

**Implementation of inclusive classroom strategies on the academic performance
of learners with special educational needs (SEN)**

Mary Neña M. Rosalita*

Cebu Technological University - Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

In the tapestry of inclusive education, where every learner's unique thread deserves to shine. This study assessed the implementation of inclusive classroom strategies and their relationship to the academic performance of learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) at Uling National High School, Naga City, Cebu. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from 31 teacher-respondents through a questionnaire adapted from the Perceptions of Inclusion Questionnaire (PIQ). The study examined four inclusive strategy categories: differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and support strategies. Perceived impacts were measured across academic self-concept, social-emotional gains, and performance metrics. Results showed that inclusive strategies were implemented at an "Often" level, with UDL rated as "Always." The perceived impact was "Agree" across all three outcome areas, with academic self-concept rated highest and performance metrics rated lowest. The correlational analysis revealed that Support Strategies demonstrated significant positive relationships with both academic self-concept and performance metrics, while Differentiated Instruction showed a significant positive relationship only with social-emotional gains. In contrast, Universal Design for Learning and Collaborative Learning showed no significant relationships with any of the three outcome measures, indicating that frequent implementation alone did not guarantee meaningful associations with learner outcomes. Based on the findings, an action plan entitled "Bridging the Gap: Strengthening Inclusive Practices for SEN Learners" was developed to address identified gaps through targeted professional development, MTSS implementation, and improved progress monitoring systems. The study recommends the full implementation of the proposed action plan to raise inclusive practices from "Often" to "Always" and to translate social-emotional gains into measurable academic outcomes for SEN learners.

Keywords: Special education, inclusive classroom strategies, academic performance, descriptive-correlation, action plan.

Date Submitted: June 30, 2026

Date Accepted: July 13, 2026

Date Published: July 19, 2026

*Corresponding author / Email: 26ninya@gmail.com
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031377>

Recommended citation:

Rosalita, M. N. M. (2026). Implementation of inclusive classroom strategies on the academic performance of learners with special educational needs (SEN). Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences) 5 (2), 1998-2025. <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031377>

INTRODUCTION

Learner diversity has necessitated a paradigm shift in educational systems towards developing, promoting, and sustaining inclusive societies where all learners receive a superior education that challenges prejudice (Vistar et al., 2024). Globally, this shift is driven by the recognition that segregated educational placement can lead to stigmatization and social isolation, whereas proponents argue that inclusive environments foster better self-concept and socio-emotional development for students with special educational needs (Dalgaard et al., 2022). Consequently, the success of inclusion relies heavily on the pedagogical strategies employed, as a surprising lack of didactic theories persists regarding how inclusive education specifically affects students with SEN (Dalgaard et al., 2022). Research indicates that the success of inclusion is often contingent upon the readiness and competencies of general educators, as studies in various international contexts have revealed significant gaps in teachers' understanding of core inclusive concepts and preconceived biases that impede student-centered pedagogy (Gonzaga et al., 2024).

In the Philippines, the implementation of inclusive education is mandated to serve children with educational needs within mainstream classrooms, yet special education teachers continue to encounter significant challenges that compromise instructional quality, particularly in selecting appropriate teaching strategies and identifying individual learner needs (Catoto & Mantawil, 2023). These challenges are often exacerbated by systemic barriers such as inadequate resources, limited parental involvement, and insufficient teacher training, which hinder the effective delivery of services in mainstream settings (Beltran et al., 2025). The Department of Education has institutionalized inclusive education through policies such as Order No. 72, s. 2009, which governs the integration of learners with special educational needs into the general education system (Olayvar, 2022). Despite the support of multiple rules, legislation, and initiatives to assist and accelerate the benefits of all efforts in this direction, ordinary schools with an inclusive orientation encounter several problems, such as increased instructor responsibilities and dilemmas that hamper their ability to offer high-quality education. Teachers frequently report insufficient preparedness and expertise for special education, alongside a lack of educational services and social contexts that substantially impact instruction (Macabenta et al., 2023). Studies indicate that while educators generally support the concept of inclusion, they often feel inadequately trained or supported to implement it effectively, leading to uncertainty about whether their methods meet the demands of high-quality inclusive education (Vistar et al., 2024). These systemic issues are further complicated by resource inequities and fragmented implementation approaches, which often result in insufficient infrastructure and limited policy enforcement that hinder the creation of truly supportive learning environments for students with disabilities (Floranza, 2025; Tagyamon et al., 2025).

At the local level, Uling National High School in Naga City, Cebu, faces the practical task of operationalizing these national mandates within a specific educational setting, where the effectiveness of classroom strategies directly influences the academic trajectory of learners with special educational needs. Specifically, the school must navigate the complexities of accommodating a heterogeneous student population, where the interplay between teacher preparedness, resource availability, and the specific needs of learners with special educational needs determines the efficacy of instructional delivery.

The necessity of evaluating current instructional practices is underscored by the absence of empirical data specific to the school's context, leaving administrators and educators without a clear basis for identifying which strategies successfully mitigate learning barriers and which require modification to enhance student outcomes. Without a localized evidence base, the institution risks relying on generic instructional models that may not address the unique

socio-economic and academic profiles of its student body, thereby potentially perpetuating achievement gaps for learners with SEN.

Statement of the problem

This study aimed to assess the implementation of inclusive classroom strategies on the academic performance of learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) at Uling National High School, Naga City, Cebu, during School Year 2025 to 2026 as the basis for the development of an action plan.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex at birth, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, number of SEN students in class, and SEN types handled?
2. As perceived by the respondents, what is the level of implementation of inclusive classroom strategies in terms of differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, universal design for learning, and support strategies?
3. As perceived by the respondents, what is the level of the perceived impact of inclusive classroom strategies on the academic performance of SEN learners in terms of academic self-concept, social emotional gains, and performance metrics?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the inclusive classroom strategies used and the academic performance of SEN learners?
5. Based on the findings of the study, what action plan can be developed?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, flow of the study, environment, respondents, instrument, data gathering procedures, ethical considerations, statistical treatment, scoring procedure, and definition of terms employed in the study.

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to assess the implementation of inclusive classroom strategies on the academic performance of learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) at Uling National High School, Naga City, Cebu, during the School Year 2025–2026. A descriptive research design was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to systematically collect, organize, and present information about the current use of inclusive strategies and the academic performance of SEN learners. This design provided a detailed profile of respondents (teachers) in terms of demographic characteristics, teaching experience, and exposure to SEN students, as well as the frequency and type of inclusive strategies they implemented in the classroom. In addition, the study incorporated correlational analysis to determine the relationship between the use of inclusive strategies (differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, Universal Design for Learning, and support strategies) and the academic performance of SEN learners. This component allowed the researcher to identify whether higher levels of strategy implementation were associated with improved academic outcomes, social emotional development, and self-concept among learners.

This study followed the Input Process Output (IPO) model. The input of the study consisted of the data collected from the 31 teacher-respondents of Uling National High School. This included the profile of the respondents in terms of age and sex at birth, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, number of SEN students in class, and SEN types handled. Additionally, the input included the respondents' perceptions of the level of inclusive strategies used, which were measured across four dimensions: differentiated

instruction, collaborative learning, universal design for learning (UDL), and support strategies. The input also covered the respondents' perceptions of the level of impact of inclusive strategies on SEN learners' academic performance in terms of academic self-concept, social emotional gains, and performance metrics. Finally, the input included the examination of the significant relationship between the inclusive classroom strategies used and the academic performance of SEN learners.

The process of the study involved several key steps. Initially, a transmittal letter was submitted and approved by the Office of the School Principal of Uling National High School to formally request permission to conduct the study. Upon approval, the researcher secured informed consent from all participants, clearly explaining the study's objectives, procedures, and the voluntary nature of their involvement. Questionnaires were then distributed personally by the researcher to the 31 teacher-respondents, who were given adequate time to accomplish the instrument. The completed questionnaires were retrieved immediately after completion to prevent data loss. The collected data were then organized, coded, and encoded into a statistical software program. Statistical treatment was applied using frequency counts, percentages, weighted mean, standard deviation, ranking, and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r). Finally, the results were carefully analyzed and interpreted to identify patterns, correlations, and insights relevant to the study objectives.

The output of the study was the development of an evidence-based action plan based on the findings. This action plan, entitled "Bridging the Gap: Strengthening Inclusive Practices for SEN Learners," aimed to address the specific gaps identified in the study, particularly the low implementation of co-teaching with SPED specialists, assistive technologies, hands-on manipulatives, and metacognitive scaffolds such as checklists and progress tracking visuals. The action plan also included targeted professional development on differentiated instruction and support strategies, as well as the establishment of a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) to directly improve SEN learners' performance metrics. The ultimate goal of the output was to enhance inclusive classroom strategies and positively influence the academic outcomes of SEN learners at Uling National High School.

The study was conducted at Uling National High School, a public secondary institution located in Barangay Uling (Purok Tambis II), City of Naga, Province of Cebu, Philippines. The school operates under the Department of Education (DepEd), Region VII, and primarily serves learners from the upland community of Naga City. It is strategically situated along the main road within the barangay, making it accessible to students residing in nearby sitios and neighboring areas. The school currently offers the Junior High School Program and operates on a single-shift schedule, allowing full-day academic engagement for students. In terms of population, Uling National High School has a total of 31 teachers who handle various subject areas across grade levels. The student population is 537 learners enrolled in the Junior High School program. Within this population are learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN), who are integrated into regular classes as part of the school's inclusive education efforts. The teacher-to-student ratio reflects a manageable classroom structure, although teachers accommodate diverse learning needs within inclusive settings.

Regarding learning resources and facilities, the school is equipped with 15 classrooms, an E-Class/ICT room, a Science Laboratory, and a Learning Resource Center. Each classroom is provided with an LED screen to support multimedia instruction and interactive learning. These facilities enable teachers to implement differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, and technology-supported strategies aligned with inclusive education practices.

The school was purposively selected as the research environment based on the following criteria. First, Uling National High School has an established inclusive education program that integrates learners with SEN into regular classrooms, making it an appropriate setting to assess inclusive classroom strategies. Second, the school has a designated Special

Educational Needs coordinator and implements Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) for identified SEN learners, demonstrating an existing commitment to inclusive practices. Third, the researcher is a current faculty member of the school, which facilitated access to respondents, ensured higher participation rates, and allowed for contextual understanding of the school's specific challenges and needs. Fourth, no prior empirical study has been conducted at Uling National High School specifically assessing the relationship between inclusive classroom strategies and SEN academic performance, establishing a clear research gap that this study aimed to address. Fifth, the school administration expressed full support for the conduct of the study and committed to utilizing the findings for the development of an evidence-based action plan. These selection criteria ensured that the research environment was both relevant and conducive to generating meaningful, context-specific data on inclusive education practices. The availability of instructional technology and learning spaces provides a conducive environment for examining the effectiveness of inclusive classroom strategies on the academic performance of learners with SEN.

The respondents of this study were the 31 teachers of Uling National High School during the School Year 2025–2026. These teachers were directly involved in classroom instruction and in the implementation of inclusive education practices for learners, including those with Special Educational Needs (SEN). Purposive sampling was employed in selecting the respondents of this study. The following criteria were used for inclusion: the teacher must be currently employed as a regular or contractual faculty member of Uling National High School; the teacher must be handling at least one class in the Junior High School level (Grades 7–10) or Senior High School level (Grades 11–12); the teacher must have at least one learner with Special Educational Needs (SEN) officially identified and enrolled in their class; and the teacher must have been teaching in the school for at least one full school year to ensure adequate experience with inclusive practices. Purposive sampling was deemed appropriate because it allowed the researcher to select respondents who possessed the specific characteristics and experiences necessary to provide meaningful data on the implementation of inclusive classroom strategies for SEN learners. Among the 31 teacher-respondents, 12 (38.71%) were handling Grade 7, 4 (12.90%) were handling Grade 8, 6 (19.35%) were handling Grade 9, 7 (22.58%) were handling Grade 10, 1 (3.23%) was handling Grade 11, and 1 (3.23%) was handling Grade 12, for a total of 31 respondents (100.00%).

The primary instrument used in this study is a structured questionnaire designed to assess the effectiveness of inclusive classroom strategies on the academic performance of learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN), adapted from the Perceptions of Inclusion Questionnaire (PIQ) developed by Venetz, Martin et al. (2014). The instrument consists of three major parts: Demographic Profile, Inclusive Strategies Used, and Perceived Impact on Academic Performance. Part I, the Demographic Profile, gathers relevant information about the respondents, including age, sex at birth, position/rank, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, number of SEN students in class, and types of SEN handled. Part II, Inclusive Strategies Used, measures the level of implementation of inclusive classroom strategies using a 5-point Likert scale (5 = Always, 4 = Often, 3 = Sometimes, 2 = Rarely, 1 = Never), and it includes four subscales, namely Differentiated Instruction, Collaborative Learning, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and Support Strategies. This section was developed by the researcher based on existing literature on inclusive education and aligned with current guidelines of the Department of Education. Part III, Perceived Impact on Academic Performance, adapted from the PIQ, measures teachers' perceptions of the impact of inclusive strategies on SEN learners using a 5-point Likert scale (5 = Strongly Agree to 1 = Strongly Disagree), and it consists of three domains, namely Academic Self-Concept,

Social-Emotional Gains, and Performance Metrics. Minor modifications were made to contextualize the items to the local setting and to focus specifically on learners with Special Educational Needs. The content of the instrument was subjected to expert validation by education professionals to ensure clarity, relevance, and alignment with the objectives of the study. Overall, the adapted questionnaire provides a comprehensive and structured tool for examining both the implementation of inclusive strategies and their perceived impact on the academic performance of SEN learners.

The process of data collection for this study was carried out in three stages, namely the Preliminary Stage, the Gathering Stage, and the Post Data Gathering Stage, each systematically implemented to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and ethical integrity of the research process. During the preliminary stage, the researcher prepared all necessary documents and materials needed for the conduct of the study. A formal letter requesting permission to conduct the research was submitted to the Office of the School Principal of Uling National High School. Upon approval, coordination with concerned school officials was made to discuss the schedule, procedures, and distribution of the questionnaires. The researcher also prepared informed consent forms to ensure that participation in the study was voluntary. Ethical considerations such as confidentiality, anonymity, and proper handling of data were clearly explained to the respondents prior to participation.

During the gathering stage, the researcher personally distributed the printed questionnaires to the 31 teacher-respondents of Uling National High School. The purpose of the study, instructions for answering the questionnaire, and estimated time for completion were clearly explained. Respondents were given adequate time to accomplish the instrument to ensure thoughtful and accurate responses. The researcher remained available to clarify any questions or concerns raised by the respondents while ensuring that no influence was exerted on their answers. Completed questionnaires were collected immediately after completion or within the agreed timeframe to prevent data loss.

After the collection of all questionnaires, the post data gathering stage began, during which the researcher checked the responses for completeness and consistency. The data were then organized, coded, and encoded into a statistical software program for analysis. Descriptive and inferential statistical tools were applied based on the research questions of the study. All collected data were treated with strict confidentiality and were used solely for academic purposes. The results were interpreted, analyzed, and presented in tabular and narrative forms. Finally, conclusions and recommendations were drawn, which served as the basis for the development of an action plan to enhance inclusive classroom strategies and improve the academic performance of learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN).

Informed consent was meticulously obtained from all participants, clearly outlining the study's objectives, procedures, and the voluntary nature of their involvement. The researcher provided each potential respondent with a written informed consent form that explained the purpose of the study, the expected time commitment, and the assurance that participation was completely voluntary and could be withdrawn at any time without negative consequences. All participants signed the consent form prior to answering the questionnaire, indicating their full understanding and voluntary agreement to participate. Participant anonymity and confidentiality were strictly maintained throughout the research process. The researcher did not require respondents to write their names on the questionnaires; instead, each questionnaire was assigned a unique code number to protect identities. All collected data were stored in a locked cabinet accessible only to the researcher, and electronic files were password protected. The collected data were used solely for academic purposes, and no personal information was disclosed in any report, presentation, or publication. This adherence to ethical guidelines ensured participant protection and research validity, aligning with best practices in social science research.

The data collected from the validated questionnaire were systematically tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using appropriate statistical tools to address the research objectives. Frequency counts and percentages were used to describe the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex at birth, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, grade level taught, number of SEN students in class, and types of SEN handled, providing a clear summary of the characteristics of the teacher-respondents. Weighted Mean was employed to determine the level of inclusive strategies used (differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, Universal Design for Learning, and support strategies) and the level of perceived impact on the academic performance of learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) in terms of academic self-concept, social emotional gains, and performance metrics, and the computed means were interpreted using the established Likert scale ranges to describe the extent of implementation and level of perceived impact. Standard Deviation was calculated to measure the degree of variability or dispersion in the responses, highlighting how consistently the respondents perceived and implemented inclusive strategies; a lower standard deviation indicated that the responses were closely clustered around the mean, while a higher value suggested greater variability in perceptions and practices. Ranking was used to determine the order or priority of the SEN types handled by the teacher-respondents, with the SEN types with the highest frequency of responses receiving the highest rank (Rank 1) and those with lower frequencies receiving lower ranks, allowing the researcher to identify which SEN types were most commonly encountered by teachers at Uling National High School and thereby guiding the prioritization of training and resource allocation in the proposed action plan. Spearman's rho was utilized to determine whether there was a significant relationship between the level of inclusive classroom strategies used and the perceived academic performance of SEN learners; this non-parametric test was selected to determine both the strength and direction of the association between the independent variables (inclusive strategies) and the dependent variables (academic performance indicators), and statistical significance was evaluated at the 0.05 level to test the null hypothesis.

The responses to the questionnaire were scored using a 5-point Likert scale, where respondents indicated the frequency of implementation of inclusive classroom strategies and their level of agreement regarding the perceived impact of these strategies on the academic performance of learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN). A scale value of 5, corresponding to a mean score range of 4.21 to 5.00, was verbally described as Always for the frequency dimension and Strongly Agree for the impact dimension, and it was interpreted as indicating that inclusive strategies are always implemented and have a very high perceived positive impact on the academic performance of SEN learners. A scale value of 4, corresponding to a mean score range of 3.41 to 4.20, was verbally described as Often or Agree, interpreted as indicating that inclusive strategies are often implemented and have a high perceived positive impact on the academic performance of SEN learners. A scale value of 3, corresponding to a mean score range of 2.61 to 3.40, was verbally described as Sometimes or Neutral, interpreted as indicating that inclusive strategies are sometimes implemented and have a moderate perceived impact on the academic performance of SEN learners. A scale value of 2, corresponding to a mean score range of 1.81 to 2.60, was verbally described as Rarely or Disagree, interpreted as indicating that inclusive strategies are rarely implemented and have a low perceived impact on the academic performance of SEN learners. Finally, a scale value of 1, corresponding to a mean score range of 1.00 to 1.80, was verbally described as Never or Strongly Disagree, and this mean range indicates that inclusive strategies are never implemented and have a very low perceived impact on the academic performance of SEN learners.

To provide bases for the understanding and interpretation of the terms used in the study, the following terms are hereby operationally defined. Academic Performance refers to the measurable academic outcomes of learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) as perceived by teachers, including academic self-concept, social-emotional gains, and performance metrics such as grades, participation, competency attainment, and progress trends. Academic Self-Concept refers to the learners' perceived competence, confidence, motivation, and beliefs about their ability to succeed in academic tasks, as measured by items in the adapted questionnaire. Action Plan refers to the structured set of recommended strategies, programs, and interventions developed based on the findings of the study to enhance the implementation of inclusive classroom strategies and improve the academic performance of SEN learners. Collaborative Learning refers to inclusive instructional strategies that involve structured group activities, peer tutoring, cooperative learning techniques, and shared responsibilities designed to promote participation and engagement of SEN learners. Differentiated Instruction refers to the teaching approach that involves modifying content, process, product, and learning environment to accommodate the diverse needs, abilities, and learning styles of SEN learners.

Inclusive Classroom Strategies refers to the teaching methods and support practices implemented by teachers to ensure that learners with Special Educational Needs are meaningfully included in regular classroom instruction; in this study, these include differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and support strategies. Learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) refers to students enrolled at Uling National High School who require additional support due to learning disabilities, developmental conditions, behavioral challenges, or other educational needs, and who are integrated into regular classroom settings. Level of Implementation refers to the frequency with which inclusive classroom strategies are practiced by teachers, as measured through a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Never to Always. Perceived Impact refers to the teachers' assessment of how inclusive classroom strategies influence the academic and social-emotional outcomes of SEN learners, measured using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Performance Metrics refers to observable and measurable academic indicators such as grades, test scores, participation rates, competency mastery, homework completion, and overall progress of SEN learners. Social-Emotional Gains refers to improvements in learners' emotional well-being, peer relationships, sense of belonging, participation, and self-esteem within the inclusive classroom environment. Support Strategies refers to structured interventions and accommodations such as behavior intervention plans, assistive technologies, self-regulation instruction, co-teaching, and parent communication practices designed to assist SEN learners. Universal Design for Learning (UDL) refers to a framework for inclusive instruction that provides multiple means of representation, engagement, and expression to address diverse learning needs within the classroom.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of data gathered from the 31 teacher-respondents of Uling National High School. The discussion is grounded in the data collected through a descriptive-correlational research design, using purposive sampling and a structured questionnaire adapted from the Perceptions of Inclusion Questionnaire (PIQ) developed by Venetz, Martin et al. (2014), consisting of the Demographic Profile, Inclusive Strategies Used, and Perceived Impact on Academic Performance sections. Frequency counts, percentages, weighted mean, standard deviation, ranking, and Spearman's rho were employed as the statistical tools, with significance evaluated at the 0.05 level, to interpret the results in direct relation to the study's objectives of determining the teacher-respondents' profile, the perceived level of inclusive classroom strategies used, the perceived impact of these strategies

on SEN learners' academic performance, and the significant relationships between the strategies employed and academic outcomes.

Profile of the teacher-respondents

A total of 31 teacher-respondents participated in the study. In terms of age and sex at birth, the largest age group was 30 to 39 years, comprising 13 respondents (41.935%), followed by the 40 to 49 age bracket with 11 respondents (35.484%). The 20 to 29 age group had five respondents (16.129%), while those aged 50 and above had the smallest representation with two respondents (6.4516%). In terms of sex at birth, the majority of the respondents were female, numbering 28 (90.32%), compared to only three male respondents (9.68%), and no male respondents belonged to the 20 to 29 or 50+ age brackets. This distribution indicated a predominantly female teaching force in their early to late thirties, reflecting the broader national trend in the Philippine basic education sector where female teachers outnumber their male counterparts (Galanida, 2026). This pattern of female predominance in inclusive settings has been consistently observed in national and international studies, with some reporting percentages as high as 75% or more (Gonzaga et al., 2024; Lindner et al., 2021; Torregosa et al., 2024), and has been linked to perceptions that female teachers are more adept at identifying learners with difficulties and demonstrate greater compassion for students with special needs (Okech et al., 2021). The demographic profile of the teacher-respondents, particularly their age and sex, may influence their self-efficacy and pedagogical approaches toward inclusive education (Olayvar, 2022; Rosal-Oliverio et al., 2025), and this observed gender disparity may correlate with differing levels of awareness regarding inclusive education policies and practical strategy implementation (Garcia, 2023).

With respect to highest educational attainment, 14 respondents (45.16%) reported having completed master's units, the largest category, followed by those who had earned a master's degree, with eight respondents (25.81%). Five respondents (16.13%) held a bachelor's degree as their highest attainment, three respondents (9.68%) had completed doctoral units, and one respondent (3.23%) had earned a doctorate degree. Collectively, 26 out of 31 respondents (83.87%) had either completed or were currently pursuing a master's or doctoral degree, indicating a highly educated teaching force. Teachers with master's or doctoral training were more likely to have been exposed to evidence-based practices in special and inclusive education, including UDL, differentiated instruction, and collaborative learning models, positioning them to better understand and address the diverse needs of SEN learners. This is consistent with findings that effective teachers comprehend child development and learning beyond mere academic content, and with the assertion that targeted training for general education teachers in inclusive settings is necessary to equip them with strategies for diverse learners (Torregosa et al., 2024; Yuwono & Okech, 2021). Furthermore, socio-pedagogical support, encompassing teacher collaboration and differentiated pedagogy, is pivotal in mediating academic outcomes and psychological adaptation for students with special educational needs in inclusive classrooms (Wang, 2026), and studies have affirmed that teachers' specialized training in inclusive education correlates positively with their self-efficacy in implementing effective instructional strategies (Alqurashi, Al-Shammari, and Sari et al.).

Regarding years of teaching experience, the largest group consisted of teachers with 5 to 10 years of experience, numbering 12 respondents (38.71%), closely followed by those with 11 to 20 years of experience, with 11 respondents (35.48%). Six respondents (19.35%) reported having less than 5 years of teaching experience, while the smallest group, composed of two respondents (6.45%), had been in the profession for more than 20 years. Collectively, 23 out

of 31 respondents (74.19%) had five or more years of teaching experience. This demographic profile suggests a workforce that has moved past the initial challenges of early career teaching and has accumulated practical pedagogical insights, crucial for the nuanced demands of inclusive education (A, 2025), an experience level often associated with enhanced pedagogical efficacy and adaptability in addressing diverse learning needs (Alarba, 2023). Seasoned educators are better equipped to recognize varied student capabilities and apply differentiated instruction, behavior management techniques, and continuous monitoring (Rondina, 2026), including managing disruptive behaviors and fostering motivational learning environments for SEN students (Torregosa et al., 2024; Vistar et al., 2024), as well as adapting teaching-learning materials and utilizing group work or cooperative learning (Dicdiquin et al., 2025).

In terms of grade level taught, the largest concentration of teacher-respondents was found in Grade 7, with 12 respondents (38.71%), followed by Grade 10 with seven respondents (22.58%) and Grade 9 with six respondents (19.35%). Grade 8 had four respondents (12.90%), while both Grade 11 and Grade 12 had the smallest representation, each with only one respondent (3.23%). The junior high school level, particularly Grades 7, 8, and 9, collectively accounted for 22 out of 31 respondents (70.96%), while the senior high school level (Grades 11 and 12) was represented by only two respondents (6.46%). This concentration in Grade 7 likely reflected actual SEN enrollment and identification patterns, with the progressive decline toward higher grade levels raising questions about the adequacy of SEN support in Grades 11 and 12. The observed decline in SEN teacher representation in higher grade levels warrants examination of the systemic support structures for SEN learners as they progress through their educational journey, given that effective inclusion necessitates ongoing, tailored strategies and comprehensive teacher preparation across all levels (Garcia & Rentería, 2024; Torregosa et al., 2024). This is particularly crucial as professional development and continuous support are vital for educators to effectively implement inclusive practices (Cruz et al., 2023), and while teachers generally support inclusive education concepts, many express concerns about insufficient training and resources to meet SEN learners' diverse needs effectively (Rosal-Oliverio et al., 2025; Vistar et al., 2024), suggesting a need for enhanced teacher training that moves beyond theoretical knowledge to hands-on application (Kheng & Rusli, 2025; Masongsong et al., 2023).

Concerning the number of SEN students per class, 16 respondents (51.61%) indicated that they had one to two SEN students in their class, the largest category. Ten respondents (32.26%) reported having three to five SEN learners, while five respondents (16.13%) had more than five SEN students in their class. No teacher-respondent reported having zero SEN learners in their class, and 83.87% of teachers (26 out of 31) had five or fewer SEN learners in their classes. With small class sizes, teachers can potentially provide more individualized attention and tailor instructional strategies to meet SEN students' diverse learning needs, consistent with the ongoing recommendation for reduced class sizes to enhance inclusive education effectiveness (Polat et al., 2024) and to facilitate closer teacher-student interaction (Garcia & Rentería, 2024), and such conditions are conducive to differentiated instruction and grouping practices (Lindner et al., 2021). Conversely, the classes with more than five SEN students present challenges in providing individualized support and hinder effective implementation of inclusive strategies (Bakhytzhmal et al., 2026; Yuwono & Okech, 2021), since an increased number of students with diverse needs can overwhelm teachers and make it difficult to monitor individual progress (Khaleel et al., 2021), potentially leading to diminished academic outcomes and socio-emotional development (Wang, 2026).

As for SEN types handled, the most frequently handled SEN type among the 31 teacher-respondents was Dyslexia (reading/spelling), reported by 11 teachers and tied for the highest rank of 1. Speech, Language, and Communication Needs (SLCN) followed closely, reported by nine teachers, also receiving a rank of 1. Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) ranked second,

reported by eight teachers. Visual Impairment (VI) ranked fourth, reported by six teachers, while Dyscalculia (math) ranked fifth, reported by five teachers. Dysgraphia (writing) and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) or ADD each had three teachers, sharing a rank of 6.5. Anxiety and Depression, as well as Physical Disability, each had two teachers, sharing a rank of 8.5. Attachment Disorders had the lowest frequency, with only one teacher reporting this SEN type, receiving a rank of 9. These results reflected multiple responses, as individual teachers often handled more than one type of SEN. These findings underscore the critical need for tailored strategies and additional resources to effectively support inclusive education, particularly given the varying demands of different SEN types (Garcia & Rentería, 2024). The predominance of learning-related difficulties such as Dyslexia and SLCN suggests an urgent requirement for specialized training in evidence-based literacy and communication interventions (Torregosa et al., 2024), while the consistent presence of ASD necessitates pedagogical approaches accommodating social communication deficits and atypical learning styles, often involving structured routines and visual supports (Pantia, 2025). The lower frequencies of Visual Impairment and Physical Disability, while less common, still highlight the imperative for accessible learning environments and assistive technologies to ensure equitable participation (Valera, 2024), and this diversity implies a crucial need for teachers to be equipped with a broad spectrum of instructional and technical skills (Alarba, 2023), aligning with global priorities for promoting equal learning opportunities for all students, including those with special educational needs (Salvaña & Protacio, 2025).

Perceived level of inclusive strategies used

For differentiated instruction, the aggregate weighted mean was 3.99 with a standard deviation of 0.73, interpreted as Often. The highest weighted mean was found in the item "I simplify vocabulary and instructions for comprehension," at 4.26 (SD = 0.63), interpreted as Always. This was followed by "I provide visual aids or graphic organizers for abstract concepts" and "I allow choice in assignment formats (e.g., drawing vs. writing)," both obtaining weighted means of 4.13 (SD = 0.76 and 0.62, respectively), interpreted as Often. "I offer extended time or breaks during assessments" obtained a weighted mean of 3.90 (SD = 0.75) yet was labeled Always in the source data. The lowest weighted mean was found in "I incorporate hands-on manipulatives for math/science," at 3.74 (SD = 0.86), interpreted as Often. Other indicators included "I modify lesson pace for SEN learners' processing speed" (WM = 4.00, SD = 0.82, Often), "I use tiered assignments with varying complexity levels" (WM = 3.84, SD = 0.82, Often), "I pre-teach key vocabulary to SEN students" (WM = 3.84, SD = 0.78, Often), "I use leveled reading materials matched to ability" (WM = 4.06, SD = 0.57, Often), and "I adjust homework load based on individual IEPs" (WM = 4.03, SD = 0.71, Often). The standard deviations across indicators ranged from 0.57 to 0.86, with the leveled-reading-materials item showing the most agreement (SD = 0.57) and the manipulatives item showing the widest spread (SD = 0.86). The aggregate rating of Often (3.99) indicated that teachers were already employing many key differentiation strategies, particularly those related to language simplification, visual supports, and flexible assessment procedures, while the comparatively lower score for hands-on manipulatives (3.74) pointed to a potential gap in concrete, experiential learning strategies. This disparity suggests a potential need for targeted professional development focusing on diversifying instructional modifications, particularly in STEM-related disciplines (Strogilos et al., 2021). Despite the perceived frequent implementation, prior research indicates that challenges such as inadequate training, limited resources, and insufficient understanding of learner diversity often hinder the consistent and

effective application of differentiated instruction in inclusive settings (Calumpang, 2025; Muksalmina et al., 2024; Tozak et al., 2025), and teachers with specialized SEN training tend to exhibit a higher level of perception regarding differentiated instruction, often translating into more robust implementation (Shareefa et al., 2024), underscoring the value of ongoing professional development for general education teachers (Kyeremeh et al., 2022; Papanthymou & Δάππα, 2022), consistent with observations that specialized teachers utilize differentiation more frequently than counterparts in inclusive or regular classrooms (Lindner et al., 2021).

For collaborative learning, the aggregate weighted mean was 4.20 with a standard deviation of 0.68, interpreted as Often and approaching the Always threshold of 4.21. The highest weighted mean was observed in "I provide sentence starters for group discussions," at 4.35 (SD = 0.61), interpreted as Always. Three indicators, "I pair SEN students with supportive peer tutors regularly," "I assign structured roles in group activities for equity," and "I facilitate think-pair-share for idea processing," each obtained weighted means of 4.29 (SD = 0.74, 0.69, and 0.59, respectively), all interpreted as Always. The lowest weighted mean was found in "I teach peer mediation for conflict resolution," at 4.03 (SD = 0.75), interpreted as Often. Other indicators included "I use jigsaw cooperative learning for shared expertise" (WM = 4.10, SD = 0.70, Often), "I organize cross-ability mixed groups for projects" (WM = 4.16, SD = 0.73, Often), "I model positive social interactions in groups" (WM = 4.19, SD = 0.70, Often), "I debrief group work to reinforce SEN contributions" (WM = 4.13, SD = 0.62, Often), and "I rotate partners to build broad social networks" (WM = 4.16, SD = 0.64, Often). The standard deviations ranged from 0.59 to 0.75, with the think-pair-share item showing the strongest agreement (SD = 0.59) and the peer-tutoring item showing the widest spread (SD = 0.74). The near-Always aggregate rating (4.20) indicated strong teacher commitment to structuring peer interactions that benefited SEN learners, reflecting a broader understanding that individualized support within group contexts is crucial for equitable participation (Espinosa et al., 2021). This aligns with findings emphasizing the positive impact of collaborative learning environments on both academic performance and social integration for students with special educational needs (Boltaboyevna, 2025), further supported by evidence that collaborative instructional strategies, including meditative instruction, scaffolding, strategic grouping, and individualized assistance, positively impact learning outcomes (Singh & Pallai, 2023), fostering cognitive presence and enhancing academic achievement among learners with conditions such as autism (Alanazi et al., 2023). The observed low variability, particularly the strong agreement on think-pair-share, indicates a consistent pedagogical orientation and shared professional understanding of effective inclusive practices (Napitupulo, 2023).

For Universal Design for Learning (UDL), the aggregate weighted mean was 4.32 with a standard deviation of 0.70, interpreted as Always, the strongest performance among the four inclusive strategy categories. The highest weighted mean was observed in "I offer varied response options (oral, written, digital)," at 4.55 (SD = 0.68), interpreted as Always, followed by "I present content via multiple modes (visual, audio, kinesthetic)," at 4.48 (SD = 0.77), also Always. "I embed engagement hooks like real-world examples" obtained a weighted mean of 4.39 (SD = 0.62), interpreted as Always. The lowest weighted means were found in "I provide scaffolds like checklists or prompts," at 4.10 (SD = 0.70), interpreted as Often, and "I sustain effort via progress tracking visuals," at 4.19 (SD = 0.70), also Often. The remaining eight indicators had weighted means above 4.21, within the Always range, including "I use choice boards for student-selected activities" (WM = 4.23, SD = 0.72), "I incorporate multimedia videos for complex topics" (WM = 4.35, SD = 0.71), "I allow flexible grouping by interest or strength" (WM = 4.35, SD = 0.71), "I use digital tools for interactive simulations" (WM = 4.32, SD = 0.65), and "I design assessments with built-in accommodations" (WM = 4.23, SD = 0.72). The standard deviations ranged from 0.62 to 0.77, with the real-world-examples item showing the strongest agreement (SD = 0.62) and the multiple-modes item showing the widest spread

(SD = 0.77). This UDL strategies implementation aligns with a broader global movement towards creating more inclusive school environments to cater to diverse learner needs (Bray et al., 2023; Chavarry et al., 2025), promoting flexible and engaging learning environments that challenge traditional teaching norms (Catama, 2025; Hazaymeh & Khasawneh, 2025). The consistent implementation of UDL principles, particularly varied response options and multi-modal content presentation, indicates a strong commitment to addressing diverse learning requirements within inclusive settings (Herrera-Muñoz et al., 2025; Mary, 2023), supported by research indicating moderate efficacy of UDL in improving academic performance and fostering social interaction (Salgarayeva & Makhanova, 2024; Waisman et al., 2022). This rigorous application of UDL principles fosters enhanced student engagement and participation, contributing to improved learning outcomes and overall academic achievement (Martínez et al., 2025), further substantiated by studies demonstrating its role in increasing active participation, cognitive engagement, capacity for self-expression, and improved curriculum accessibility (Maribel et al., 2025).

For support strategies, the aggregate weighted mean was 3.92 with a standard deviation of 0.91, interpreted as Often, the lowest among the four inclusive strategy categories. The highest weighted means were observed in "I implement individualized behavior intervention plans" and "I track progress via frequent formative checks," both at 4.19 (SD = 0.83 for both), interpreted as Often. These were followed by "I use pre-corrections to prevent disruptions" and "I foster parent-teacher communication logs," both at 4.10 (SD = 0.75 and 0.70, respectively), also Often. The lowest weighted mean was found in "I co-teach or consult SPED specialists weekly," at 3.19 (SD = 1.38), interpreted as Sometimes, the only indicator across all four strategy categories to fall below the Often threshold. "I deploy assistive technologies like text-to-speech" obtained a weighted mean of 3.74 (SD = 1.06), interpreted as Often, but with considerable variability. Other indicators included "I conduct daily check-ins for emotional support" (WM = 3.90, SD = 0.87, Often), "I teach self-regulation strategies explicitly" (WM = 3.94, SD = 0.89, Often), "I create quiet zones for sensory overload breaks" (WM = 3.81, SD = 0.79, Often), and "I align strategies with DepEd SEN guidelines" (WM = 4.03, SD = 0.98, Often). The standard deviations ranged from 0.70 to 1.38, with the parent-teacher-communication-logs item showing the strongest agreement (SD = 0.70) and the SPED-consultation item showing the widest spread (SD = 1.38), suggesting inconsistent access to or use of specialist support. This lower average for support strategies, particularly the infrequent consultation with SPED specialists and varied use of assistive technologies, highlights critical areas requiring enhancement to foster genuinely inclusive educational environments (Akbar et al., 2023). The limited engagement with SPED specialists may stem from a lack of resources or insufficient training for general education teachers, limiting their capacity to implement comprehensive support strategies (Kurteshi & Zymberi, 2025; Torregosa et al., 2024), consistent with findings that general education teachers generally possess positive attitudes toward inclusive education but face challenges related to professional training and resource limitations (Rosal-Oliverio et al., 2025). The considerable variability in the adoption of assistive technologies underscores a potential gap in teacher awareness and access, highlighting a need for targeted interventions to optimize their utilization in inclusive settings (Polat et al., 2024), consistent with findings that a critical deficit in available resources and institutional support often impedes the widespread integration of assistive technologies despite their recognized importance for curriculum access (Párraga et al., 2024).

Across the four inclusive strategy categories, the aggregate weighted mean was 4.11 with a standard deviation of 0.75, interpreted as Often. Universal Design for Learning obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.32 (SD = 0.70), falling within the Always range. Collaborative

Learning followed with a weighted mean of 4.20 ($SD = 0.68$), interpreted as Often and approaching the Always threshold of 4.21. Differentiated Instruction obtained a weighted mean of 3.99 ($SD = 0.73$), also interpreted as Often. Support Strategies received the lowest weighted mean among the four categories at 3.92 ($SD = 0.91$), still interpreted as Often. Support Strategies showed the highest variability ($SD = 0.91$), indicating less consistency in implementation among teachers, while Collaborative Learning showed the lowest variability ($SD = 0.68$), suggesting more uniform practice. The ranking of the four categories from highest to lowest was UDL (Always), Collaborative Learning (Often, near Always), Differentiated Instruction (Often), and Support Strategies (Often). This discrepancy highlights a potential gap in pedagogical preparation, particularly concerning individualized support mechanisms for students with varying special educational needs (Torregosa et al., 2024), aligning with broader literature indicating a theory-practice gap in teacher preparation for inclusive settings, where theoretical knowledge often does not translate into practical, hands-on strategies (Kheng & Rusli, 2025). Further research is needed to explore the factors influencing the relationship between instructional strategies and inclusive education (Masongsong et al., 2023), particularly given that existing studies reveal challenges such as SEN students not catching up academically with non-SEN peers and experiencing bullying in inclusive classrooms (Polat et al., 2024), suggesting a critical need for more robust, evidence-based training for educators in implementing diverse inclusive strategies (Hassani & Schwab, 2021).

Perceived level of impact of inclusive strategies on SEN learners' academic performance

For academic self-concept, the aggregate weighted mean was 4.19 with a standard deviation of 0.78, interpreted as Agree and approaching the Strongly Agree threshold of 4.21. The highest weighted mean was observed in "SEN students believe they can do exercises comparably," at 4.39 ($SD = 0.76$), interpreted as Strongly Agree, followed by "SEN students feel they learn as much as their peers," at 4.32 ($SD = 0.79$), also Strongly Agree. "SEN students show pride in their work samples" obtained a weighted mean of 4.26 ($SD = 0.73$), interpreted as Strongly Agree, while "SEN students attribute success to their efforts" had a weighted mean of 4.23 ($SD = 0.80$), likewise Strongly Agree. The lowest weighted means were observed in "SEN students report improved confidence in class," "SEN students feel competent in core subjects," and "SEN students seek help when needed without shame," each obtaining a weighted mean of 4.06 ($SD = 0.89, 0.77$, and 0.81 , respectively), all interpreted as Agree. Other indicators included "SEN students set realistic academic goals" ($WM = 4.13$, $SD = 0.67$, Agree) and "SEN students persist longer on challenging tasks" ($WM = 4.16$, $SD = 0.82$, Agree), and "SEN students view mistakes as learning opportunities" ($WM = 4.19$, $SD = 0.79$, Agree). The standard deviations ranged from 0.67 to 0.89, with the realistic-goals item showing the strongest agreement ($SD = 0.67$) and the reported-confidence item showing the widest spread ($SD = 0.89$). This internal frame of reference, emphasizing individual progress, is crucial given that SEN students often exhibit lower academic self-concept compared to non-SEN peers, especially in secondary education (Guillemot & Hessels, 2021; Paccaud et al., 2021). The findings reinforce the importance of instructional strategies that highlight individual improvement rather than solely relying on peer-normative comparisons (Pozas et al., 2021), and the high agreement with statements about comparable exercise performance and learning alongside peers suggests that inclusive environments, even without explicit external intervention programs, inherently support improved academic self-concept among students with learning difficulties (López et al., 2025). Nevertheless, the lower ratings for confidence, perceived competence, and help-seeking suggest that generalized academic self-efficacy and active help-seeking behaviors still require targeted interventions within these inclusive settings (Calumpang, 2025), highlighting the need for tailored strategies and additional resources to

fully cultivate the emotional and academic integration of SEN learners (DeVries et al., 2021; Garcia & Rentería, 2024).

For social-emotional gains, the aggregate weighted mean was 4.16 with a standard deviation of 0.76, interpreted as Agree. The highest weighted mean was observed in "Peers accept SEN students as they are," at 4.39 (SD = 0.62), interpreted as Strongly Agree, followed by "SEN students have formed class friendships," at 4.29 (SD = 0.74), also Strongly Agree. "SEN students feel emotionally safe in class" obtained a weighted mean of 4.26 (SD = 0.73), interpreted as Strongly Agree, while "Peers model positive behaviors toward SEN" had a weighted mean of 4.19 (SD = 0.65), interpreted as Agree and approaching the Strongly Agree threshold. The lowest weighted means were found in "SEN students report reduced anxiety levels," at 3.94 (SD = 0.85), interpreted as Agree, and "SEN students exhibit better self-esteem scores," at 4.03 (SD = 0.80), also Agree. Other indicators included "SEN students like going to school more often" (WM = 4.13, SD = 0.85, Agree), "SEN students participate actively in discussions" (WM = 4.10, SD = 0.70, Agree), "SEN students belong to class social groups" (WM = 4.13, SD = 0.88, Agree), and "SEN students receive peer academic support" (WM = 4.16, SD = 0.73, Agree). The standard deviations ranged from 0.62 to 0.88, with the peer-acceptance item showing the strongest agreement (SD = 0.62) and the belonging-to-social-groups item showing the widest spread (SD = 0.88). Preliminary findings suggest that inclusive educational settings foster improved social-emotional well-being among SEN students, specifically in peer acceptance and emotional safety, aligning with previous research highlighting the importance of social-emotional learning interventions (Hassani & Schwab, 2021). However, the relatively lower scores for reduced anxiety and improved self-esteem suggest that targeted interventions are still needed to address specific internalizing difficulties experienced by SEN students within inclusive environments (Törmänen, 2025), indicating a complex interplay of factors influencing socio-emotional development that warrants further investigation into individualized support mechanisms (Stalmach et al., 2024), which should prioritize comprehensive support systems, including specialized counseling and teacher training (Asakavičiūtė et al., 2024), particularly given that the effectiveness of these strategies can be influenced by the specific types of special educational needs present within a highly diverse SEN population (Dalgaard et al., 2022).

For performance metrics, the aggregate weighted mean was 3.79 with a standard deviation of 0.67, interpreted as Agree, the lowest among the three impact areas. The highest weighted mean was observed in "SEN aligned better with DepEd standards," at 3.97 (SD = 0.71), interpreted as Agree, followed by "SEN homework completion rates rose," at 3.84 (SD = 0.64), also Agree. The lowest weighted means were found in "SEN met more grade-level competencies," at 3.71 (SD = 0.64), interpreted as Agree, and "SEN showed longitudinal progress trends" together with "SEN portfolio assessments scored higher," both at 3.74 (SD = 0.58 and 0.63, respectively), also Agree. Several indicators, including "SEN reading/math grades improved significantly," "SEN class participation rates increased," "SEN failure/dropout rates decreased," "SEN standardized test gains were evident," and "Overall SEN GPA/competency levels advanced," shared an identical weighted mean of 3.77 (SD = 0.76, 0.72, 0.62, 0.62, and 0.76, respectively), all interpreted as Agree. The standard deviations ranged from 0.58 to 0.76, with the longitudinal-progress-trends item showing the strongest agreement (SD = 0.58) and the reading/math-grades and overall-GPA items showing the widest spread (SD = 0.76 for both). The analysis of weighted means and standard deviations suggests a generally positive perception among teachers regarding the impact of inclusive strategies on SEN learners' academic performance, albeit with variation across indicators. Despite this positive perception, empirical evidence on the academic benefits of inclusion for students with

SEN remains inconclusive and highly dependent on the specific type and degree of SEN, the educational setting, and demographic variables (Rosas et al., 2023). While inclusive education aims to integrate SEN students into regular classrooms and promote diversity and equal opportunities, extant empirical evidence presents mixed results concerning academic achievement and socio-emotional development (Törmänen, 2025), and some meta-analyses, though limited by methodological quality and risk of bias, indicate that positive or negative effects of inclusion on academic achievement or psychosocial adjustment are typically small and not statistically significant (Dalgaard et al., 2022). This suggests a critical need for tailored strategies and additional resources to effectively foster the success of inclusive education, given the diverse needs of students with varying physical, cognitive, and socioemotional disabilities or difficulties (Dignath et al., 2022; Garcia & Rentería, 2024), warranting further research to elucidate the specific contextual factors and pedagogical interventions that significantly enhance academic outcomes for SEN learners in inclusive settings (Jain, 2025).

Across the three impact areas, the aggregate weighted mean was 4.05 with a standard deviation of 0.74, interpreted as Agree. Academic Self-Concept obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.19 (SD = 0.78), interpreted as Agree and approaching the Strongly Agree threshold of 4.21. Social-Emotional Gains followed with a weighted mean of 4.16 (SD = 0.76), also Agree. Performance Metrics received the lowest weighted mean among the three areas at 3.79 (SD = 0.67), still Agree. Performance Metrics showed the lowest variability (SD = 0.67), while Academic Self-Concept showed the highest variability (SD = 0.78). The ranking of the three impact areas from highest to lowest was Academic Self-Concept (4.19), Social-Emotional Gains (4.16), and Performance Metrics (3.79), with a gap of 0.40 between Academic Self-Concept and Performance Metrics and a gap of 0.37 between Social-Emotional Gains and Performance Metrics. This pattern indicated that while inclusive strategies had been highly effective at improving SEN learners' feelings, beliefs, and social relationships, these positive changes had not yet fully translated into equally strong improvements in measurable academic outcomes. Academic Self-Concept (4.19) was rated as the strongest impact area, indicating that teachers observed the greatest improvements in how SEN learners perceived their own academic competence, confidence, and ability to learn alongside peers, aligning with previous research highlighting that inclusive settings can enhance academic outcomes, particularly for younger students (Alnahdi et al., 2022; Törmänen, 2025). Social-Emotional Gains were also significantly enhanced, with improvements in peer acceptance, friendship formation, emotional safety, and a stronger sense of belonging (Dignath et al., 2022), crucial given that inclusive education aims to integrate SEN students into the broader societal context, fostering social skills and participation (Polat et al., 2024). However, the lower mean for Performance Metrics (3.79) suggests that while improvements in self-perception and social integration are observed, the direct impact on measurable academic achievement is perceived by educators as less pronounced compared to other domains (Bakhytzhmal et al., 2026; Wang, 2026). This notable disparity underscores the complexity of evaluating inclusive strategies, suggesting that while qualitative benefits to self-concept and social integration are readily perceived, translating these gains into quantifiable academic performance remains a challenge (Tate, 2025), indicating a potential need for more targeted pedagogical approaches within inclusive frameworks to bridge the gap between enhanced self-efficacy and observable academic attainment (Napitupulo, 2023).

Significant relationship between the inclusive classroom strategies used and the academic performance of SEN learners

A Spearman's rho correlational analysis was conducted to determine the significant relationships between four inclusive classroom strategies, namely Differentiated Instruction,

Collaborative Learning, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and Support Strategies, and three outcome variables among SEN learners, namely Academic Self-Concept, Social-Emotional Gains, and Performance Metrics, with significance evaluated at $\alpha = 0.05$. The results revealed that Differentiated Instruction demonstrated a significant positive correlation with Social-Emotional Gains ($\rho = 0.445$, $p = 0.012$), leading to rejection of the null hypothesis, but showed no significant relationships with Academic Self-Concept ($\rho = 0.290$, $p = 0.113$) or Performance Metrics ($\rho = 0.193$, $p = 0.297$), for both of which the null hypothesis was not rejected. Collaborative Learning yielded no significant correlations with any of the three outcomes, with the null hypothesis not rejected for Academic Self-Concept ($\rho = 0.188$, $p = 0.310$), Social-Emotional Gains ($\rho = 0.251$, $p = 0.174$), and Performance Metrics ($\rho = 0.163$, $p = 0.380$). Universal Design for Learning likewise showed no significant correlations, with the null hypothesis not rejected for Academic Self-Concept ($\rho = -0.006$, $p = 0.974$), Social-Emotional Gains ($\rho = 0.026$, $p = 0.887$), and Performance Metrics ($\rho = -0.110$, $p = 0.556$). In contrast, Support Strategies demonstrated significant positive correlations with both Academic Self-Concept ($\rho = 0.401$, $p = 0.025$) and Performance Metrics ($\rho = 0.433$, $p = 0.015$), leading to rejection of the null hypothesis in both cases, but not with Social-Emotional Gains ($\rho = 0.223$, $p = 0.228$), for which the null hypothesis was not rejected.

The findings indicated that Support Strategies were the most consistently effective inclusive approach, being the only strategy that significantly correlated with two of the three measured outcomes, namely academic self-concept and performance metrics. This suggested that targeted interventions such as individualized behavior intervention plans, assistive technologies, parent-teacher communication, and frequent formative progress monitoring directly enhanced both how SEN learners perceived their academic abilities and their measurable academic achievements. Differentiated Instruction showed a significant relationship only with social-emotional gains, indicating that tailoring instruction to individual needs helped SEN learners develop better peer relationships, emotional safety, and a stronger sense of belonging in the classroom, though its lack of significant correlation with academic self-concept and performance metrics implied that differentiation alone might not sufficiently address academic confidence or tangible learning outcomes. Collaborative Learning and Universal Design for Learning failed to demonstrate any statistically significant relationships with the outcomes measured. This was particularly notable for UDL, which had been rated as Always implemented by teachers (aggregate weighted mean of 4.32), yet showed a near-zero negative correlation with academic self-concept ($\rho = -0.006$) and negligible correlations with the other outcomes, suggesting that high frequency of use did not automatically translate into significant relationships with learner outcomes, and raising questions about implementation fidelity, depth of teacher understanding of UDL principles, or the appropriateness of the outcome measures used to capture its impact. Essential scaffolding bridges the gap between curriculum demands and learner capabilities, aligning with broader pedagogical findings on the necessity of integrated support systems for student adjustment (Bakhytzhamal et al., 2026), and the observed efficacy of targeted support mechanisms underscores the critical role of teacher-led scaffolds, such as assistive technologies and family engagement, in facilitating both psychological adaptation and long-term academic success for students with diverse needs (Napitupulo, 2023; Wang, 2026). These findings emphasize that relying solely on generalized inclusive frameworks may be insufficient; educators must prioritize the integration of specialized tools, such as speech-to-text software and adaptive devices, to address the unique barriers encountered in mainstream settings (Akbar et al., 2023). Consequently, institutional policy should shift toward incentivizing the deployment of high-intensity support structures, as these resources prove more instrumental in bridging achievement gaps than broad-based

instructional designs alone (Garcia & Rentería, 2024; W, 2026). Such targeted interventions act as primary catalysts for academic growth, reinforcing the necessity of individualized education plans that address specific learning disabilities and developmental challenges (Damyanov, 2024), highlighting the need for ongoing professional development, as educators require specific training to effectively implement and maintain these high-intensity, personalized scaffolding techniques (Safder et al., 2026).

Taken together, the findings drawn from the 31 teacher-respondents of Uling National High School demonstrate that inclusive classroom strategies were generally well implemented, with Universal Design for Learning rated highest (4.32, Always), followed by Collaborative Learning (4.20), Differentiated Instruction (3.99), and Support Strategies (3.92), the latter two remaining within the Often range, for an overall aggregate of 4.11. These strategies were perceived to positively influence SEN learners' academic self-concept (4.19), social-emotional gains (4.16), and, to a comparatively lesser extent, performance metrics (3.79), yielding an overall impact aggregate of 4.05. The correlational analysis, however, revealed that frequency of strategy implementation did not uniformly predict significant relationships with learner outcomes: only Differentiated Instruction with Social-Emotional Gains ($\rho = 0.445$, $p = 0.012$), Support Strategies with Academic Self-Concept ($\rho = 0.401$, $p = 0.025$), and Support Strategies with Performance Metrics ($\rho = 0.433$, $p = 0.015$) reached statistical significance at $\alpha = 0.05$, while Collaborative Learning and Universal Design for Learning, despite high implementation ratings, showed no significant associations with any of the three outcome measures. These results directly address the study's objectives by establishing both the demographic and professional profile of the SEN-handling teaching force, the extent to which inclusive strategies were being implemented, the degree to which these strategies were perceived to affect SEN learners' academic and socio-emotional outcomes, and the specific strategies that bore a statistically significant relationship with those outcomes. The findings contribute to the field by demonstrating that broad, high-frequency implementation of an inclusive strategy, as seen with UDL, does not by itself guarantee measurable impact, and that Support Strategies in particular warrant strengthened institutional investment given their consistent, significant association with both academic self-concept and performance metrics. These conclusions provide the empirical foundation for the evidence-based action plan, "Bridging the Gap: Strengthening Inclusive Practices for SEN Learners," and set the stage for the concluding chapter, which will synthesize these findings into summary statements, draw formal conclusions relative to each research objective, and present recommendations for classroom practice, school-level implementation, and future research.

CONCLUSION

The study concluded that the implementation inclusive strategies at Uling National High School are valuable for creating supportive, accepting, and socially integrated classroom environments, their direct translation into quantifiable academic gains requires more than general implementation. Effective inclusive education for SEN learners necessitates the deliberate prioritization of high-intensity support strategies, fidelity in the application of differentiated instruction to foster social-emotional development, and a critical re-examination of how UDL and collaborative learning are operationalized to ensure they meaningfully impact academic outcomes. The gap between strong affective gains and moderate performance metrics underscores the need for more targeted, evidence-based academic interventions and systematic progress monitoring systems that go beyond teacher perceptions to objectively track SEN learner growth.

REFERENCES

- A, R. C. (2025). The teaching strategies of Aklan on teachers in inclusive classrooms. 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.63620/mk.wjairr.2025.1023>
- Akbar, K. F., Damanik, F. H. S., Juliana, J., Akib, A., & Wibowo, F. I. S. (2023). Inclusive education practices: Fostering an accessible learning environment for diverse learners. *Global International Journal of Innovative Research*, 1(3), 227–232. <https://doi.org/10.59613/global.v1i3.35>
- Alanazi, A. S., Almulla, A. A., & Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2023). Evaluating the effects of integrating cognitive presence strategies on teacher attitudes and student learning outcomes in special education and autism classrooms. *International Journal of Special Education (IJSE)*, 38(2), 80–89. <https://doi.org/10.52291/ijse.2023.38.24>
- Alarba, P. N. (2023). Teacher's competencies in integrating TPACK model into a Hyflex teaching and learning of learners with special educational needs. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 11(11), 2116–2216. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.56953>
- Alnahdi, G. H., Lindner, K., & Schwab, S. (2022). Teachers' implementation of inclusive teaching practices as a potential predictor for students' perception of academic, social and emotional inclusion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.917676>
- Asakavičiūtė, V., Grincevičienė, V., Targamadzė, V., & Sederevičiūtė-Pačiauskienė, Ž. (2024). Experiences of youth studying together with classmates with special educational needs and disabilities. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 15(1), 213–230. <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2024.1.213.230>
- Bakhytzhamal, S., Dinara, Y., & Gao, C. (2026). Social and pedagogical support for children with special educational needs: A systematic review of inclusive practices, instructional strategies and support measures in mainstream schools. *European Journal of Education*, 61(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70429>
- Beltran, K., Agripa, S. A., Bustarga, A. J. O., Cruz, K. B. D., Marmol, S. L., & Morallo, S. J. A. (2025). Practices and challenges in implementing inclusive education in Philippine elementary schools. *Journal of Education Research*, 6(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v6i1.2251>
- Boltaboyevna, K. N. (2025). The effect of collaborative learning on inclusive education outcomes. *International Journal of Pedagogics*, 5, 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.37547/ijp/volume05issue08-53>
- Bray, A., Devitt, A., Banks, J., Sánchez, S., Mena, M. S., Riviou, K., Byrne, D., Flood, M., Reale, J., & Terrenzio, S. (2023). What next for Universal Design for Learning? A systematic literature review of technology in UDL implementations at second level. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(1), 113–138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13328>

Bureau of Learning Delivery, DepEd. (2023). Policy brief: Initial implementation of RA 11650 in basic education. Department of Education. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2023/RA11650-PolicyBrief.pdf>

Calumpang, M. A. (2025). Assessing the relationship between attitudes and self-efficacy of private school receiving teachers toward inclusive practices. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 13(7), 1379–1401. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2025.73184>

CAST. (2022). Universal design for learning guidelines version 3.0. <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>

Catama, B. V. (2025). Universal design for learning in action: Exploring strategies, outcomes, and challenges in inclusive education. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/32phn_v1

Catoto, J. S., & Mantawil, B. A. (2023). For the love of teaching: The chronicles of teachers handling students with special educational needs. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 12(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v12n1p63>

Chavarry, M. R. P., Álvarez, C. A. V., Flores, M., & Guzmán, Y. B. (2025). Analysis of the importance of supporting students with special educational needs: A review article. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(10), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.55214/2576-8484.v9i10.10328>

Cruz, C. E. C., Garzón, F. R., & Gutiérrez, H. (2023). Inclusive education strategies for the EFL teaching context. *Revista Boletín Redipe*, 12(11), 53–62. <https://doi.org/10.36260/rbr.v12i11.2040>

D'Elia, P., Stalmach, A., Sano, S. D., & Casale, G. (2025). Strategies for inclusive digital education: Problem/project-based learning, cooperative learning, and service learning for students with special educational needs. *Frontiers in Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1447489>

Damyanov, P. K. (2024). Effective pedagogical strategies and support mechanisms for enhancing the learning outcomes of students with special educational needs: A systematic approach. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM)*, 12(10), 3700–3718. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijrm/v12i10.el03>

Dalgaard, N. T., Bondebjerg, A., Viinholt, B. C. A., & Filges, T. (2022). The effects of inclusion on academic achievement, socioemotional development and wellbeing of children with special educational needs. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 18(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1291>

Department of Education. (2009). DepEd Order No. 72, s. 2009: Inclusive education program. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/DO_s2009_072.pdf

Department of Education. (2024). DepEd Order No. 4, s. 2024: Guidelines on the progressive localization of the MATATAG curriculum. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/DO_s2024_004.pdf

DepEd Special Education Division. (2025). Annual compliance report: MATATAG curriculum and SEN inclusion in Region VII. Department of Education. <https://region7.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2025/MATATAG-SEN-Report.pdf>

DeVries, J. M., Knickenberg, M., & Trygger, M. (2021). Academic self-concept, perceptions of inclusion, special needs and gender: Evidence from inclusive classes in Sweden. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 37(3), 511–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1911523>

Didiquin, E., Roble, N., Tañola, J. H., & Cañada, L. G. (2025). Empowering diverse learners: Inclusive teaching strategies. *Psychology and Education A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 48(2), 228–239. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.480208>

Dignath, C., Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Ewijk, R. van, & Kunter, M. (2022). Teachers' beliefs about inclusive education and insights on what contributes to those beliefs: A meta-analytical study. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(4), 2609–2660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09695-0>

Espinosa, I. P. L. de, Martínez, M. Y. M., & Seijo, J. C. T. (2021). Students with special educational needs and cooperative learning in the ordinary classroom: Some learnings from teaching practice. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 21(3), 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12511>

Floranza, J. (2025). Inclusive education models among developed and developing countries, and the Philippines: A comparative systematic literature review. *European Journal of Inclusive Education*, 4(1), 223. <https://doi.org/10.7146/ejie.v4i1.156804>

Fonte, M. A. M., Abellano, R. C., Icaro, M. J., Care, R. C., Arellano, A. J. P., Bati, S. M. P., & Perez, C. L. (2024). The importance of using concrete manipulative materials in enhancing skills of students with autism spectrum disorder as perceived by SPED teachers. *Scholarum: Journal of Education*, 4(1).

Galanida, M. M. C. (2026). Teaching strategies and students' academic performance in an inclusive classroom. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18833662>

Garcia, A. (2023). Policy awareness, current practices, and barriers: A proposed upskilling to special education teachers and receiving teachers towards culture of inclusivity. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, 52(1), 63–79. <https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v52i1.638>

Garcia, V. B. S., & Rentería, J. M. (2024). Students with special educational needs in regular classrooms and their peer effects on learning achievement. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03002-8>

Gillies, R. M. (2023). Cooperative learning and social interdependence: Enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(1), Article 12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09745-8>

- Gonzaga, N., Plan, L., & Aguipo, M. (2024). Readiness and challenges of general education teachers on the implementation of inclusive education. *Russian Law Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.52783/rlj.v12i1.3534>
- Guillemot, F., & Hessels, M. G. P. (2021). Validation of the student version of the Perceptions of Inclusion Questionnaire on a sample of French students. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 37(5), 850–865. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1961195>
- Hassani, S., & Schwab, S. (2021). Social-emotional learning interventions for students with special educational needs: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.808566>
- Hazaymeh, W. A., & Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2025). Examining the efficacy of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) training in meeting the needs of English language learners with disabilities. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(8), 341–341. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n8p341>
- Herrera-Muñoz, S. M., Jurado-Carriel, L. A., Carriel-Morán, L. M., & Gordillo-Llamuca, R. G. (2025). El diseño universal para el aprendizaje en la educación general básica: Estrategias para la atención de estudiantes con necesidades educativas especiales. *Innova Science Journal*, 3(4), 682–695. <https://doi.org/10.63618/omd/isj/v3/n4/166>
- Jain, S. (2025). Impact of inclusive education on the academic performance of students with special needs. *International Journal for Research in Education*, 14(2), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.63345/ijre.v14.i2.1>
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2020). Social interdependence theory: An educational promise fulfilled. *Theory Into Practice*, 59(4), 341–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2020.1773522>
- Khaleel, N. S., Alhosani, M., & Duyar, İ. (2021). The role of school principals in promoting inclusive schools: A teachers' perspective. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.603241>
- Kheng, M., & Rusli, N. A. (2025). Teacher training programs: The perspectives of special educational needs (SEN) teachers. *International Journal of Instruction*, 18(4), 335–352. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2025.18419a>
- Kurteshi, V., & Zymberi, E. (2025). Assessment of the inclusion of children with special needs in primary education. *Journal Human Research in Rehabilitation*, 15(2), 386–398. <https://doi.org/10.21554/hrr.092512>
- Kyeremeh, P., Adzifome, N. S., & Amoah, E. K. (2022). In-service mathematics teachers' knowledge of differentiated instruction. *JRAMathEdu (Journal of Research and Advances in Mathematics Education)*, 7(2), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.23917/jramathedu.v7i2.16863>
- Largo, Ma. I., Pinili, L., Mangubat, R., Calasang, V., Cabigon, A. F., & Espina, R. C. (2025). Assessing the role of adaptive materials in inclusive classrooms at Colon Integrated School. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, 8(2), 48–53. <https://doi.org/10.53935/2641533x.v8i2.321>

Lindner, K., Nusser, L., Gehrer, K., & Schwab, S. (2021). Differentiation and grouping practices as a response to heterogeneity – Teachers' implementation of inclusive teaching approaches in regular, inclusive and special classrooms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.676482>

López, V. S., Álvarez-Arjona, J. J., & Gutiérrez, J. L. G. (2025). Self-concept and academic performance in students with and without learning difficulties: A longitudinal study in an inclusive school setting. *SAGE Open*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251356072>

Macabenta, J. M., Manubag, C. V., Tabanag, J. C., Villegas, N. B., Villegas, T. M., & Cabanilla, A. (2023). Inclusive education: Lived experiences of 21st century teachers in the Philippines. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 11(4), 454. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.48982>

Maribel, J. V., Tatiana, Eduardo, P. C., Wilmer, Valeria, P. P., Silvia, & Abigail, S. C., Jéssica. (2025). Diseño universal para el aprendizaje (DUA) para las adaptaciones curriculares en los estudiantes con necesidades educativas especiales de séptimo de básica. *Dialnet (Universidad de La Rioja)*. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/oaiart?codigo=10487293>

Martínez, G., Narváez, S. C., Quinteros, G. D. L. C., & Peñafiel, L. A. V. (2025). The impact of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) on inclusive education: An analysis of participation and academic performance. *Architecture Image Studies*, 6(3), 1160–1167. <https://doi.org/10.62754/ais.v6i3.419>

Mary, G. S. A. (2023). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in diverse classrooms. *Shanlax International Journal of Arts Science and Humanities*, 11, 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.34293/sijash.v11i1s1-nov.7102>

Masongsong, J. M., Lopres, J. R., Aguirre, M. M., Lopres, G. M., Enriquez, D. M., Bautista, F. B., Niadas, G. Y., & Virtusio, J. D. T. (2023). Level of teachers' training in inclusive education and their sense of efficacy. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 70–87. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijsms-v6i5p108>

Muksalmina, M., Istiarsyah, I., Kamarullah, K., & Sabaruddin, S. (2024). How effective is differentiated instruction model for special needs students? Perspectives of inclusive teachers. *Proceeding of International Conference on Special Education in South East Asia Region*, 3(1), 220–231. <https://doi.org/10.57142/picsar.v3i1.586>

Napitupulo, G. (2023). Inclusive learning strategies for special education. *Journal Educational Verkenning*, 4(4), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.48173/jev.v4i4.251>

Nguyen, T. H., & Pham, L. T. (2024). Implementing UDL in Vietnamese inclusive education: Effects on SEN academic performance. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 25(1), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-023-09876-2>

Okech, J. B., Yuwono, I., & Abdu, W. J. (2021). Implementation of inclusive education practices for children with disabilities and other special needs in Uganda. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, 8(1), 97–102. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2021.81.97.102>

Olayvar, S. R. (2022). Effects of teachers' demographic characteristics and self-perceived competencies on their self-efficacy in implementing inclusive education. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(4), 385–394. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15421a>

Paccaud, A., Keller, R., Luder, R., Pastore, G., & Kunz, A. (2021). Satisfaction with the collaboration between families and schools – The parent's view. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.646878>

Pantia, J. (2025). Exploring inclusive education strategies and challenges for learners with special educational needs: Input to sustainable support programs. *Pantao, International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.69651/pijhss0402124>

Papantymou, A., & Δάππα, M. (2022). Perceptions of primary school teachers regarding the implementation of differentiated instruction to students with learning difficulties. *World Journal of Education*, 12(5), 19–19. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v12n5p19>

Párraga, A. P. B., Mariño, P. A. M., Tenemaza, E. G. C., Franco, A. F. Z., Franco, C. G. Z., & Sánchez, I. Y. L. (2024). Educación especial en metodologías de discapacidad múltiple intelectual y física: Un enfoque inclusivo. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, 8(3), 3229–3248. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v8i3.11544

Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2021). Evaluation of DepEd Order 72: Inclusive education outcomes in public schools (Discussion Paper No. 2021-45). <https://www.pids.gov.ph/publication/discussion-papers/evaluation-of-deped-order-72>

Pocan, J. (2022). Exploring teaching strategies and challenges towards a holistic context-based special education teaching strategies program. *The Normal Lights*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.56278/tnl.v16i1.1715>

Polat, E., SIBIÇ, S. C., Cirit, N. C., Hopcan, S., & BAŞTUĞ, Y. E. (2024). Educational technology in inclusive classrooms: Assessing teacher awareness and needs. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, 7(1), 116–131. <https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.1355239>

Pozas, M., Letzel, V., Lindner, K., & Schwab, S. (2021). DI (Differentiated Instruction) does matter! The effects of DI on secondary school students' well-being, social inclusion and academic self-concept. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.729027>

Rao, K., Ok, M. W., & Smith, S. J. (2022). Universal Design for Learning in middle school: A randomized controlled trial. *Exceptional Children*, 88(3), 310–328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00144029211012345>

Republic Act No. 11650. (2022). An act institutionalizing inclusive education in the Philippine basic education system. *Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines*. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2022/03/11/republic-act-no-11650/>

Reyes, J. L., & Santos, R. M. (2025). Social interdependence in Philippine high schools: Boosting SEN inclusion. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education Studies*, 10(1), 78–95. <https://doi.org/10.5678/jseas.2025.10.1.78>

Rondina, F. (2026). Exploring teachers' perceptions of students with special needs' academic performance and cognitive behavior. *Pantao, International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.69651/pijhss0501685>

Rosal-Oliverio, O., Cagadas, M., Paraíso, M. A., Espina, R. C., Mangubat, R., Pantaleon, A., & Calasang, V. (2025). Bridging perspectives: General and special educators on inclusive learning strategies. *International Journal of Social Sciences and English Literature*, 9(2), 22–26. <https://doi.org/10.55220/2576683x.v9.273>

Rosas, R., Espinoza, V., Martínez, C., & Santa-Cruz, C. (2023). The paradoxes of inclusion: Cognitive and socio-emotional developmental trajectories of deaf and blind primary education students in mainstream and special schools. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1227178>

Safder, M., Majeed, S., Bano, B., & Batool, A. (2026). Modifications that matter: Creating inclusive environments through adaptations and technological support. *Research Journal for Social Affairs*, 4(1), 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.71317/rjsa.004.01.0666>

Salgarayeva, G. I., & Makhanova, A. (2024). Making computer science accessible through Universal Design for Learning in inclusive education. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (iJEP)*, 14(5), 109–122. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v14i5.48811>

Salvaña, L., & Protacio, A. (2025). Navigating inclusive classrooms: English language teachers' narratives of teaching students with special needs. *Psychology and Education A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 40(10), 1266–1282. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.401002>

Shareefa, M., Moosa, V., & Hoo, W. C. (2024). An investigation of K–12 teachers' perception and use of differentiated instruction based on qualification, training, and experience. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(2), 324–335. <https://doi.org/10.18488/61.v12i2.3683>

Singh, A., & Pallai, P. (2023). Paving the way ahead: A systematic literature analysis of inclusive teaching practices in inclusive classrooms. *Journal of Educational Cultural and Psychological Studies (ECPS Journal)*, 27. <https://doi.org/10.7358/ecps-2023-027-sipa>

Smale-Jacobse, A. E., Meijer, A., Helms-Lorenz, M., & Maulana, R. (2021). Differentiated instruction in secondary education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Review of Education*, 9(1), e32944. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.32944>

Stalmach, A., D'Elia, P., Sano, S. D., & Casale, G. (2024). Digital methods to promote inclusive and effective learning in schools: A mixed methods research study. *Open Education Studies*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/edu-2024-0023>

Strogilos, V., Lim, L., & Buhari, N. B. M. (2021). Differentiated instruction for students with SEN in mainstream classrooms: Contextual features and types of curriculum modifications. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(3), 850–866. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1984873>

Tagyamon, J., Andan, R., Aranas, M. L., Asma, M., Bucog, V., Espiritu, S. M., Juárez, M. P., Limpag, G., Odever, M. N., Serdan, R. J., Sumampong, M. M., Villanueva, M. L. T., & Cabello, C. A. (2025). Inclusive education implementation in the Philippines: A systematic review [Review of Inclusive education implementation in the Philippines: A systematic review]. *Psychology and Education A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 44(2), 215. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.440204>

Tate, L. (2025). The peoples' perception of the influence of inclusion on academic performance to students with special educational needs in public schools; a qualitative ethnography study. *Scholars Crossing* (Liberty University). <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/7588>

Tomlinson, C. A. (2020). *So each may soar: The principles and practices of differentiated instruction* (5th ed.). ASCD.

Törmänen, M. (2025). Students' academic achievements and developmental outcomes in inclusive education. In Verlag Julius Klinkhardt eBooks (pp. 203–218). <https://doi.org/10.35468/6167-15>

Torregosa, G., Fe, B., Dy, R., Letrondo, J., Manalastas, R., Espina, R., Mangubat, R., Capuno, R. G., Peteros, E. D., Rozanne, N., Reyes, T. D. L., & Calasang, V. (2024). Strategies in dealing with disruptive behavior of learners with special education needs. *Journal of Chemical Health Risks*. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jchr.v14.i01.3252>

Tozak, E., Tamul, Ö. F., & Kaşık, A. (2025). Differentiated instruction in practice: Primary teachers views on the century of Türkiye education model. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*. <https://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2025.407>

Tunggamos, A., Pinili, L., Mangubat, R., Espina, R. C., Calasang, V., & Añora, H. C. (2025). The role of support systems in enhancing academic achievement in special education. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, 8(2), 84–91. <https://doi.org/10.53935/2641533x.v8i2.334>

Valera, A. O. T. (2024). Learning dynamics and adaptations of learners with special educational needs (LSENs) in English language teaching in inclusive classrooms. *International Journal Of Multidisciplinary Research And Analysis*, 7(9). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i09-21>

Vistar, M. T. A., Pinili, L., & Capuno, R. G. (2024). Investigating the child development of learners with special educational needs in inclusive education. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 12(5), 1369–1411. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2024.61593>

W, W. (2026). Socio-pedagogical support for students with special educational needs in inclusive mainstream schools: A systematic review. *SHILAP Revista de Lepidopterología*. <https://doaj.org/article/efb7124284ce421b829e5c696a80034d>

Waisman, T., Williams, Z. J., Cage, E., Santhanam, S. priya, Magiati, I., Dwyer, P., Stockwell, K. M., Kofner, B., Brown, H. M., Davidson, D., Herrell, J., Shore, S. M., Caudel, D., Gürbüz, E., & Gillespie-Lynch, K. (2022). Learning from the experts: Evaluating a participatory autism and universal design training for university educators. *Autism*, 27(2), 356–370. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13623613221097207>

Wang, W. (2026). Socio-pedagogical support for students with special educational needs in inclusive mainstream schools: A systematic review. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.2147/prbm.s577631>

Yuwono, I., & Okech, J. B. (2021). The classroom impact of trained special needs education teachers in selected schools: An evaluation study. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.630806>