and preparedness to apply the science of reading in inclusive education setting

Luke Mirasol M. Tagalog*
Cebu Technological University – Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study examined elementary teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs at Catarman Integrated School during the 2025–2026 school year, forming the basis for a professional intervention plan. Employing a quantitative descriptive-correlational design, 51 teachers were purposively selected to complete standardized survey questionnaires measuring their knowledge of dyslexia, readiness to implement evidence-based reading strategies, and confidence in teaching reading. Data were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, weighted means, standard deviations, rankings, and Pearson correlations. Results showed that most respondents were female, aged 35–44 years, held Master's units, and had 6 to over 16 years of teaching experience. Teachers demonstrated high knowledge of dyslexia, particularly in recognizing its neurological basis, modeling fluent reading, and understanding that learners with dyslexia may also be gifted, though misconceptions received lower scores. Respondents were generally prepared to implement structured literacy practices, though there were some gaps in integrating reading and writing. Self-efficacy was high, especially in applying effective reading strategies, with slightly lower confidence in supporting struggling readers. Correlation analysis revealed a moderate positive relationship between knowledge and preparedness, a weak positive relationship between knowledge and self-efficacy, and a moderate positive relationship between preparedness and self-efficacy. The study concluded that teacher knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy are critical for inclusive literacy instruction. The researcher recommends implementing the A.I.D.E. Program at Catarman Integrated School, providing ongoing professional development, hands-on workshops, mentoring, and regular monitoring to enhance teachers' competence and ensure continuous improvement in inclusive reading instruction.

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

Date Submitted: June 25, 2026
Date Accepted: July 1, 2026
Date Published: June 8, 2026

*Corresponding author / Email: tagaloglukemirasol@gmail.com

Recommended citation:
Tagalog, L. M. M. (2026). The relationship between teachers' knowledge on dyslexia, teaching efficacy and preparedness to apply the science of reading in inclusive education setting. Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences) 5 (3), 608-635.

INTRODUCTION

Reading proficiency is a foundational skill that strongly influences learners' academic success, social participation, and long-term educational outcomes. When learners experience persistent reading difficulties, their ability to engage meaningfully with classroom instruction is compromised. These challenges are further intensified in inclusive classrooms, where teachers are expected to address diverse learning needs using appropriate instructional approaches. Effective reading instruction therefore depends not only on sound educational policies but also on teachers' knowledge, confidence, and preparedness. Examining these teacher-related factors is essential to strengthening inclusive education and improving reading outcomes for all learners.

Reading acquisition remains a pressing global challenge, particularly for learners with dyslexia, who comprise approximately 5 to 10 percent of school-aged children worldwide (World Health Organization & UNESCO). Despite normal intelligence, these learners experience persistent difficulties in decoding, fluency, and comprehension, which negatively affect academic performance and self-esteem. Research indicates that teacher knowledge about dyslexia is often limited or inconsistent, resulting in ineffective instruction and missed opportunities for early intervention (Knight, 2018). This gap in teacher knowledge creates a critical barrier to equitable learning outcomes. Strengthening educators' understanding of dyslexia and evidence-based reading strategies is therefore an urgent educational priority.

Another significant issue concerns teachers' preparedness and self-efficacy in implementing effective reading instruction. International studies report that many educators feel underprepared to apply research-based strategies such as structured literacy or phonics instruction due to insufficient training and professional development (Carey et al., 2019; Gonzalez, 2021). Low teacher self-efficacy can influence classroom behavior, motivation, and persistence, often leading to the avoidance of specialized instructional approaches. These challenges directly contribute to ongoing literacy disparities among learners with dyslexia. Investigating the relationship between teacher confidence and instructional practices is therefore critical.

Although the Science of Reading and structured literacy approaches are internationally recognized as effective for learners with dyslexia, a gap remains between research and classroom practice (International Dyslexia Association, 2020c; Moats, 2020). Explicit and systematic instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension is essential for struggling readers (Flynn et al., 2021; Spear-Swerling, 2019). Many teachers, however, lack sufficient training to implement these approaches effectively (Arrow et al., 2019; McMahan et al., 2019). This disconnects between research and practice highlights the need for targeted professional development and stronger institutional support. Addressing this gap is necessary to ensure high-quality reading instruction in inclusive classrooms, as inadequate alignment between teacher knowledge and classroom practice can limit the effectiveness of instructional strategies. This view is supported by Feliciano and Dy (2021), who found that differences in teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and actual classroom practices reflect the influence of training opportunities and institutional support systems on instructional quality.

At the national level, inclusive education is emphasized as a strategy to promote equitable learning opportunities for all Filipino learners (Department of Education, 2009). Despite policy support, gaps persist in teachers' preparedness and efficacy in implementing inclusive practices. Tubo and Antonio (2022) reported varying levels of self-efficacy among prospective early childhood teachers in applying inclusive strategies, suggesting inconsistencies in training and confidence. Similarly, Yilmaz (2020) emphasized that teachers'

beliefs and mindset influence instructional efficacy. These findings indicate that both knowledge and attitudes affect the successful implementation of inclusive education.

A specific national gap exists in addressing learners with hidden disabilities such as dyslexia. Rosales (2020) identified persistent reading comprehension difficulties among learners suspected of having dyslexia, underscoring the need for improved teacher training in identification and support strategies. Teachers' perceptions of their training have been shown to affect the quality of implementation of inclusive education directly (Triviño-Amigo et al., 2022). Crispel and Kasperski (2021) further confirmed that targeted training in special education enhances the application of inclusive practices. These studies collectively highlight professional development as a key factor in improving instructional effectiveness.

In Cebu, Philippines, teachers in inclusive classrooms face significant challenges related to training and preparedness in supporting learners with special needs. Alido et al. (2023) found that teachers received limited training in inclusive education and reported only moderate preparedness in collaboration, instructional methods, behavioral intervention planning, and curriculum access. Limited knowledge and confidence may hinder teachers' ability to meet diverse learning needs. Such conditions pose a barrier to the effective implementation of inclusive education. Addressing these limitations is therefore essential.

Gaps are also evident in specialized training for supporting learners with dyslexia. Hettiarachchi and Das (2014) reported that many teachers lacked adequate preparation for inclusive education, particularly in planning and implementing individualized instructional support. Although in-service training programs are available, these initiatives often provide only general coverage of inclusion and rarely focus on reading difficulties such as dyslexia. As a result, teachers may not develop the specific skills required to apply evidence-based reading strategies effectively in their classrooms. This limitation affects teachers' ability to design targeted interventions and respond appropriately to learners' diverse reading needs. Consequently, insufficient specialized training weakens instructional support for learners with dyslexia in inclusive settings.

Limited access to professional development opportunities further exacerbates these challenges. Boyes et al. (2020) reported that only 23.81 percent of teachers in Cebu had attended inclusive education training, with financial constraints and limited opportunities cited as major barriers. Although teachers demonstrate some competence in inclusive practices, structural and resource limitations restrict their effectiveness. These gaps in training and professional development highlight the need for targeted interventions. Strengthening teacher knowledge and self-efficacy is critical to improving inclusive classroom instruction.

This study therefore seeks to examine teachers' self-efficacy, knowledge about dyslexia, and perceived preparedness to implement the principles of the Science of Reading in inclusive classrooms in Liloan, Cebu. Identifying areas of strength and areas requiring support will inform the development of a Professional Intervention Plan. This plan aims to enhance teacher competence and confidence in delivering evidence-based reading instruction. The findings will provide practical guidance for educators, administrators, and policymakers. Ultimately, the study seeks to contribute to a more equitable learning environment where all learners can reach their full potential.

Statement of the problem

This study assessed teachers' knowledge of dyslexia and their levels of self-efficacy and preparedness for teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms at

Catarman Integrated School for the school year 2025 to 2026 as the 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 at related seminars or training on inclusive education, and reading exposure to literacy education?
2. What is the level of the respondents' knowledge about dyslexia?
3. What is the extent of the respondents' preparedness to apply the Science of Reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms?
4. What is the level of the respondents' 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 and their self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms?
6. 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?
7. 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 for investigating teachers' knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy 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 study's flow, providing a clear sequence of the phases undertaken.

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationships among teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, their self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs, and their preparedness to apply the principles of the Science of Reading. Descriptive-correlational research is used to describe variables and determine the degree of relationship among them without manipulating any conditions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Polit & Beck, 2021). Quantitative research emphasizes the collection and analysis of numerical data to identify patterns, test relationships, and make generalizations (Bloomfield & Fisher, 2019). This design is appropriate because it allows the researcher to determine the strength and direction of relationships among naturally occurring variables. The approach supports objective measurement of teacher-related factors relevant to inclusive reading instruction, and it also aligns with the study's goal of generating data to inform intervention development. Data were collected from elementary teachers at Catarman Integrated School who are actively involved in teaching reading in inclusive classrooms, and the study examined three main components: teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, their self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs, and their perceived preparedness to apply the principles of the Science of Reading. Standardized survey instruments and validated assessment tools were utilized to ensure the reliability and accuracy of the data, and the use of established instruments strengthens the credibility of the findings, since these tools enabled consistent measurement across participants, a consistency that is essential in correlational research.

Statistical analyses included weighted mean, standard deviation, ranking, and Pearson correlation to determine the levels of each variable and identify significant relationships among them. Correlational analysis is commonly used in educational research to examine associations

among teacher knowledge, beliefs, and instructional practices (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The results of these analyses served as the empirical basis for developing a Professional Intervention Plan aligned with the Science of Reading framework, an intervention plan that focuses on enhancing teacher competence and instructional confidence. Findings were interpreted within the context of inclusive education, which ensures relevance to real classroom settings.

This study also used the Input-Process-Output (IPO) model as a conceptual guide to illustrate the research's systematic flow. The IPO model explains how inputs are transformed through specific processes to produce desired outputs, making it suitable for program development and educational research (McGrath, 2017; Donabedian, 2005). The input phase includes the study variables, namely teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, level of self-efficacy, and perceived readiness to apply the Science of Reading. These inputs represent the existing conditions influencing instructional practice, and their clear identification supports logical analysis while also strengthening alignment between data and outcomes. The process phase covers the procedures undertaken in the study, including instrument preparation and validation, transmittal of letters, obtaining informed consent, questionnaire administration, and statistical treatment of data. These procedures ensured systematic, ethical, and reliable implementation of the research, since structured processes enhance the credibility and validity of quantitative studies (Polit & Beck, 2021). Ethical considerations were observed throughout data collection, and accuracy and consistency were prioritized at every stage, ensuring dependable results. The study's output is the Professional Intervention Plan, developed based on key findings regarding teachers' knowledge, self-efficacy, and preparedness. Analysis of the relationships among these variables identified specific gaps in instructional confidence and understanding of dyslexia, and the intervention plan was designed to address these needs through targeted professional development aligned with the realities of inclusive classrooms. The IPO framework ensures that the intervention is evidence-based and logically derived from empirical findings, which strengthens its practical applicability, and the plan supports teachers in delivering effective reading instruction to learners with diverse needs.

The flow of the study, guided by the IPO model, illustrates the systematic progression of the research process from data gathering to outcome generation. The input phase includes the variables of the study, such as the level of literacy knowledge of elementary-grade educators regarding dyslexia, the level of teachers' self-efficacy, and their perceived readiness to apply the principles of the Science of Reading. The process phase covers the series of systematic steps undertaken in conducting the study, including preparing and validating the adopted research instruments to ensure their clarity, relevance, and reliability, as well as transmitting formal letters seeking permission to conduct the study and obtaining informed consent from respondents to uphold ethical research standards. The process further includes administering questionnaires to gather the necessary data from respondents in a structured manner, after which appropriate statistical treatments are applied to analyze and interpret the gathered information. These research activities ensure that the entire process is carried out systematically, accurately, and reliably, in accordance with ethical research principles from data gathering through analysis. The Professional Intervention Plan (PIP) was established based on the study's key findings regarding teachers' levels of self-efficacy and knowledge about dyslexia, and their perceived preparedness to apply the principles of the Science of Reading. Analysis of these variables identified specific gaps and areas of need in teacher preparedness, instructional confidence, and understanding of dyslexia, and by examining the relationships among these components, the PIP was designed to address deficiencies, strengthen teacher competence, and provide targeted professional development directly aligned

with the realities of inclusive classroom instruction, ensuring that the plan is both evidence-based and practically applicable in supporting teachers to deliver effective reading instruction to learners with diverse needs.

This study was conducted at Catarman Integrated School (Catarman IS) under the Department of Education, Region VII, Central Visayas, Division of Cebu Province, Liloan District. The school was selected as the research locale because it provides a representative setting for examining teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, self-efficacy in teaching reading, and preparedness to apply the principles of the Science of Reading. Catarman IS serves a diverse population of learners, including those with varying literacy levels and learning needs, making it an ideal environment to explore instructional practices, teacher preparedness, and the implementation of evidence-based reading strategies. The school's inclusive classrooms enable a comprehensive assessment of how educators integrate structured literacy methods and address the needs of learners with dyslexia in real-world teaching contexts. The respondents consisted of elementary teachers at Catarman IS who are actively engaged in both general and special education settings, providing relevant insights into literacy instruction and inclusive teaching practices.

The respondents of this study consisted of 51 elementary teachers from Catarman Integrated School (Catarman IS) who were directly involved in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. The study employed purposive sampling, selecting teachers who met specific inclusion criteria to ensure participants were knowledgeable and relevant to the study's objectives. These teachers were chosen because they were able to provide informed perspectives on their knowledge of dyslexia, self-efficacy in teaching reading, and preparedness to apply the principles of the Science of Reading, and all 51 identified teachers from Catarman IS participated in the study. The inclusion criteria required that teachers be currently assigned to Catarman IS, have at least 1 year of teaching experience, and teach reading-related subjects. This sampling approach strengthened the relevance, reliability, and validity of the study's findings. With respect to the distribution of respondents according to the grade level they teach, Kindergarten accounted for 6 teachers (11.76%), Grade One accounted for 9 teachers (17.65%), Grade Two accounted for 7 teachers (13.73%), Grade Three accounted for 9 teachers (17.65%), Grade Four accounted for 8 teachers (15.69%), Grade Five accounted for 6 teachers (11.76%), and Grade Six accounted for 6 teachers (11.76%), yielding a total of 51 teachers (100.00%). These figures show that Grade One and Grade Three have the highest number of respondents, each with 9 teachers (17.65%), followed by Grade Four with 8 teachers (15.69%) and Grade Two with 7 teachers (13.73%), while Kindergarten, Grade Five, and Grade Six have the lowest number of respondents, each with 6 teachers (11.76%). Overall, the distribution is relatively balanced across grade levels, indicating that the study includes teachers from different stages of elementary education.

This study utilized four adopted research instruments to gather 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 instruments were adopted from established and empirically validated studies, specifically the Teachers' Knowledge and Beliefs about Developmental Dyslexia Scale developed by Soriano-Ferrer and Echegaray-Bengoa (2014), the Reading Teaching Efficacy Instrument (RTEI) by Szabo and Mokhtari (2004), and the Science of Reading readiness instrument adapted from Gump (2024). All questionnaires were adopted without modifications; therefore, pilot testing was not required. The instruments measured the respondents' demographic information, their knowledge and beliefs about developmental dyslexia, their preparedness and readiness to apply the Science of Reading, and their self-efficacy in teaching reading. All scales in this study used a five-point Likert scale: 5, Strongly Agree; 4, Agree; 3, Undecided; 2, Disagree; and 1, Strongly Disagree.

The first part of the instrument gathered the demographic profile of the participants to describe their background and professional characteristics. It included age, gender, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, attendance in related seminars or training on inclusive education, and reading exposure to literacy education. These data helped in identifying patterns that might influence teachers' knowledge, self-efficacy, and preparedness to apply the Science of Reading in inclusive classrooms.

The second part of the instrument measured teachers' knowledge and beliefs about developmental dyslexia using the 36-item scale adopted from Soriano-Ferrer and Echegaray-Bengoa (2014). The instrument assessed teachers' understanding and misconceptions about dyslexia through three areas, namely general information, symptoms and diagnosis, and treatment or intervention. Each statement was rated on the five-point Likert scale, and the scale was designed to reveal how well teachers understand dyslexia and identify any incorrect beliefs that could affect their reading instruction for learners with diverse needs.

The third part of the instrument determined the extent to which teachers perceive themselves as ready and prepared to apply the principles of the Science of Reading in their teaching practices. The instrument was adopted from Gump (2024) and included 10 items that focused on teachers' confidence, instructional knowledge, and ability to use evidence-based literacy strategies. All items were rated using the five-point Likert scale, and this section provided insights into teachers' readiness to apply systematic and research-based reading instruction in inclusive settings.

The fourth part of the instrument measured teachers' confidence in their ability to teach reading effectively using the Reading Teaching Efficacy Instrument (RTEI) adopted from Szabo and Mokhtari (2004). The instrument consisted of 16 items focusing on teachers' self-efficacy in planning and delivering reading instruction to learners with varying literacy needs, and respondents indicated their agreement with each statement using the five-point Likert scale. This instrument helped identify how teachers' beliefs about their teaching ability influence their performance and motivation in literacy instruction. All the adopted instruments used in this study have been previously validated and recognized in literacy and reading education research, and their inclusion ensured that the data collected were both reliable and appropriate for analyzing the relationship between teachers' knowledge, teaching efficacy, and preparedness to apply the Science of Reading in inclusive education settings.

The data collection process for this study was conducted in three stages, namely the Preliminary Stage, the Data Gathering Stage, and the Post-Data Gathering Stage, each designed to ensure that ethical standards are upheld, that data are collected systematically, and that the research process maintains transparency and validity. In the preliminary stage, the researcher will first seek permission from the Dean of the Graduate School and obtain an endorsement letter to conduct the study. Following this, a formal request letter will be sent to the Schools Division Superintendent of the Department of Education, Division of Cebu Province, through the District Office of Liloan, to secure authorization to administer the research instruments to the participating schools. Once approval is granted, copies of the approved transmittal letters will be distributed to the school heads of the identified elementary schools within the Liloan District, and prior to data collection, informed consent forms will be distributed to all potential participants. These forms will clearly state the study's purpose, voluntary nature of participation, confidentiality of responses, and assurance that participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

The data gathering stage begins upon receiving permission from the school heads and the consent of the participating teachers. The researcher will personally administer the questionnaires, which may be distributed either as printed copies or through a Google Form,

depending on the accessibility and preference of the participants, and coordination will be made with the designated school coordinators or focal persons to determine the most convenient schedule for data collection. To avoid disruption to teaching activities, data collection will be conducted after regular working hours or during other convenient times agreed upon by the teachers. Respondents will be reminded that participation is voluntary and that all responses will remain anonymous, and each questionnaire will be coded by number to ensure confidentiality. Respondents will be given one to two weeks to complete and return the accomplished questionnaires or to submit their online responses. After the retrieval period, the researcher will check the instruments for completeness before proceeding to data encoding and statistical processing, and all collected data will be stored securely in a password-protected file, accessible only to the researcher.

In the post-data gathering stage, after all data have been retrieved, the researcher will proceed with data encoding, analysis, and interpretation using appropriate statistical tools as described in the research design. All gathered information will be treated with strict confidentiality, and no individual responses will be disclosed in the report. The results will be summarized and analyzed to address the specific research questions and hypotheses of the study, and upon completion of the study, a summary of findings will be provided to the participating schools and the Division Office as a form of academic feedback and contribution to the improvement of reading instruction programs. The researcher will ensure the ethical disposal of all paper-based questionnaires after the data analysis phase, following institutional data retention and ethical guidelines, and the study will adhere to all ethical standards for research involving human participants.

To ensure the privacy and protection of all participants, the study implemented strict data privacy measures. All data collected is anonymized, meaning that individual identities will not be linked to their responses, ensuring that personal information cannot be traced back to any participant, and any information that could potentially identify respondents will be handled with strict confidentiality, with only the researcher having access to the raw data. Digital files containing responses are stored in password-protected devices, while any physical forms, such as survey questionnaires, will be securely locked in a cabinet throughout the research period. Data will be used exclusively for the purposes of this study and will not be shared with any third parties, and upon completion of the research, data will be retained according to ethical research guidelines and then properly disposed of to prevent unauthorized access or misuse. These measures ensure that participants' information is handled responsibly, maintaining their trust and the integrity of the research process.

This study adhered to strict ethical principles to ensure the rights, dignity, safety, and overall welfare of all participants are fully protected throughout the entire research process. Ethical responsibility was observed from the planning stage up to the dissemination of results to maintain the integrity of the study and to ensure respect for all individuals involved. Voluntary participation was strictly emphasized, and respondents were informed that their involvement in the study was completely optional, being given the freedom to refuse participation or withdraw at any stage of the research process without any form of penalty, pressure, or negative consequence. This ensured that participation was based purely on informed willingness rather than obligation or coercion. Prior to data collection, informed consent was secured from all respondents, with the consent form clearly explaining the purpose of the study, its significance, the procedures involved, possible benefits, and any potential risks that may be encountered, as well as information regarding the sources of funding and the intended use of the data gathered, allowing participants to make a well-informed and autonomous decision regarding their participation in the study. The study also upheld anonymity by ensuring that no personally identifiable information such as names, contact details, or any traceable identifiers were collected from the respondents; instead, responses

were encoded and assigned numerical or coded identifiers to ensure that individual participants could not be identified at any point in the analysis or reporting of data, a measure that protected the identity of all respondents and encouraged honest and unbiased responses. In addition, strict confidentiality was maintained throughout the research process. Although the researcher may have been aware of the participants' identities during data collection, such information was securely stored and protected, access to raw data was limited solely to the researcher, and all findings were presented in aggregate form to ensure that individual responses could not be traced back to any participant, with data storage and handling procedures carefully managed to prevent unauthorized access or data leakage. Furthermore, the study took deliberate steps to minimize any form of harm to participants, and the research instruments and procedures were designed to avoid causing physical discomfort, emotional distress, psychological pressure, or social risk. The questions included in the survey were carefully reviewed to ensure that they were appropriate, respectful, and non-sensitive in nature, and the overall conduct of the study was guided by respect for the participants' well-being and professional environment. Lastly, the communication and reporting of results were guided by honesty, accuracy, and academic integrity. The researcher ensured that all findings were presented truthfully without manipulation, fabrication, or misrepresentation of data, and proper citation practices were followed to avoid plagiarism, with the results reflecting only the actual outcomes derived from the data gathered. These ethical safeguards collectively ensured that the study maintained high standards of research ethics while protecting participants and preserving the credibility and reliability of the research output.

The data gathered in this study will be analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics to accurately address the stated research problems. All computations will be carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to ensure accuracy and reliability of results. The statistical tools to be employed include the frequency and percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, ranking, and the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC). Frequency and percentage will be used to describe the respondents' profile variables such as age, gender, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, attendance in related seminars or trainings on inclusive education, and reading exposure to literacy education, and these descriptive statistics will present how respondents are distributed across different categories, providing a clear overview of the demographic and professional characteristics of the teachers involved in the study. The weighted mean and standard deviation will be used to determine the level of teachers' knowledge about dyslexia in terms of general information, symptoms and diagnosis, and treatment of dyslexia, as well as their overall knowledge of dyslexia, and these tools will also measure teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading in inclusive classrooms. The weighted mean will provide an average score for each variable based on the five-point Likert scale, giving a clear indication of whether teachers exhibit high, moderate, or low levels of knowledge, confidence, and preparedness, while the standard deviation will show the degree of variation or consistency in the teachers' responses, indicating whether the scores are closely clustered around the mean or widely spread. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC) will be used as the inferential statistical tool to test the significance of the relationships among the study's major variables, specifically the significance of the relationship between teachers' knowledge about dyslexia and their self-efficacy in teaching reading, the significance of the relationship between teachers' knowledge about dyslexia and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and the significance of the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading. This tool is appropriate since

the variables are measured on interval scales, and the correlation coefficient (r) will indicate the direction and strength of the relationship, while a 0.05 level of significance will be used to determine if the correlation is statistically significant. This analysis will help establish whether the variables are meaningfully connected, which can serve as a basis for designing a targeted intervention plan.

The scoring of the research instruments was based on the standardized procedures of the original studies from which they were adopted. All sections of the questionnaire utilize a five-point Likert scale ranging from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree), and higher scores indicate greater knowledge, self-efficacy, or preparedness. For teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, this section measures the teachers' understanding of dyslexia in terms of general information, symptoms and diagnosis, and treatment, with the 36 items assessing the accuracy of teachers' knowledge as well as possible misconceptions. The responses are scored using a five-point Likert scale, where higher scores reflect a stronger and more accurate understanding of dyslexia, and the interpretation of the scores allows the researcher to determine whether teachers possess very high, high, moderate, low, or very low knowledge about dyslexia. Specifically, a rating of 5 (SA) with a mean range of 4.21 – 5.00 is verbally described as Very High and interpreted as teachers demonstrating accurate and comprehensive knowledge about dyslexia; a rating of 4 (A) with a mean range of 3.41 – 4.20 is described as High and interpreted as teachers demonstrating a high level of knowledge about dyslexia; a rating of 3 (U) with a mean range of 2.61 – 3.40 is described as Moderate and interpreted as teachers demonstrating moderate knowledge about dyslexia; a rating of 2 (D) with a mean range of 1.81 – 2.60 is described as Low and interpreted as teachers demonstrating low knowledge about dyslexia; and a rating of 1 (SD) with a mean range of 1.00 – 1.80 is described as Very Low and interpreted as teachers demonstrating very low knowledge about dyslexia.

For teachers' preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, this part evaluates the teachers' readiness to implement the principles of the Science of Reading in inclusive classrooms, with the 10 items measuring teachers' perception of their own preparedness and practical ability to apply evidence-based reading strategies. The Likert scale scoring allows for a clear interpretation of teachers' preparedness, identifying whether they are very prepared, prepared, moderately prepared, less prepared, or not prepared at all. In this scale, a rating of 5 (SA) with a mean range of 4.21 – 5.00 is described as Very High and interpreted as teachers demonstrating very high confidence in teaching reading; a rating of 4 (A) with a mean range of 3.41 – 4.20 is described as High and interpreted as teachers demonstrating high confidence in teaching reading; a rating of 3 (U) with a mean range of 2.61 – 3.40 is described as Moderate and interpreted as teachers demonstrating moderate confidence in teaching reading; a rating of 2 (D) with a mean range of 1.81 – 2.60 is described as Low and interpreted as teachers demonstrating low confidence in teaching reading; and a rating of 1 (SD) with a mean range of 1.00 – 1.80 is described as Very Low and interpreted as teachers demonstrating very low confidence in teaching reading.

For teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading, this section assesses teachers' confidence in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. Using the 16-item Reading Teaching Efficacy Instrument (RTEI), responses are rated on a five-point Likert scale, and the total and mean scores provide an overall measure of teachers' self-efficacy, helping identify areas of strong confidence or where additional support may be needed, with higher scores indicating greater confidence in effectively teaching reading. In this scale, a rating of 5 (SA) with a mean range of 4.21 – 5.00 is described as Very High and interpreted as teachers demonstrating very high preparedness to apply the Science of Reading; a rating of 4 (A) with a mean range of 3.41 – 4.20 is described as High and interpreted as teachers demonstrating high preparedness to apply the Science of Reading; a rating of 3 (U) with a mean range of 2.61 – 3.40 is described as Moderate and interpreted as teachers demonstrating moderate

preparedness to apply the Science of Reading; a rating of 2 (D) with a mean range of 1.81 – 2.60 is described as Low and interpreted as teachers demonstrating low preparedness to apply the Science of Reading; and a rating of 1 (SD) with a mean range of 1.00 – 1.80 is described as Very Low and interpreted as teachers demonstrating very low preparedness to apply the Science of Reading.

To ensure clarity and a common understanding of the key concepts used in this study, several terms central to the research objectives and variables are defined below, providing context for the study's focus on teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, self-efficacy, preparedness to apply 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, and learners with dyslexia often experience challenges in word recognition, reading fluency, and phonological processing despite having average or above-average intelligence and access to appropriate instruction; in this study, dyslexia is treated as a key factor influencing how teachers plan, implement, and adapt reading instruction for learners with diverse needs. An inclusive classroom refers to a learning environment where learners with diverse abilities and learning needs, including those with dyslexia and other learning difficulties, are educated together within the same instructional setting, and in this environment all learners are provided with equal opportunities to participate and succeed in learning activities. Instruction is intentionally adapted through differentiated teaching strategies, individualized support, and appropriate accommodations to address varying learner needs, and teachers in inclusive classrooms are expected to modify content, process, and assessment to ensure accessibility and meaningful participation for all students, with the ultimate goal of promoting equity, participation, and positive learning outcomes regardless of learners' individual differences or challenges.

Preparedness to apply the Science of Reading refers to the extent to which teachers perceive themselves as ready, capable, and confident in implementing research-based and structured approaches to reading instruction, including their readiness to teach essential components of reading such as phonological awareness, phonics, decoding, fluency, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension in a systematic manner. It also involves the ability to integrate these components into daily instructional practices within inclusive classroom settings, and teachers who are well-prepared are able to design appropriate lesson plans, select suitable instructional materials, and apply evidence-based strategies that support learners with diverse reading abilities, a construct that highlights both theoretical understanding and practical readiness in delivering effective reading instruction. The Professional Intervention Plan (PIP) is a structured and evidence-based program developed from the findings of the study, designed to address identified gaps in teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, their self-efficacy in teaching reading, and their preparedness to implement the Science of Reading. The plan includes targeted professional development activities such as training workshops, seminars, coaching sessions, and collaborative learning opportunities, and it also incorporates instructional support materials and practical demonstrations to enhance classroom application. The PIP aims to strengthen teachers' competencies by bridging the gap between theory and practice, ultimately improving instructional quality in inclusive classrooms, and continuous evaluation and feedback are integrated into the plan to ensure its effectiveness and sustainability.

Symptoms and diagnosis refer to the identification and understanding of observable indicators associated with dyslexia, as well as the formal recognition of the condition. Common symptoms include persistent difficulties in decoding words, spelling inaccuracies, slow reading fluency, and challenges in reading comprehension, and in this study symptoms and diagnosis

also involve teachers' ability to recognize early warning signs of dyslexia in learners and differentiate these from general reading difficulties. Proper understanding of these indicators is essential in guiding teachers to provide timely and appropriate instructional interventions, and accurate recognition supports early support strategies and prevents further learning delays among affected learners. Treatment of dyslexia involves the application of evidence-based instructional strategies and interventions aimed at improving learners' reading and language skills, and these interventions are typically structured, explicit, systematic, and multisensory in nature, aligning with the principles of effective reading instruction. Common approaches include phonics-based instruction, guided reading, repeated reading practice, and the use of assistive learning tools, and in the context of this study, treatment also refers to teachers' awareness and application of these strategies within inclusive classrooms, requiring consistency, individualized support, and continuous monitoring of learner progress to ensure improvement in reading outcomes.

Teachers' knowledge about dyslexia refers to their understanding of the nature, causes, characteristics, early indicators, and instructional approaches related to dyslexia, including awareness that dyslexia is a neurodevelopmental learning difficulty that affects reading, spelling, and language processing. This construct also examines teachers' ability to distinguish dyslexia from general reading difficulties and their familiarity with appropriate teaching strategies to support affected learners, and strong knowledge about dyslexia enables teachers to make informed instructional decisions, identify learners' needs accurately, and implement suitable interventions that support literacy development in inclusive classrooms. Finally, teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading refers to their belief in their own capability to effectively teach reading skills to learners with diverse learning needs, reflecting the level of confidence teachers have in planning, delivering, and evaluating reading instruction using appropriate strategies. High self-efficacy is associated with greater instructional effort, persistence in addressing learning difficulties, and willingness to try new or evidence-based approaches, and in inclusive classrooms, self-efficacy plays a crucial role in how teachers respond to struggling readers, adapt instruction, and maintain effective learning environments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of the study and provides an analysis and discussion of the findings in relation to the teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and their self-efficacy in teaching learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. The discussion is grounded strictly in the data gathered from 51 elementary teachers of Catarman Integrated School who were selected through purposive sampling based on established inclusion criteria. The study employed a descriptive correlational research design, and data were collected using a structured questionnaire composed of four adopted and validated instruments, namely the Teachers' Knowledge and Beliefs about Developmental Dyslexia Scale, the Science of Reading readiness instrument, the Reading Teaching Efficacy Instrument, and a demographic profile sheet. Frequencies, percentages, weighted means, and standard deviations were used to describe the respondents' profile and the levels of knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy, while Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to test the significance of relationships among the major variables at the 0.05 level of significance. The results that follow are organized according to the specific research sub-problems and are interpreted directly in relation to the objectives of the study, integrating descriptive findings with relevant literature to deepen understanding of teachers' competencies and challenges in addressing the needs of learners with dyslexia and other learning difficulties in inclusive classrooms.

Profile of the respondents

The demographic profile of the 51 respondents was examined in terms of age, gender, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, attendance to seminars or training on inclusive education, and reading exposure to literacy education, as these characteristics provided context for interpreting teachers' knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy. With respect to age and gender, the respondents were predominantly female at 86.27 percent, with the largest proportion belonging to the 35 to 44 age group, comprising 17 female teachers (33.33%) and 2 male teachers (3.92%) for a combined 19 respondents in that bracket, followed by the 45 to 54 age group with 13 female teachers (25.49%) and 1 male teacher (1.96%) totaling 14 respondents, the 25 to 34 age group with 10 female teachers (19.61%) and 4 male teachers (7.84%) totaling 14 respondents, and the 55 and above age group with 4 female teachers (7.84%) and 0 male teachers (0.00%). This distribution indicated a largely mid-career teaching workforce in which accumulated classroom experience and repeated exposure to training programs likely influenced preparedness for inclusive education, with female teachers being more actively engaged in collaborative learning and school-based professional development that may have strengthened inclusive teaching practices across all age groups. These results implied that inclusive education initiatives should be designed to sustain engagement across all age groups and genders while leveraging the experience of mid-career teachers to mentor younger colleagues. This interpretation was supported by Ainscow and Miles (2008), Ainscow and Sandill (2010), Ainscow, Slee, and Best (2019), and Ibrohim et al. (2022), who emphasized that inclusive education outcomes were shaped by teacher characteristics such as age, gender, and professional experience, which influence participation in professional development, self-efficacy, and pedagogical competence.

In terms of highest educational attainment, 34 teachers or 66.67 percent had completed master's units, 5 teachers or 9.80 percent were master's graduates, 1 teacher or 1.96 percent had earned doctorate units, and 11 teachers or 21.57 percent held only a bachelor's degree, indicating that 78.43 percent of respondents had engaged in postgraduate studies. This high level of academic preparation suggested that respondents were better positioned to understand complex concepts related to dyslexia, inclusive education, and evidence-based instructional strategies, implying that institutional support for postgraduate education plays a critical role in strengthening teachers' capacity to implement inclusive practices. Bigueras et al. (2020) similarly found that teachers with higher educational attainment tended to exhibit stronger professional competencies and deeper pedagogical knowledge, while Caraig and Quimbo (2022) and Gonzalez (2021) reported that advanced and graduate-level training enhanced professional engagement, preparedness, and self-efficacy in addressing learning difficulties.

Regarding years of teaching experience, 16 respondents or 31.37 percent had 16 years or more in teaching, an equal number of 16 respondents or 31.37 percent had 6 to 10 years of experience, 11 teachers or 21.57 percent had 11 to 15 years of experience, and 8 teachers or 15.69 percent had 1 to 5 years of experience. This balanced distribution suggested that respondents collectively brought both long-term professional expertise and relatively recent training exposure, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of inclusive education practices, and implied that schools should promote mentoring and collaborative professional learning across experience levels. Barnes, Boedeker, Cartwright, and Zhang (2022) highlighted that instructional effectiveness in early reading was closely linked to teachers' cognitive management abilities that were often strengthened through sustained classroom experience, while Van Mieghem et al. (2022) noted that experienced teachers tended to draw on a wider range of support resources.

With regard to grade level taught, Grade One and Grade Three each had 9 teachers or 17.65 percent, Grade Four had 8 teachers or 15.69 percent, Grade Two had 7 teachers or 13.73 percent, and Kindergarten, Grade Five, and Grade Six each had 6 teachers or 11.76 percent, for a total of 51 respondents or 100.00 percent. This distribution, in which no single grade level dominated the sample, suggested that respondents collectively had experience teaching learners at varying developmental and cognitive stages, essential for adapting inclusive strategies, and implied that inclusive education initiatives should be vertically aligned across grade levels. Bernardo and Mante-Estacio (2023) and Bianan and Santos (2020) found that grade-level assignment influences teachers' professional engagement and instructional adaptability, while Duke and Cartwright (2021) emphasized that early-grade teaching experience is critical in shaping understanding of foundational and inclusive literacy practices.

For attendance to related seminars or training on inclusive education, 47 respondents or 92.16 percent had attended such seminars or training, while only 4 respondents or 7.84 percent had not. This high level of training attendance reflected strong professional engagement and was likely to enhance teachers' conceptual understanding, instructional skills, and confidence, implying that continued and well-structured professional development should be institutionalized. Alido et al. (2023) found that sustained participation in professional development enhances preparedness and self-efficacy in handling students with special educational needs, Crispel and Kasperski (2021) reported that targeted training in special and inclusive education strengthens implementation of inclusive practices, and Forlin et al. (2014) demonstrated that even basic inclusion-focused training leads to measurable gains in teaching efficacy.

Lastly, regarding reading exposure to literacy education, 34 respondents or 66.67 percent reported having such exposure while 17 respondents or 33.33 percent indicated no exposure, suggesting that two thirds of the teachers were familiar with literacy-related texts, research, or professional materials informing reading instruction and inclusive practices. This finding implied that schools should encourage sustained reading engagement through access to professional resources and guided literacy communities. Ibrohim et al. (2022) noted that teachers who actively engage with literacy-related readings demonstrate stronger pedagogical knowledge, Hudson et al. (2021) found that exposure to research-based literacy content is closely linked to knowledge of foundational reading skills, and McMahan et al. (2019) reported that continuous engagement with literacy literature enhances instructional decision-making.

Level of respondents' knowledge about dyslexia

The respondents demonstrated a generally high level of knowledge about dyslexia, as reflected by the aggregate weighted mean of 3.67 and an aggregate standard deviation of 0.94, corresponding to a verbal interpretation of High. This indicated that, overall, teachers possessed substantial understanding of dyslexia, its characteristics, and teaching strategies, though variation existed across specific concepts, a result that aligned with Peltier, Washburn, Heddy, and Binks-Cantrell (2022), who emphasized that while teachers tend to have foundational knowledge about dyslexia, certain misconceptions and gaps persist. Data underpinning this finding showed that respondents rated the item that dyslexia is a result of a neurologically-based disorder at 4.37 (SD = 0.72, Very High), that dyslexia is caused by visual-perception deficits producing the reversal of letters and words at 4.14 (SD = 1.18, High), that a child can be dyslexic and gifted at 4.29 (SD = 0.81, Very High), that dyslexic children often have emotional and social disabilities at 3.94 (SD = 0.90, High), that the brains of individuals with dyslexia are different from those of people without dyslexia at 4.16 (SD = 1.07, High), that dyslexia is hereditary at 3.69 (SD = 1.12, High), that about 5% of school-age students have dyslexia at 3.67 (SD = 0.99, High), that dyslexia has a greater occurrence in males than in

females at 3.43 (SD = 0.92, High), that children with dyslexia are more consistently impaired in phonemic awareness at 4.00 (SD = 0.85, High), that modeling fluent reading is often used as a teaching strategy at 4.31 (SD = 0.68, Very High), that people with dyslexia have below average intelligence at 2.90 (SD = 1.14, Moderate), that the reading of students with dyslexia is often characterized by inaccuracy and lack of fluency at 3.88 (SD = 0.97, High), that seeing letters and words backwards is a basic characteristic of dyslexia at 3.86 (SD = 1.10, High), that difficulty with phonological processing is one of the most important deficits in dyslexia at 4.16 (SD = 0.73, High), that intelligence tests are useful in identifying dyslexia at 3.61 (SD = 1.17, High), that all poor readers have dyslexia at 2.55 (SD = 1.19, Low), that children with dyslexia can be helped by using colored lenses or colored overlays at 3.59 (SD = 0.80, High), that physicians can prescribe medications to help students with dyslexia at 3.20 (SD = 1.13, Moderate), that multisensory instruction is not an effective training method now at 3.04 (SD = 0.98, Moderate), that students who have reading disabilities without an apparent cause are called dyslexic at 3.37 (SD = 1.04, Moderate), that people with dyslexia are not stupid or lazy and knowing about the term helps children at 4.10 (SD = 0.85, High), that giving students with dyslexia accommodations is unfair to other students at 2.67 (SD = 1.29, Moderate), that intervention programs emphasizing phonological aspects of language with visual support from letters are effective at 4.27 (SD = 0.70, Very High), that most teachers receive intensive training in working with dyslexic children at 3.24 (SD = 1.24, Moderate), that dyslexia is a myth that does not exist at 2.12 (SD = 1.03, Low), that repeated reading techniques are useful for improving reading fluency at 4.27 (SD = 0.63, Very High), that problems in establishing laterality are the cause of dyslexia at 3.08 (SD = 0.77, Moderate), that students with dyslexia need structured, sequential, direct instruction at 4.16 (SD = 0.64, High), that dyslexia refers to a relatively chronic condition often not completely overcome at 3.59 (SD = 0.96, High), that many students with dyslexia continue to have reading problems as adults at 3.71 (SD = 0.78, High), that many students with dyslexia have low self-esteem at 3.63 (SD = 0.96, High), that children with dyslexia have problems with decoding and spelling but not with listening comprehension at 3.69 (SD = 0.81, High), that applying an individual reading test is essential to diagnosing dyslexia at 4.22 (SD = 0.70, Very High), that people with dyslexia tend to spell words wrong at 3.71 (SD = 1.14, High), that dyslexia usually lasts for a long time at 3.37 (SD = 0.96, Moderate), and that dyslexia is characterized by difficulty with learning to read fluently at 4.08 (SD = 0.82, High).

A closer examination of the highest mean values reveals that teachers are particularly knowledgeable in core concepts and practical instructional strategies, as reflected in the very high scores for understanding dyslexia as a neurologically-based condition (M = 4.37, SD = 0.72), recognizing that learners with dyslexia may also be intellectually gifted (M = 4.29, SD = 0.81), modeling fluent reading as a teaching strategy (M = 4.31, SD = 0.68), implementing interventions that emphasize phonological skills supported by letters (M = 4.27, SD = 0.70), and using repeated reading to improve fluency (M = 4.27, SD = 0.63). These results suggest that teachers are well acquainted with evidence-based practices that are both research-informed and readily applicable in classroom settings, a familiarity likely stemming from structured pre-service training, professional development programs, and repeated classroom application. This pattern aligns with Chao, Forlin, and Ho (2016), who emphasized that sustained training and instructional support in inclusive education strengthen teachers' knowledge base and instructional competence.

Conversely, the lowest mean scores indicate areas where misconceptions or knowledge gaps persist. Teachers showed limited understanding regarding extreme misconceptions, such as doubts about the existence of dyslexia (M = 2.12, SD = 1.03) and the belief that all struggling

readers have dyslexia (M = 2.55, SD = 1.19). Moderate scores were observed in perceptions about the fairness of accommodations (M = 2.67, SD = 1.29), the role of medication in addressing reading difficulties (M = 3.20, SD = 1.13), and the effectiveness of multisensory instructional methods (M = 3.04, SD = 0.98). These results suggest that while teachers generally reject extreme myths, uncertainty persists in less emphasized areas, including specialized interventions, assessment practices, and alternative approaches, which Clark and Andreasen (2021) similarly attributed to limited preparation and fewer opportunities to engage with less frequently practiced instructional approaches. The implications of these findings are significant for instructional practice, since teachers' strong knowledge of core concepts provides a foundation for effective literacy interventions, while gaps in understanding accommodations, assessment strategies, and alternative interventions may hinder full realization of inclusive instructional practices, underscoring the need for focused professional development, mentoring, and collaborative learning opportunities to strengthen teachers' ability to apply comprehensive, research-based approaches and promote more inclusive literacy outcomes.

Extent of respondents' preparedness to apply the Science of Reading

The results indicate that respondents generally exhibit a high level of preparedness to apply the Science of Reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms, as reflected by an aggregate weighted mean of 3.84 and an aggregate standard deviation of 0.81, interpreted as Prepared. This finding suggests that teachers perceive themselves as capable of implementing evidence-based reading strategies and possess foundational competencies essential for effective literacy instruction. Specific indicator results showed that teachers felt confident in assessing student learning gaps to determine individualized teaching at a weighted mean of 3.86 (SD = 0.92, Prepared), were aware of and understood the Science of Reading at 4.00 (SD = 0.75, Prepared), knew how to effectively teach the Science of Reading at 3.92 (SD = 0.66, Prepared), felt confident teaching the Science of Reading at 3.96 (SD = 0.75, Prepared), felt confident teaching writing at 4.08 (SD = 0.74, Prepared), understood that the purpose of reading instruction is to teach children to recognize words and pronounce them correctly at 4.24 (SD = 0.84, Highly Prepared), viewed reading and writing as unrelated processes at 2.12 (SD = 1.09, Less Prepared), believed students should be encouraged to sound out all unknown words at 4.08 (SD = 0.87, Prepared), understood that the purpose of reading is to understand print at 4.16 (SD = 0.81, Prepared), and practiced flexible grouping for reading instruction at 4.02 (SD = 0.68, Prepared).

A closer examination of the highest mean values demonstrates that teachers feel particularly confident in core literacy objectives and routine instructional strategies, reporting very high preparedness in facilitating accurate word recognition and comprehension of print (M = 4.24, SD = 0.84; M = 4.16, SD = 0.81) and in applying basic decoding strategies such as encouraging students to sound out unfamiliar words (M = 4.08, SD = 0.87). High confidence was also evident in teaching writing (M = 4.08, SD = 0.74) and in delivering Science of Reading-aligned lessons (M = 3.96 to 3.92, SD = 0.66 to 0.75). These findings suggest that teachers' preparedness is strongest in areas routinely emphasized in teacher preparation programs and frequently practiced in the classroom, a pattern consistent with Darling-Hammond, Schachner, Wojcikiewicz, and Flook (2024), who found that structured and well-supported training programs significantly strengthen teachers' instructional confidence and ability to implement research-based reading strategies.

Conversely, the lowest mean scores point to areas where teachers experience relative uncertainty or face more complex instructional demands. A notably low mean score of 2.12 (SD = 1.09) indicates limited preparedness in understanding the integrated relationship

between reading and writing, reflecting a misconception that these literacy processes operate independently. Other areas with lower preparedness include assessing individual learning gaps to inform instruction (M = 3.86, SD = 0.92), applying Science of Reading principles effectively in classroom practice (M = 3.92, SD = 0.66), and managing flexible student groupings for reading instruction (M = 4.02, SD = 0.68). These findings suggest that teachers may feel less confident when instructional practices demand diagnostic assessment, individualized planning, or dynamic classroom organization, components that require higher-order decision-making and are less consistently emphasized in pre-service or in-service training. Livers et al. (2021) similarly noted that teachers often feel less prepared in implementing assessment-driven instruction and flexible grouping, emphasizing the importance of continuous, hands-on training. The implications of these findings are significant for instructional practice, since teachers' strong preparation in foundational reading skills ensures that learners in inclusive classrooms receive consistent, research-based support, while gaps in understanding and confidence regarding assessment, individualized instruction, and literacy integration suggest that students with diverse needs, including those with dyslexia, may not always receive optimally tailored support, underscoring the value of professional learning communities, coaching, and structured interventions.

Level of self-efficacy in teaching reading

The respondents demonstrated a generally high level of self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms, with an aggregate weighted mean of 3.63 and an aggregate standard deviation of 0.90, corresponding to a verbal interpretation of High, a result aligning with Clark and Andreasen (2021), who emphasized that elementary teachers' self-efficacy is shaped by their beliefs, prior experiences, and preparation. The item-level results showed that teachers attributed better-than-usual reading performance to teacher effort at a weighted mean of 3.96 (SD = 1.06, High), reported that they would continually look for better ways to teach reading at 4.53 (SD = 0.58, Very High), indicated at 2.08 (SD = 1.25, Low) that even with effort they would not teach reading as well as other subjects, attributed improved reading performance to teachers finding more effective ways to support reading at 4.37 (SD = 0.80, Very High), reported knowing several ways to teach reading effectively at 4.22 (SD = 0.70, Very High), rated themselves as not very effective in monitoring reading activities at 2.55 (SD = 1.12, Low), attributed progress among low-achieving readers to extra teacher support at 4.18 (SD = 0.79, High), reported understanding the reading process well enough to teach effectively at 4.16 (SD = 0.64, High), agreed that the teacher is generally responsible for students' reading achievement at 3.90 (SD = 0.98, High), agreed that students' reading achievement is directly related to teacher effectiveness at 3.96 (SD = 1.02, High), agreed that parental observations of increased reading interest are likely due to the teacher's performance at 3.82 (SD = 0.97, High), reported difficulty teaching students with reading problems at 2.84 (SD = 1.05, Low), indicated they would usually welcome student questions when teaching reading at 4.20 (SD = 0.63, High), reported difficulty explaining to students how to improve their reading at 2.73 (SD = 1.06, Low), indicated not knowing what to do to turn students on to reading at 2.41 (SD = 0.94, Low), and reported using community resources to support literacy in the classroom at 4.14 (SD = 0.80, High).

A closer look at the highest mean values reveals that teachers exhibit the strongest self-efficacy in proactive and reflective aspects of reading instruction. The highest mean of 4.53 (SD = 0.58) reflects teachers' commitment to continually seeking improved approaches to teaching reading, indicating a proactive stance toward professional growth. Teachers also

recognize the role of effective instructional support in enhancing students' reading performance (M = 4.37, SD = 0.80) and report confidence in employing multiple strategies to teach reading successfully (M = 4.22, SD = 0.70). High confidence was also observed in supporting progress among low-achieving readers (M = 4.18, SD = 0.79) and in fostering student engagement through welcoming questions during reading instruction (M = 4.20, SD = 0.63). These findings suggest that teachers view themselves as active facilitators of student learning, an interpretation aligning with Woodcock and Hardy (2025), who found that teacher self-efficacy is enhanced when educators receive inclusive teaching training coupled with continuous professional development.

In contrast, the lowest mean values highlight areas where teachers experience reduced confidence in specific instructional practices. A low mean of 2.08 (SD = 1.25) suggests that some teachers perceive reading instruction as more challenging compared with other subject areas. Lower self-efficacy was also evident in monitoring reading activities (M = 2.55, SD = 1.12), teaching students with reading difficulties (M = 2.84, SD = 1.05), explaining reading improvement strategies (M = 2.73, SD = 1.06), and motivating students to engage with reading (M = 2.41, SD = 0.94). These results indicate that teachers may feel less confident when instructional tasks require differentiated support, individualized interventions, or complex classroom management strategies, challenges often rooted in limited exposure to specialized interventions or insufficient hands-on training. Yakut (2021) similarly observed that teachers' self-efficacy is lower when managing specialized instructional demands. High teacher self-efficacy in core and proactive instructional strategies ensures that learners benefit from consistent and effective reading instruction, while areas of lower confidence suggest potential gaps in supporting struggling readers and implementing individualized or complex strategies, indicating that targeted professional development, coaching, and collaborative learning opportunities remain necessary to strengthen inclusive reading instruction across all domains.

Relationships among knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy

The relationship between teachers' knowledge about dyslexia and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading was examined using Pearson's correlation analysis. The results indicated a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.592$, $p = 0.000$) between the two variables. Since the p-value was less than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected, confirming that the relationship was statistically significant, and this finding suggested that as teachers' understanding of dyslexia increased, so did their confidence and readiness to apply the Science of Reading in classrooms with diverse learners. This significant moderate relationship implied that knowledge of dyslexia served as a critical foundation for instructional preparedness, since teachers who were well informed about the characteristics, causes, and manifestations of dyslexia were better equipped to plan lessons, identify students' learning gaps, and implement targeted reading interventions. These findings were consistent with Van Mieghem, Struyf, and Verschueren (2022), who reported that teachers' access to relevant knowledge and instructional resources enhanced both self-efficacy and preparedness, and with Hudson, Moore, Han, Wee Koh, Binks-Cantrell, and Malatesha Joshi (2021), who found that teachers with higher literacy knowledge demonstrated greater confidence in implementing evidence-based reading practices. These results could be further explained through the Science of Reading framework, which underscored the importance of combining theoretical understanding with practical skills, reinforcing the interconnectedness of knowledge and preparedness in fostering inclusive literacy outcomes.

The relationship between teachers' knowledge about dyslexia and their self-efficacy in teaching reading was likewise examined using Pearson's correlation analysis. The results revealed a weak positive correlation ($r = 0.393$, $p = 0.004$) between the two variables. Since

the p-value was less than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected, confirming that the relationship was statistically significant. Despite its significance, the relatively low r-value indicated that while greater knowledge was associated with slightly higher confidence in teaching reading, other factors also contributed to self-efficacy. This weak positive relationship suggested that knowledge of dyslexia alone was not sufficient to fully determine teachers' confidence in delivering reading instruction, as self-efficacy was also shaped by practical classroom experience, familiarity with evidence-based strategies, and previous successes in teaching learners with diverse reading needs. These findings were consistent with Szymanski (2024), who emphasized that knowledge of dyslexia contributed to teacher confidence but that practical experience, consistent application of strategies, and professional support were critical in strengthening self-efficacy, and with Woodcock and Hardy (2025), who noted that teachers with strong theoretical knowledge may still feel less confident if they lacked opportunities to apply interventions effectively in real classroom settings. This result highlighted an important implication for professional development, in that improving teachers' self-efficacy required more than enhancing knowledge, requiring structured opportunities to practice interventions, observe model lessons, receive coaching, and reflect on student outcomes.

The relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in teaching reading and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading was examined using Pearson's correlation analysis as well. The results revealed a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.681$, $p = 0.000$), indicating that the relationship was statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Since the p-value was less than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected, confirming that teachers' self-efficacy was meaningfully associated with their preparedness to implement evidence-based reading strategies, and this finding suggested that higher confidence in teaching abilities corresponded to greater readiness to apply the Science of Reading in inclusive classroom settings. This moderate positive relationship implied that teachers who felt capable and confident in their instructional skills were more likely to engage in deliberate planning, apply a range of instructional strategies, and adjust their teaching to meet the needs of learners with diverse reading abilities, monitoring student progress more systematically and identifying learning gaps more effectively. These findings were supported by Van Mieghem, Struyf, and Verschueren (2022), who noted that self-efficacy enhanced teachers' motivation and commitment to implement inclusive practices, by Szymanski (2024), who emphasized that teachers with high confidence were better able to convert knowledge into actionable strategies, and by Woodcock and Hardy (2025), who highlighted that professional development programs targeting both knowledge and self-efficacy significantly increased teachers' readiness to implement evidence-based interventions.

Taken together, the findings of this study demonstrate that the 51 teacher respondents from Catarman Integrated School possess a high level of knowledge about dyslexia (aggregate weighted mean of 3.67, SD = 0.94), a high extent of preparedness to apply the Science of Reading (aggregate weighted mean of 3.84, SD = 0.81), and a high level of self-efficacy in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs (aggregate weighted mean of 3.63, SD = 0.90), while the Pearson correlation results confirm statistically significant relationships among these three variables, namely a moderate positive correlation between knowledge and preparedness ($r = 0.592$, $p = 0.000$), a weak positive correlation between knowledge and self-efficacy ($r = 0.393$, $p = 0.004$), and a moderate positive correlation between self-efficacy and preparedness ($r = 0.681$, $p = 0.000$), with the null hypothesis rejected in all three tests. These results directly address the study's objectives by establishing that teachers' understanding of dyslexia, their confidence in their teaching abilities, and their readiness to apply evidence-based reading

strategies are interconnected components that collectively shape the quality of literacy instruction delivered to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. The findings also reveal specific strengths, particularly in foundational and neurologically grounded knowledge, core literacy objectives, and proactive instructional dispositions, as well as specific gaps in areas requiring higher-order decision-making, such as accommodations, assessment-driven instruction, flexible grouping, and support for struggling readers. These patterns contribute to the field by empirically demonstrating, within the context of a public elementary school setting, that knowledge acquisition alone is insufficient to guarantee instructional confidence and readiness, and that practical experience, coaching, and sustained professional development are equally necessary to translate theoretical understanding into effective classroom practice. Collectively, these results provide the empirical foundation for the Professional Intervention Plan to be presented in the succeeding chapter, which is designed to address the identified gaps in teachers' knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy through targeted professional development activities aimed at strengthening inclusive reading instruction for learners with dyslexia and other diverse learning needs.

CONCLUSION

The study examined teachers' knowledge about dyslexia and their levels of self-efficacy and preparedness in teaching reading to learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms at Catarman Integrated School during the school year 2025 to 2026. It sought to determine teachers' understanding of dyslexia, their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and their confidence in delivering reading instruction to diverse learners while also considering selected demographic characteristics that may influence literacy instruction in inclusive settings. Employing a quantitative descriptive correlational research design, the study utilized standardized survey questionnaires to measure teachers' knowledge about dyslexia, preparedness to apply evidence-based reading instruction, and self-efficacy in teaching reading. Data gathered from 51 elementary teachers selected through purposive sampling were analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, ranking, and Pearson correlation to determine the levels of the variables and the significance of their relationships. The use of validated instruments provided a reliable basis for examining the interaction among teachers' knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy and for developing an intervention plan that supports inclusive and evidence-based literacy instruction.

The findings revealed that most respondents were female teachers between 35 and 44 years of age, many of whom had earned Master's units and had previously attended seminars or training related to inclusive and literacy education. These characteristics suggest that the respondents already possessed foundational exposure to inclusive teaching practices. The results further showed that teachers demonstrated a high level of knowledge about dyslexia, particularly in recognizing its neurological basis and understanding effective reading interventions, although minor misconceptions remained. Likewise, respondents were generally well prepared to apply the Science of Reading, especially in implementing structured literacy strategies, although additional support is needed to strengthen their understanding of the relationship between reading and writing. Teachers also reported a high level of self-efficacy in teaching reading and improving learners' performance, although comparatively lower confidence was observed when working with struggling readers.

The correlational analysis demonstrated a moderate positive relationship between teachers' knowledge about dyslexia and their preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, as well as between self-efficacy and preparedness. In contrast, the relationship between knowledge and self-efficacy was weak, indicating that knowledge alone is insufficient to strengthen teachers' confidence in delivering effective reading instruction. These findings

suggest that while theoretical understanding provides an important foundation for inclusive literacy instruction, confidence and instructional readiness are further enhanced through meaningful teaching experiences, continuous professional learning, and opportunities to apply evidence-based practices in authentic classroom settings.

Overall, the study concludes that teachers' knowledge of dyslexia, preparedness to apply the Science of Reading, and self-efficacy in teaching reading are essential and interconnected factors that influence the quality of reading instruction for learners with diverse needs in inclusive classrooms. A sound understanding of dyslexia enables teachers to recognize reading difficulties accurately and implement appropriate instructional interventions, while preparedness reflects their capacity to consistently apply structured literacy and evidence-based reading strategies across varied learning contexts. At the same time, strong self-efficacy enhances teachers' confidence to engage learners, differentiate instruction according to individual needs, and respond effectively to reading challenges. The findings emphasize that improving inclusive literacy instruction requires a comprehensive approach that integrates theoretical knowledge, practical application, and sustained confidence building.

The study further highlights important implications for educational practice, program development, and institutional policy. Strengthening teachers' competence in inclusive reading instruction requires continuous professional development, targeted interventions, mentoring, and sustained institutional support that promote dyslexia awareness, structured literacy, and the effective implementation of the Science of Reading framework. In this regard, the implementation of the A.I.D.E. Program at Catarman Integrated School is recommended as the primary intervention developed from the findings of the study. The program should be complemented by continuous professional development activities, practical workshops, mentoring sessions, and the provision of instructional resources that enable teachers to translate evidence-based reading practices into effective classroom instruction. Furthermore, regular monitoring and evaluation should be undertaken to assess program implementation, identify areas for improvement, and ensure the continuous enhancement of teachers' knowledge, preparedness, and self-efficacy. Through these sustained efforts, schools can strengthen inclusive reading instruction and promote more equitable literacy outcomes for all learners.

REFERENCES

Abutazil, A. F. (2023). Inclusive education policies: Solidifying actions and opportunities to accommodate persons with disabilities. Jozac Academic Voice, 3(1), 33–36. https://shorturl.at/2NN42

Adams, M. J. (1990). Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print. MIT Press. https://tinyurl.com/4m2f33p5

Afangideh, M. E., & Jude, W. I. (2012). Developing literacy skills to enhance the academic performance of learners in the Uyo Education Zone. Academic Research International, 3(3), 296–302. https://shorturl.at/zgZzl

Ainscow, M., & Miles, S. (2008). Making education for all inclusive: Where next? Prospects, 38(1), 15–34. https://shorturl.at/V3bJQ

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 14(4), 401–416. https://shorturl.at/JKgMk

Ainscow, M., Slee, R., & Best, M. (2019). The Salamanca statement: 25 years on. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 23(7–8), 671–676. https://shorturl.at/sFJPf

Alido, A. P., Ancheta, R. A., Manalastas, R., Reyes, N. R. T. D., Sitoy, R. E., Manguilimotan, R. P., & Padillo, G. G. (2023). Receiving teachers' preparedness in handling students with special educational needs in the junior high school level. Russian Law Journal, 11(3), 2850–2872. https://russianlawjournal.org/index.php/journal/article/view/2286/1262

Anderson, C. M. (2016). An experimental study of literacy intervention: Teaching foundational reading skills and guided reading (Doctoral dissertation, D'Youville College). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. https://rb.gy/g7nn1j

Arias, C. R., Calago, C. N. S., Calungsod, H. F. B., Delica, M. A., Fullo, M. E., & Cabanilla, A. B. (2023). Challenges and implementation of inclusive education in selected Asian countries: A meta-synthesis. International Journal of Research in Education and Science, 9(2), 512–534. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.3089

Arrow, A. W., Braid, C., & Chapman, J. W. (2019). Explicit linguistic knowledge is necessary, but not sufficient, for the provision of explicit early literacy instruction. Annals of Dyslexia, 69(1), 99–113. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11881-018-00168-0

Baog, I., Victorino, D., Gundaya, D., Marino, A. J., Tayag, N., & Mullet, J. (2022, May 1). Reforming students' perceptions on inclusive education through DepEd Order 72, s. 2009. International Journal of Research Publications, 101(1). https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001011520223176

Barnes, Z. T., Boedeker, P., Cartwright, K. B., & Zhang, B. (2022). Socioeconomic status and early reading achievement: How working memory and cognitive flexibility mediate the relation in low-achieving and typically developing K to first grade students. Journal of Research in Reading, 45(2), 204–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12398

Batilaran, J., Llanos, A., & Mercado, M. (2024). Enhancing literacy: A comprehensive examination of individualized reading programs. International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE), 1(2), 182–187. https://tinyurl.com/5bwbdw3j

Ben-Naim, S., Laslo-Roth, R., Einav, M., Biran, H., & Margalit, M. (2016). Academic self-efficacy, sense of coherence, hope and tiredness among college students with learning disabilities. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 32(1), 18–34. https://tinyurl.com/mryh5rfz

Bernardo, A. B. I., & Mante-Estacio, M. J. (2023). Metacognitive reading strategies and its relationship with Filipino high school students' reading proficiency: Insights from the PISA 2018 data. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10, Article 400. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01886-6

Bianan, D. R., & Santos, P. G. D. (2020). Personality types and learning styles of children with dyslexia in San Carlos City Division. Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 3(1). https://tinyurl.com/j3rue5wz

Bigueras, R. T., Arispe, M. C. A., Torio, J. O., Maligat Jr, D. E., & Palaoag, T. D. (2020). Design of mobile game-based learning application for children with dyslexia. International Journal, 9(1.3). https://tinyurl.com/53zvkuxu

Bolotaolo, R. A. (2019). With open arms: Integrating teachers' self-efficacy and their inclusion accommodation modality. Amang Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Office of the EARIST Research Services. https://tinyurl.com/2t9n72k6

Bongabong, J., Delicano, M., Cagape, W., Dela Cerna, R., & Magno, C. (2022, December 1). Exploring the real-life issues and challenges in an inclusive classroom through the lens of general education kindergarten teachers and parents: A qualitative study. International Journal of Research Publications, 115(1). https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp10011511220224313

Boulhrir, T. (2017). Twenty-first century instructional classroom practices and reading motivation: Probing the effectiveness of interventional reading programs. International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 5(3), 57–66. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.5n.3p.57

Boyes, M. E., Leitão, S., Claessen, M., & Badcock, N. A. (2020). Correlates of externalising and internalising problems in children with dyslexia: An analysis of data from clinical casefiles. Australian Psychologist, 55(1), 62–72. https://tinyurl.com/yvbv5xw9

Campilla, M. E., & Cariño, C. M. (2024). Reading literacy of Grade 7 learners. International Journal of Open-access, Interdisciplinary and New Educational Discoveries of ETCOR Educational Research Center (iJOINED ETCOR), 3(2), 319–334. https://tinyurl.com/35wv6rkp

Capangpangan, S. E., Tango-an, J. M., & Lumapas, R. Z. (2023). Teachers' preparation and support in the implementation of inclusive education for learners with exceptionalities. International Journal of Inclusive and Sustainable Education, 2(6), 244–273. https://tinyurl.com/2z6fp85u

Caraig, R. V., & Quimbo, M. A. T. (2022). Assessing reading comprehension difficulties in core science subjects of senior high school students in a private school in Calamba City, Philippines. International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 14(3), 1983–2010. https://tinyurl.com/bhzv6mvr

Carey, L. B., Stephan, C., & Pritchard, A. E. (2019). Preparing students for competent use of academic testing accommodations: Teachers' belief, knowledge, and practice. Learning Disabilities: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 24(1), 33–42. https://doi.org/10.18666/ldmj-2019-v24-i1-9021

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 (JRPPTTE), 14(1). https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol14.1.5.2024

Carretti, B., Borella, E., Elosúa, M. R., Gómez-Veiga, I., & García-Madruga, J. A. (2017). Improvements in reading comprehension performance after a training program focusing on executive processes of working memory. Journal of Cognitive Enhancement, 1(3), 268–279. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41465-017-0012-9

Cartwright, K. B. (2002). Cognitive development and reading: The relation of reading-specific multiple classification skill to reading comprehension in elementary school children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 94(1), 56–63. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.1.56

Cartwright, K. B., Bock, A. M., Clause, J. H., August, E. A. C., Saunders, H. G., & Schmidt, K. J. (2020). Near- and far-transfer effects of an executive function intervention for 2nd to 5th-grade struggling readers. Cognitive Development, 56, 100932. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2020.100932

Casinto, C. (2022). Does school climate matter in inclusive education? A case of instructional leadership in the Philippines. International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies, 9(1), 91–106. https://tinyurl.com/52d5tujv

Chao, C. N. G., Forlin, C., & Ho, F. C. (2016). Improving teaching self-efficacy for teachers in inclusive classrooms in Hong Kong. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 20(11), 1142–1154. https://tinyurl.com/35v572rb

Clark, S. K., & Andreasen, L. (2021). Exploring elementary teacher self-efficacy and teacher beliefs: Are we preparing teachers to teach culturally diverse students? Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 49(1), 128–142. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1359866X.2020.1777528

Coxon, M. (2024). "All children are reachable": An exploration of teachers' differing inclusive attitudes, self-efficacy, and pedagogical approaches to supporting children with reading difficulties and/or dyslexia, and Lesson Study as a method of supporting mainstream primary school teachers [Abstract methods]. https://hdl.handle.net/10871/137227

Crispel, O., & Kasperski, R. (2021). The impact of teacher training in special education on the implementation of inclusion in mainstream classrooms. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 25(9), 1079–1090. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1600590

Culajara, J. P. M., & Culajara, C. J. (2023, May 1). A case study on teachers' challenges in inclusive mathematics classes in a secondary public school. Journal of Mathematics Instruction, Social Research and Opinion, 2(2), 145–157. https://doi.org/10.58421/misro.v2i2.90

Darling-Hammond, L., Schachner, A. C., Wojcikiewicz, S. K., & Flook, L. (2024). Educating teachers to enact the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 28(1), 1–21. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10888691.2022.2130506

Dehaene, S. (2009). Reading in the brain: The science and evolution of a human invention. Viking. https://tinyurl.com/3peuk3dr

Department of Education (DepEd). (2021). DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021 – Policy guidelines on the provision of educational programs and services for learners with disabilities in the K to 12 basic education program. https://tinyurl.com/55sma6j2

Dioso, M., Iglesia, A., Ramiro, F., & Iglesia, N. (n.d.). Readiness for inclusive special education: A survey among in-service teachers in Zamboanga City, Philippines. International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 14(3), 10819–10831. https://tinyurl.com/yyews5us

Duke, N. K., & Cartwright, K. B. (2021). The science of reading progresses: Communicating advances beyond the simple view of reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 56(S1), S25–S44. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.411

Dunning, D. L., Holmes, J., & Gathercole, S. E. (2013). Does working memory training lead to generalized improvements in children with low working memory? A randomized controlled trial. Developmental Science, 16(6), 915–925. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12068

Dyson, H., Best, W., Solity, J., & Hulme, C. (2017). Training mispronunciation correction and word meanings improves children's ability to learn to read words. Scientific Studies of Reading, 21(5), 392–407. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2017.1315424

Feliciano, C. J. O., & Dy, M. F. R. (2021). Comparative analysis of the knowledge, attitude, and practice of first- to third-grade teachers of private and public schools toward free play. Journal of Education, 202(4), 375–384. https://doi.org/mp3h

Flynn, N., Powell, D., Stainthorp, R., & Stuart, M. (2021). Training teachers for phonics and early reading: Developing research-informed practice. Journal of Research in Reading, 44(2), 301–318. https://tinyurl.com/33uhwxpv

Forlin, C., Sharma, U., & Loreman, T. (2014). Predictors of improved teaching efficacy following basic training for inclusion in Hong Kong. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 18(7), 718–730. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603116.2013.819941

Francis, D. A., Caruana, N., Hudson, J. L., & McArthur, G. M. (2019). The association between poor reading and internalising problems: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clinical Psychology Review, 67, 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2018.09.002

Francisco, G., Abequibel-Encarnacion, B., Asid, B., & Saavedra, A. (2023). Prospective language teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards the inclusion of special learners in regular classrooms. Studies in Educational Evaluation. https://tinyurl.com/54t4z6fh

García-Madruga, J. A., Elosúa, M. R., Gil, L., Gómez-Veiga, I., Vila, J. O. S., Orjales, I., Contreras, A., Rodríguez, R., Melero, M. Á., & Duque, G. (2013). Reading comprehension and working memory's executive processes: An intervention study in primary school students. Reading Research Quarterly, 48(2), 155–174. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.44

Garvanova, M., & Eftimova, S. (2021). Educational initiatives to stimulate reading among young people. In EDULEARN21 proceedings (pp. 3812–3816). IATED. https://tinyurl.com/2ha7yb7

Gonzalez, M. (2021). Dyslexia knowledge, perceived preparedness, and professional development needs of in-service educators. Annals of Dyslexia, 71(3), 547–567. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11881-021-00235-z

Hermosura, L. (2022). Gender and development inclusive learning practice of the Department of Education–Bayombong Districts: Basis for organizational development intervention. International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 3(4), 97–105. https://doi.org/10.54476/iimrj210

Hettiarachchi, S., & Das, A. (2014). Perceptions of 'inclusion' and perceived preparedness among school teachers in Sri Lanka. Teaching and Teacher Education, 43, 143–153. https://tinyurl.com/fav5w748

Indrarathne, B. (2019). Accommodating learners with dyslexia in English language teaching in Sri Lanka: Teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and challenges. TESOL Quarterly, 53(3), 630–654. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/tesq.500

Martan, V., Skočić Mihić, S., & Čepić, R. (2023). Teachers' knowledge about students with dyslexia and professional development. European Journal of Contemporary Education, 12(2), 535–552. https://tinyurl.com/yuvs7acx

Mazidah, A., Ardzulyna, A., Rohaizat, I., Kaur, B. S. H., Hilmiah, H., Letchumi, P. T. T., & Azura, B. S. (2021). The relationship between the readiness of knowledge and teachers' attitudes towards students with dyslexic characteristics in mainstream schools. Linguistica Antverpiensia, 2, 1–19. https://tinyurl.com/3twfvef8

McArthur, G. M., Filardi, N., Francis, D. A., Boyes, M. E., & Badcock, N. A. (2020). Self-concept in poor readers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PeerJ, 8, e8772. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8772

McMahan, K. M., Oslund, E. L., & Odegard, T. N. (2019). Characterizing the knowledge of educators receiving training in systematic literacy instruction. Annals of Dyslexia, 69(1), 21–33. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11881-018-00174-2

Moats, L. (2019). Structured literacy: Effective instruction for students with dyslexia and related reading difficulties. Perspectives on Language and Literacy, 45(2), 9–11. https://tinyurl.com/3nnvpjm2

Moats, L. C. (2000). Speech to print: Language essentials for teachers. Paul H. Brookes Publishing. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED446451

Murungi, J. M., Muthaa, G. M., Micheni, L., & Mwenda, E. E. (2014). Strategies for improving parental involvement in acquisition of literacy skills among pupils in primary schools in Akithi division, Tigania West District, Kenya. Open Journal of Social Sciences, 2(4), 250–255. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2014.24027

National Reading Panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. https://tinyurl.com/ypah49tp

Nijakowska, J. (2014). Dyslexia: Does it mean anything to a foreign language teacher? In Multilingualism, literacy and dyslexia (pp. 262–270). Routledge. https://tinyurl.com/3hbj7uu9

Nijakowska, J. (2022). Inclusive teaching practices with learners with dyslexia: Face-to-face training-induced changes in foreign language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, concerns and attitudes. CEPS Journal, 12(4), 129–154. https://tinyurl.com/ybptmbks

Salcedo, J., & Chua, E. (2022, July 16). Revitalizing the program for learners with special educational needs in the promotion of inclusive education in a distance learning environment. International Journal of Research Publications, 106(1). https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001061820223704

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2021). Self-efficacy and human motivation. In Advances in motivation science (Vol. 8, pp. 153–179). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adms.2020.10.001

Seidenberg, M. S. (2017). Language at the speed of sight: How we read, why so many can't, and what can be done about it. Basic Books. https://tinyurl.com/3xnpxb9z

Singh, R. (2022). Inclusive education in ASEAN: Fostering belonging for students with disabilities. Economic Research Institute for ASEAN and East Asia. https://tinyurl.com/2ekjfjkk

Spear-Swerling, L. (2019). Structured literacy and typical literacy practices: Understanding differences to create instructional opportunities. Teaching Exceptional Children, 51(3), 201–211. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0040059917750160

Szymanski, J. R. (2024). The predictive relationship between teachers' knowledge of dyslexia and their confidence in supporting students with dyslexia. https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/5207/

Triviño-Amigo, N., Mendoza-Muñoz, D. M., Mayordomo-Pinilla, N., Barrios-Fernández, S., Contreras-Barraza, N., Gil-Marín, M., & Rojo-Ramos, J. (2022). Inclusive education in primary and secondary school: Perception of teacher training. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(23), 15451. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192315451

Tubo, M. D., & Antonio, A. F. (2022). Extent of efficacy to implement inclusive practices: A quantitative analysis among prospective early childhood teachers. International Journal of Early Childhood, 14(3). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360257847

UNESCO. (1994). The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education: Adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education; Access and quality. Salamanca, Spain, 7–10 June 1994. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000098427

UNESCO. (2020). Towards inclusion in education: Status, trends and challenges: The UNESCO Salamanca statement 25 years on. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374246

Van Mieghem, A., Struyf, E., & Verschueren, K. (2022). The relevance of sources of support for teachers' self-efficacy beliefs towards students with special educational needs. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 37(1), 28–42. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08856257.2020.1829866

Verdeflor, J. V., & Castillo, M. G. L. (2022). Told the untold accounts of senior high school learners with disabilities (LWDs): Bases for equitable pedagogical interventions. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 4(4). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2022.v04i04.060

Woodcock, S., & Hardy, I. (2025). Teacher self-efficacy, inclusion and professional development practices: Cultivating a learning environment for all. Professional Development in Education, 51(5), 890–904. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19415257.2023.2267058

Yakut, A. D. (2021). Students with specific learning disabilities in inclusive settings: A study of teachers' self-efficacy. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 36(2), 136–144. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ldrp.12241

Yilmaz, A. (2020). The relationship between in-service teachers' mindset types and their efficacy beliefs in instructional strategies. İZÜ Eğitim Dergisi, 2(4), 191–203. https://doi.org/10.46423/izujed.752446

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/mr44h3an

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

Gump, H. M. (2024). Teacher preparation and perceptions on readiness to address the science of reading. https://tinyurl.com/yykhvwd4