

**The role of educational technology in promoting access for students
with special educational needs in inclusive settings**

Niña Ivy L. Villavelez*

Cebu Technological University – Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

In inclusive classrooms, EdTech can work wonders, but only if teachers embrace it, use it well, and have the right support in place. This descriptive-correlational study examined the extent of technological integration in inclusive classrooms and its influence on teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology for learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) at Asian College of Technology Integrated School (ACT-IS), Talisay City, Cebu, during the school year 2025–2026. A total population sampling of 33 teacher-respondents participated, utilizing a validated questionnaire adapted from the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Findings revealed that most teachers were young, female, novice educators with intermediate ICT competence. Teachers demonstrated "Strongly Agree" levels of technology acceptance, with Performance Expectancy rating highest and Facilitating Conditions rating lowest. Accessibility and instructional support for SEN learners was perceived as "Strongly Agree" while the extent of technology utilization was "Always" though specialized assistive software was underutilized. Significant positive correlations were found between teachers' technology acceptance and accessibility for SEN learners ($r = 0.556$ to 0.765), and between accessibility and extent of technology utilization ($r = 0.556$). The study concluded that while teacher attitudes were favorable, systemic gaps in budget, planning time, and specialized assistive technology training hindered optimal implementation. An evidence-based action plan, "Project ACCESS," was proposed to address these gaps and enhance inclusive education practices at ACT-IS.

Keywords: Special education, technological integration, inclusive classrooms, Special Educational Needs (SEN), assistive technology, UTAUT, descriptive-correlational, action plan.

Date Submitted: July 16, 2026

Date Accepted: July 23, 2026

Date Published: August 17, 2026

INTRODUCTION

Globally, the integration of technology within inclusive educational settings has emerged as a critical strategy for addressing the diverse learning requirements of students with special educational needs (Simos & Katsiampoura, 2025). This approach aims to mitigate

*Corresponding author / Email: villavelezivy@gmail.com

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031472>

Recommended citation:

Villavelez, N. I. L. (2026). The role of educational technology in promoting access for students with special educational needs in inclusive settings. *Pantao (International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5 (3), 3470-3497. <http://doi.org/10.69651/PIJHSS05031472>

barriers to participation and optimize learning outcomes by providing adaptive content and personalized features (Layachi & Pitchford, 2024). Such technological interventions, including assistive technologies like screen readers and alternative keyboards, as well as artificial intelligence and learning analytics, facilitate equitable access to learning materials and customize pedagogical approaches to individual student profiles (Navas-Bonilla et al., 2025; Wulandari et al., 2024).

However, persistent challenges remain in fully realizing the potential of technology to support all learners, particularly in terms of consistent implementation, teacher preparedness, and ensuring equitable access to resources (Damyanov, 2024; Polat et al., 2024). The efficacy of technology-integrated instruction is significantly influenced by educators' perspectives and their ability to identify and implement relevant technological tools for diverse learning needs (Walia & GUHA, 2025). This underscores the importance of examining teacher perceptions regarding technological integration, as their acceptance and utilization are pivotal for successful implementation (Karagianni & Drigas, 2023).

In the Philippine context, while there is a recognized commitment to inclusive education, challenges persist regarding infrastructure and resources for technology integration, highlighting a disparity between national goals and practical implementation (Celeste & Osias, 2024). Specifically, Filipino teachers frequently encounter resource constraints and structural barriers in inclusive classrooms, yet they often demonstrate resilience and innovative strategies to support learners with special educational needs (Castalone et al., 2026). This issue is compounded by a significant digital divide, particularly in rural areas, where limited access to hardware, software, and reliable internet infrastructure hinders technological adoption despite teachers' optimism about its potential (Co, 2025; Moraleda et al., 2025; Villarino, 2024).

These challenges are further complicated by the lack of comprehensive teacher training and preparedness, as many educators feel ill-equipped to integrate advanced technologies like AI effectively into their teaching practices, despite expressing optimism about its potential (Adewale et al., 2024; Doria, 2024). This capacity gap is particularly pronounced in AI integration, where a significant majority of students and teachers, especially in under-resourced regions, lack exposure to or familiarity with AI tools (Venzon & Venzon, 2025). While studies often discuss these national challenges in broad terms, a more localized investigation is needed to understand how these issues manifest in specific regions, such as Central Visayas, where schools like Asian College of Technology Integrated School (ACT-IS) are developing their ICT infrastructure.

The intersection of technology and special education is a growing area of research, with studies exploring its potential to enhance accessibility for students with disabilities (Chanthiran et al., 2025). For instance, artificial intelligence has shown promise in creating adaptive learning platforms and intelligent tutoring systems that cater to individualized learning patterns, thereby improving engagement and retention among students with special needs (Li et al., 2025). Similarly, explorations into AI-driven approaches in inclusive education reveal the potential for detecting and visualizing specific learning behaviors through learning logs, enabling more efficient and appropriate learning reflections (Toyokawa et al., 2023). However, achieving effective integration necessitates addressing challenges such as shortages in device supply, inadequate teacher training, and behavioral issues among learners (Campado et al., 2023). The digital divide and gaps in teacher training are recurrent themes across various studies, underscoring the need for comprehensive strategies to bridge these disparities and ensure equitable access to technological resources and pedagogical expertise (Teng et al., 2025).

A review of existing literature reveals that most studies focus on either the efficacy of technology (e.g., Li et al., 2025) or the national policy landscape (e.g., Celeste & Osias, 2024), with very few investigating the actual acceptance and use of these technologies by teachers

within a specific Philippine integrated school. At the local level, the present study addresses this gap by focusing specifically on the Asian College of Technology Integrated School (ACT-IS) in Bulacao, Talisay City, Cebu—an under-researched setting representing a typical Philippine integrated school with mixed resources and a predominantly young, novice teaching force. Within this site, inclusive classrooms serve learners with specific learning disabilities (e.g., dyslexia, dysgraphia), attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), autism spectrum disorder (ASD), speech and language impairments, mild intellectual disabilities, and visual or hearing impairments. These contextual factors underscore the imperative for localized investigations into technological integration, particularly concerning teacher readiness and the actual utility of such tools in enhancing accessibility and instructional support for SEN learners in specific educational settings like ACT-IS (Gonzaga et al., 2024; Tagyamon et al., 2025).

Such localized studies are crucial for developing targeted interventions and professional development programs that address the specific needs and challenges faced by educators in integrating technology for SEN learners, thereby ensuring that technological advancements translate into tangible improvements in educational outcomes. The present study endeavors to address this gap by examining the extent of technological integration at ACT-IS, focusing on its influence on teacher acceptance and utilization within inclusive classrooms to benefit learners with SEN. This inquiry will therefore contribute to the extant literature by providing empirical data on the contextual factors influencing technology adoption in a specific Philippine setting, thereby informing the development of targeted action plans and professional development initiatives.

Specifically, this study will investigate teachers' perceptions of technological integration, drawing upon established frameworks such as the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) to understand factors influencing their acceptance and utilization of technology for SEN learners (Arguson et al., 2023). This exploration will also assess the perceived accessibility and instructional support afforded to SEN learners through these technological integrations, thereby providing a comprehensive understanding of their practical impact. The insights derived from this localized investigation will serve as a foundational basis for formulating an evidence-based action plan tailored to enhance the pedagogical practices and resource allocation for inclusive education at ACT-IS.

Statement of the problem

This study aimed to determine the extent of technological integration in inclusive classrooms and its influence on teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology for learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) at Asian College of Technology Integrated School (ACT-IS), Talisay City, Cebu during the school year 2025–2026 as a basis for an action plan.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the teacher respondents in terms of age and sex, position rank, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, inclusive or special education trainings attended, level of ICT competence, and access to technological resources?
2. What is the level of teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology in inclusive classrooms in terms of performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating conditions, behavioral intentions, and use behavior?

3. As perceived by the respondents, what is the level of accessibility and instructional support provided to learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) through technological integration?
4. What is the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies by teachers in inclusive classrooms in terms of frequency, type, and purpose?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology and the level of accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN and the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies by teachers in inclusive classrooms?
7. Based on the findings, what action plan may be proposed?

METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the extent of technological integration in inclusive classrooms and its relationship with instructional support for learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN) at Asian College of Technology Integrated School (ACT-IS), Bulacao, Talisay City, Cebu during the School Year 2025–2026. The descriptive component was employed to systematically describe the profile of teacher-respondents, the level of teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology, the level of accessibility and instructional support provided to learners with SEN, and the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies. The correlational component was used to determine the significant relationships between teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology and the level of accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN, and between the level of accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN and the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies by teachers in inclusive classrooms. The descriptive-correlational design was appropriate for this study as it allowed the researcher to collect data on multiple variables without manipulating any conditions, providing a realistic snapshot of existing practices and perceptions. This design enabled the identification of patterns, trends, and associations among the variables, which served as the empirical basis for proposing an evidence-based action plan.

This study followed the Input–Process–Output (IPO) model to clearly illustrate the systematic procedure undertaken. The input of this study consisted of the primary data gathered from 33 teacher-respondents at ACT-IS during the School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, the input included the profile of teacher-respondents in terms of age and sex, position rank, highest educational attainment, years of teaching experience, inclusive/special education trainings attended, level of ICT competence, and access to technological resources; the level of teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology in inclusive classrooms measured through performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating conditions, behavioral intentions, and use behavior; the level of accessibility and instructional support provided to learners with SEN through technological integration; the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies by teachers in terms of frequency and purpose; and the significant relationships between teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology and accessibility/instructional support, as well as between accessibility/instructional support and extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies. Once the data was gathered, the retrieval of questions led to the statistical treatment of the data, which concluded with a rigorous analysis and interpretation of the results to draw evidence-based conclusions. The final stage of the study was the output, which is the tangible result of the entire research flow. Based on the interpreted data and findings from the process phase, the study culminated in the

development of an action plan intended to provide strategic directions or interventions to improve technological integration and support for learners with Special Educational Needs.

This study was conducted at Asian College of Technology Integrated School (ACT-IS), established in 1994, primarily located at the ACT South Campus in Bulacao, Talisay City, Cebu, with additional access to facilities at the 15-storey ACT Cyber Tower in Cebu City. The school offers complete K-12 education, including preschool, grade school, and senior high school. Facilities feature modern classrooms, a computer-focused learning environment, and access to resources within their multi-campus system, which emphasizes IT and business programs. The institution serves a significant student population across its Metro Cebu locations. ACT-IS was chosen as the research environment because it provides a representative setting for studying technological integration in inclusive classrooms. The school's institutional identity as a technology-focused institution is evidenced by its name, its half-billion-peso ACT Cyber Tower, and its emphasis on IT and business programs, which makes it a particularly suitable site for investigating how teachers accept and utilize technology for learners with SEN. This alignment between the school's technological orientation and the study's focus on educational technology ensures that the research context is relevant and that findings can meaningfully inform technology integration practices.

The physical and organizational setting of ACT-IS offers several features relevant to this study. The school is equipped with modern classrooms designed to support contemporary teaching and learning, providing the foundational infrastructure necessary for technology integration. Its computer-focused learning environment indicates that students and teachers have access to digital devices and resources, which is essential for examining technology acceptance and utilization. The presence of multiple campuses and a 15-storey Cyber Tower suggests a commitment to technological advancement and resource availability. However, the study also recognizes potential gaps in the physical setting that may affect technology integration for SEN learners. While general technology resources such as computers and internet access are likely available, specialized assistive technologies such as screen readers, speech-to-text software, adaptive keyboards, and augmentative communication devices may not be systematically provided or fully utilized. Similarly, dedicated specialized laboratories or resource rooms for SEN learners are not explicitly described in the school's available documentation. The absence of such specialized facilities may constrain teachers' ability to provide individualized assistive technology support, making this a relevant contextual factor in examining the facilitating conditions for technology integration. Organizationally, ACT-IS operates as an integrated school, serving learners from preschool through senior high school, which provides a diverse range of grade levels and learner needs to study. This vertical integration allows the research to examine how technology acceptance and utilization may vary across different educational stages, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of inclusive education practices. The school's adherence to the Multiple Intelligences approach suggests a philosophical commitment to addressing diverse learning needs, which aligns with the principles of inclusive education and provides a supportive organizational culture for investigating technology integration for SEN learners. The choice of ACT-IS as the research environment was further justified by practical considerations. The school's accessibility, the administration's willingness to support the research, and the manageable size of the teaching population of 33 teachers made it feasible to conduct a comprehensive study using total population sampling. These factors, combined with the school's technology-focused identity and integrated school structure, establish ACT-IS as an appropriate and meaningful setting for examining the role of educational technology in promoting access for students with Special Educational Needs in inclusive settings.

The respondents of this study were the teachers of Asian College of Technology Integrated School (ACT-IS), Bulacao, Talisay City, Cebu. This included all teaching personnel involved in delivering lessons to both junior and senior high school students, particularly those engaged in inclusive classrooms with learners who had Special Educational Needs (SEN). A total population sampling method was employed for this study. Since the total number of teachers at ACT-IS was relatively manageable, all 33 teaching personnel were invited to participate. This approach ensured that the study captured comprehensive insights regarding technological integration and its influence on accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN. By including the entire population of teachers, the research obtained more accurate and reliable data without sampling bias. In terms of distribution according to grade level, Grade 7 accounted for 6 respondents or 18.18%, Grade 8 accounted for 6 respondents or 18.18%, Grade 9 accounted for 6 respondents or 18.18%, Grade 10 accounted for 5 respondents or 15.15%, Grade 11 accounted for 5 respondents or 15.15%, and Grade 12 accounted for 5 respondents or 15.15%, for a total of 33 respondents or 100.00%. The primary instrument for this study was adapted from Venkatesh et al. (2003), which was a structured questionnaire designed to gather data on teachers' perceptions and practices regarding technological integration in inclusive classrooms. The questionnaire was divided into four parts, each addressing specific research variables. Part I of the questionnaire gathered the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents. This section included items on name (optional), sex (male or female), age brackets (21–25, 26–30, 31–35, 36–40, 41–45, 46 and above), position rank (Master Teacher I, Teacher 3, Teacher 2, Teacher 1), highest educational attainment (Doctorate Degree, With Doctorate Units, Master's Degree, With Master's Units, Bachelor's Degree), years of teaching experience (1–3, 4–6, 7–9, 10–12, 13 and above), inclusive/special education trainings attended (yes or no), level of ICT competence (basic, intermediate, advanced), and access to technological resources (laptop/computer, internet access, projector/Smart TV, mobile devices/tablets). This section utilized a checklist format to facilitate ease of response and accurate data collection.

Part II of the questionnaire measured the level of teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology in inclusive classrooms, adapted from the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) by Venkatesh et al. (2003). This section consisted of 28 items distributed across six constructs: Performance Expectancy (6 items), Effort Expectancy (6 items), Social Influence (5 items), Facilitating Conditions (5 items), Behavioral Intentions (4 items), and Use Behavior (3 items). Respondents rated each statement using a 5-point Likert scale: 5 (Strongly Agree), 4 (Agree), 3 (Moderately Agree), 2 (Disagree), and 1 (Strongly Disagree). The items were contextualized to reflect inclusive classroom settings and the use of assistive and instructional technologies for learners with SEN.

Part III of the questionnaire assessed the level of accessibility and instructional support provided to learners with SEN through technological integration. This section was researcher-made, developed based on the key provisions of the Philippine legal mandates cited in the theoretical background of this study, specifically Republic Act No. 11650 (Inclusive Education Act of 2022), DepEd Order No. 13, series of 2025 (on AI integration), and DepEd Memorandum No. 203, series of 2020 (on flexible learning for learners with disabilities). The 10 indicators were derived from the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and the specific policy requirements for accessible instructional materials, differentiated instruction, assistive technology support, communication accommodations, progress monitoring, and collaborative partnerships between teachers, parents, and specialists. The indicators measured the extent to which technology helped SEN learners access instructional materials independently, reduced learning barriers, supported communication, enabled equal participation, facilitated differentiated instruction, monitored progress, enhanced collaboration,

strengthened motivation and confidence, and improved overall classroom inclusivity. Respondents rated each indicator using the same 5-point Likert scale as in Part II.

Part IV of the questionnaire measured the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies by teachers in inclusive classrooms in terms of frequency, type, and purpose. This section was also researcher-made, informed by the assistive technology frameworks and the types of disabilities served at ACT-IS, such as learning disabilities, ADHD, autism spectrum disorder, speech and language impairments, and visual or hearing impairments. The 15 indicators asked teachers to rate how often they used various technologies and for what instructional purposes. The indicators included daily technology use, incorporation of assistive technologies during lesson delivery, use of digital tools for assessment, integration of technology in collaborative activities, use for remediation and intervention, use of assistive software such as text-to-speech and speech-to-text, use of multimedia tools, use of mobile applications for SEN, use of learning management systems, use of specialized devices such as screen readers and adaptive keyboards, and use of technology for improving understanding, individualized instruction, communication, progress monitoring, and engagement. Respondents rated each indicator using a 5-point frequency scale: 5 (Always), 4 (Often), 3 (Sometimes), 2 (Rarely), and 1 (Never).

To ensure the validity and reliability of the adapted questionnaire, the researcher employed a multi-stage validation process. First, the instrument was subjected to content validity testing by a panel of five experts in the fields of special education, educational technology, and research methodology. The experts included three faculty members from the Graduate Teacher Education program of Cebu Technological University-Main Campus specializing in Special Education and educational technology, and two experienced SPED practitioners from the Division of Cebu Province. The panel evaluated the questionnaire items based on four criteria: relevance to the research objectives, clarity and comprehensibility of the language, appropriateness of the items for the target respondents, and completeness of the content coverage for each construct. Each expert rated the items using a 4-point relevance scale (1=Not Relevant, 2=Somewhat Relevant, 3=Quite Relevant, 4=Highly Relevant). Based on the expert evaluations, the researcher computed the Content Validity Index (CVI) for each item and for the overall instrument. Items with a CVI score below 0.78 were revised or removed as recommended by the experts. The final version of the questionnaire incorporated the feedback, including rephrasing of items for clarity, addition of contextual examples specific to inclusive classrooms, and deletion of redundant or ambiguous items.

Following the content validation, the questionnaire underwent a pilot testing phase. The pilot study was conducted with 15 teachers from a different private school in Cebu with similar characteristics to MCES in terms of inclusive education implementation and technology availability. These teachers were not included in the actual study sample to avoid contamination of results. The pilot testing aimed to assess the internal consistency and reliability of the instrument, determine the clarity and comprehensibility of the items, estimate the time required for completion, and identify any potential issues with the questionnaire's format or instructions. The reliability of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which measures the internal consistency of the items within each construct. The pilot testing yielded the following Cronbach's alpha values for each UTAUT construct: Performance Expectancy ($\alpha = 0.87$), Effort Expectancy ($\alpha = 0.84$), Social Influence ($\alpha = 0.82$), Facilitating Conditions ($\alpha = 0.85$), Behavioral Intentions ($\alpha = 0.88$), and Use Behavior ($\alpha = 0.79$). For Part III (Accessibility and Instructional Support), the Cronbach's alpha was 0.86, and for Part IV (Extent of Utilization of Assistive and Instructional Technologies), the Cronbach's alpha was 0.89. All alpha values exceeded the acceptable threshold of 0.70, indicating that the questionnaire demonstrated good

to excellent internal consistency reliability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The overall reliability coefficient for the entire instrument was $\alpha = 0.91$, indicating high overall reliability. Based on the pilot testing feedback, minor revisions were made to two items to improve clarity. The final questionnaire was then prepared for administration to the actual respondents.

The process of collecting data for this study was carried out in three stages: the Preliminary Stage, Data Gathering Stage, and Post-Data Gathering Stage, each systematically implemented to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and ethical integrity of the research process. In the Preliminary Stage, the researcher first secured formal approval from the School Principal of ACT-IS to conduct the study within the school. The research proposal, including its objectives, significance, methodology, and ethical considerations, was presented to obtain informed consent. Coordination with the school administration was done to schedule the distribution and collection of the questionnaires. Teacher-respondents were oriented about the purpose of the study, the content of the questionnaire, and the confidentiality of their responses. Ethical considerations such as voluntary participation and anonymity were emphasized to ensure respondents' rights were respected.

In the Data Gathering Stage, after securing permissions, the researcher administered the questionnaires to all teacher respondents of ACT-IS using a total population sampling approach. Clear instructions were provided to ensure accurate and honest responses. The questionnaire was designed to take approximately 20–30 minutes to complete, and respondents were given a one-week period to accomplish the instrument at their convenience. Retrieval of the completed questionnaires was conducted after seven days, with follow-up reminders sent on Day 4 and Day 6 to non-respondents to ensure a high return rate. The researcher coordinated with the school administration to schedule appropriate times for teachers to complete the questionnaires, minimizing disruption to classes. Respondents were assured of confidentiality and voluntary participation, emphasizing that their responses would be used solely for research purposes. The administration of the questionnaire was conducted during the teachers' free periods or scheduled faculty meetings to maximize participation rates.

In the Post-Data Gathering Stage, upon completion of the questionnaire administration, the researcher collected and organized the responses, checking for completeness and consistency. Data were then encoded and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to address the research questions. To maintain confidentiality and anonymity, each questionnaire was assigned a unique code number rather than using respondents' names, and all identifying information was separated from the response data prior to encoding. The encoded data were stored in a password-protected computer file accessible only to the researcher and the research adviser, while the physical questionnaires were kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher's office. Finally, the researcher securely stored the data to maintain confidentiality and adhere to ethical research standards. Findings from the analysis informed the preparation of the action plan and recommendations for enhancing technological integration in inclusive classrooms.

This study was conducted with strict adherence to ethical standards to protect the rights and welfare of all participants. Teachers were informed of the purpose, objectives, and procedures of the study and provided voluntary informed consent, with the option to withdraw at any time without penalty. Respondents' personal information and responses were treated with confidentiality and anonymity, and all data were securely stored in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173). The study ensured that participation did not cause any physical, psychological, or social harm, and that the data collected were used solely for academic purposes, reported objectively, and credited appropriately to all sources.

The data gathered from the validated questionnaire were carefully tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted using appropriate statistical tools to answer the specific research questions of the study. Frequency was used to determine the number of respondents falling under each category or response option, computed by counting the number of teachers who selected each

response option for each demographic variable. Percentage was used to determine the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents, such as age and sex, position rank, educational attainment, years of teaching experience, inclusive/special education trainings attended, level of ICT competence, and access to technological resources, expressing the frequency of each category as a proportion of the total number of respondents and allowing for meaningful comparison across categories. Ranking was used to arrange the access to technological resources in descending order based on the frequency of responses from teacher-respondents, allowing the researcher to identify which technological resources were most accessible to teachers and which were least accessible; specifically, the resource with the highest frequency received a rank of 1, followed by the next highest with rank 2, and so forth, facilitating the prioritization of resource needs in the proposed action plan, as resources with lower accessibility rankings required more immediate attention and intervention from school administrators. Weighted Mean was employed to determine the level of teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology in inclusive classrooms, the level of accessibility and instructional support provided to learners with SEN, and the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies, allowing for a clear interpretation of respondents' perceptions on the Likert scale, with the average score indicating the overall level of agreement or frequency for each construct and indicator. Standard Deviation was calculated to measure the variability or dispersion of responses from the mean, indicating the degree of consistency or diversity in teachers' perceptions regarding technological integration and its impact on accessibility and instructional support, wherein a low standard deviation indicated that respondents' ratings were clustered closely around the mean, suggesting consensus among teachers, while a high standard deviation indicated wide variation in responses, suggesting disagreement or diverse experiences among teacher-respondents. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to determine the significant relationship between teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology, encompassing performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating conditions, behavioral intention, and use behavior, and the level of accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN, and between the level of accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN and the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies by teachers in inclusive classrooms. The correlation analysis indicated both the strength and direction of the relationship between variables. The significance level was set at 0.05 (two-tailed).

After data collection, the weighted mean for each indicator was computed to determine the overall level of technological integration, accessibility, and instructional support for LSEN. For Part II (Technological Integration in Inclusive Classrooms) and Part III (Accessibility and Instructional Support for Learners with SEN), a scale value of 5 corresponding to a range of 4.21–5.00 was verbally described as Strongly Agree, indicating a very high level of agreement or effectiveness in technological integration and support for learners with SEN; a scale value of 4 corresponding to a range of 3.41–4.20 was verbally described as Agree, indicating a high level of agreement or effectiveness in technological integration and support for learners with SEN; a scale value of 3 corresponding to a range of 2.61–3.40 was verbally described as Moderately Agree, indicating a moderate level of agreement or effectiveness in technological integration and support for learners with SEN; a scale value of 2 corresponding to a range of 1.81–2.60 was verbally described as Disagree, indicating a low level of agreement or effectiveness in technological integration and support for learners with SEN; and a scale value of 1 corresponding to a range of 1.00–1.80 was verbally described as Strongly Disagree, indicating a very low level of agreement or effectiveness in technological integration and support for learners with SEN.

For Part IV (Extent of Utilization of Assistive and Instructional Technologies by Teachers in Inclusive Classrooms), a scale value of 5 corresponding to a range of 4.21–5.00 was verbally described as Always, indicating that teachers consistently and regularly utilize the technology in inclusive classrooms for learners with SEN; a scale value of 4 corresponding to a range of 3.41–4.20 was verbally described as Often, indicating that teachers frequently utilize the technology, though not on every occasion, for learners with SEN; a scale value of 3 corresponding to a range of 2.61–3.40 was verbally described as Sometimes, indicating that teachers occasionally utilize the technology for learners with SEN; a scale value of 2 corresponding to a range of 1.81–2.60 was verbally described as Rarely, indicating that teachers seldom utilize the technology for learners with SEN; and a scale value of 1 corresponding to a range of 1.00–1.80 was verbally described as Never, indicating that teachers do not utilize the technology at all for learners with SEN.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the data gathered from the thirty-three (33) teacher-respondents of Asian College of Technology Integrated School (ACT-IS), Bulacao, Talisay City, Cebu, during the school year 2025–2026. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design, utilizing a researcher-made survey questionnaire grounded in the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) as the primary data collection instrument, administered to the entire population of teacher-respondents through a total enumeration sampling approach. Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, weighted mean, and standard deviation, were used to analyze the profile of the respondents and their levels of acceptance, utilization, and perceived accessibility and instructional support for learners with Special Educational Needs (SEN), while the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was employed to determine the significance of relationships among key variables, with the null hypothesis tested at the 0.05 level of significance. The discussion that follows is grounded strictly in the data gathered and is interpreted in direct relation to the objectives of the study, namely to examine the profile of teachers, their acceptance and utilization of technology, the level of accessibility and instructional support afforded to SEN learners, the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies, and the significant relationships among these variables, culminating in a proposed action plan.

Profile of the teacher-respondents

With respect to age and sex, the data revealed that the largest proportion of respondents belonged to the 21–25 age bracket, comprising 11 teachers or 33.33%, followed closely by the 26–30 bracket with 10 teachers or 30.30%. The 31–35 bracket accounted for 6 teachers or 18.18%, while the 46 and above bracket comprised 3 teachers or 9.09%. The 41–45 bracket had 2 teachers or 6.06%, and the 36–40 bracket had only 1 teacher or 3.03%. Out of the total 33 respondents, 29 were female and 4 were male, meaning that female teachers constituted 87.88% of the sample. The predominance of young female teachers, with more than 63% of respondents aged 21 to 30, suggests a teaching force that may be generally more familiar with digital tools and may exhibit higher information and communication technology (ICT) competence; however, their relatively limited teaching experience implies that they may lack sufficient exposure to evidence-based inclusive practices. This finding is consistent with the work of Polat et al. (2024) and Montes et al. (2023), who confirmed that young female teachers predominate in special education contexts and often demonstrate greater digital fluency, although they may lack specialized pedagogical training for inclusive settings, a concern also

raised by Yılmaz et al. (2021). These results imply that any proposed action plan must provide professional development that simultaneously leverages teachers' digital readiness while building pedagogical knowledge specific to SEN, recognizing that younger teachers may require mentoring in differentiated instruction and assistive technology selection.

In terms of position rank, the overwhelming majority of respondents, 31 out of 33 or 93.94%, held the rank of Teacher 1, while only 1 respondent or 3.03% held the rank of Master Teacher 1 and another 1 respondent or 3.03% held the rank of Teacher 3. This concentration at the entry-level rank indicates a relatively flat hierarchical structure with a limited number of experienced teachers directly involved in technology integration for SEN learners, and the scarcity of Master Teachers implies insufficient on-site expertise to mentor novice teachers in the use of assistive technology. Искакова (2023) and Karagianni and Drigas (2023) emphasized that early-career teachers require substantial professional development and mentoring to effectively leverage assistive technologies, as the absence of experienced mentors limits knowledge transfer in technology-aided interventions for SEN students, a point corroborated by Santillán et al. (2024). This suggests that the action plan should establish peer support systems, external partnerships for technical training, and clear career pathways that encourage experienced teachers to specialize in SEN and technology integration.

Regarding highest educational attainment, two-thirds of the respondents, or 22 teachers equivalent to 66.67%, held only a Bachelor's degree, while 10 teachers or 30.30% had earned units toward a Master's degree, and only 1 teacher or 3.03% held a Doctorate degree. Notably, no respondent had completed a Master's degree. The predominance of teachers with only undergraduate preparation suggests that many respondents may lack formal coursework in assistive technologies, differentiated instruction, or evidence-based interventions for specific disability categories. Polat et al. (2024) and Santillán et al. (2024) highlighted that insufficient advanced training hinders teachers' capacity to effectively utilize assistive technologies and personalized learning platforms, underscoring the need for competency-based professional development, a claim further supported by Kheng and Rusli (2025) and D'Elia et al. (2025). This finding implies that the action plan should incorporate intensive, practice-based professional development modules that do not assume prior graduate-level knowledge, focusing instead on building foundational competencies in assistive tool identification, accessible material design, and technology adaptation for SEN learners.

With regard to years of teaching experience, the majority of respondents, or 22 teachers equivalent to 66.67%, had only 1 to 3 years of teaching experience, while 6 teachers or 18.18% had 4 to 6 years, and 5 teachers or 15.15% had 13 years or more. Notably, the complete absence of teachers in the 7 to 12 year bracket created a dichotomous workforce structure. This pattern limits internal mentoring capacity, as only five veteran teachers are available to guide twenty-two novice teachers, and the absence of a middle-experience cohort may impede the diffusion of innovative technological practices within the school. Ayanwale (2023) noted that early-career teachers often focus on technology mechanics rather than pedagogical integration, while Santillán et al. (2024) emphasized that mid-career teachers act as crucial bridging agents between veteran expertise and nascent approaches, a dynamic echoed by Shen et al. (2025). Consequently, the action plan must implement structured mentoring partnerships between veteran and novice teachers, alongside retention strategies and targeted recruitment of experienced inclusive educators, while delivering professional development in intensive, just-in-time formats suited to novice teachers' schedules.

As for inclusive or special education training attended, slightly more than half of the respondents, or 17 teachers equivalent to 51.52%, indicated that they had attended such training, while 16 teachers or 48.48% had never participated in any inclusive or special

education training. This near-even split suggests that professional development in inclusive education was neither systematic nor mandatory for all faculty members, raising concerns regarding overall teacher preparedness. Layachi and Pitchford (2024) confirmed that inadequate teacher training directly correlates with suboptimal integration of technological tools and inclusive practices, limiting accessibility and learning outcomes for SEN students, a finding supported by Hamid et al. (2025) and Fernández-Batanero et al. (2022). This implies that the action plan must prioritize mandatory, foundational training for all untrained teachers before any technology integration initiative is scaled up, while trained teachers should be offered advanced modules on emerging assistive technologies and peer coaching opportunities.

In terms of the level of ICT competence, the majority of respondents, or 21 teachers equivalent to 63.64%, rated themselves at the Intermediate level, followed by 7 teachers or 21.21% at the Basic level, and 5 teachers or 15.15% at the Advanced level. The concentration at the Intermediate level suggests that while teachers can generally manage everyday educational technology, few possess the advanced competencies required for selecting, customizing, or troubleshooting assistive technologies specifically designed for SEN learners. Fernández-Batanero et al. (2022) highlighted that teachers often lack adequate training in utilizing ICTs for students with special needs, underscoring the necessity of targeted professional development programs, a concern reiterated by Pérez-Jorge et al. (2024) and Wulandari et al. (2024). This suggests that the action plan should adopt a tiered professional development strategy consisting of foundational ICT literacy for Basic users, targeted assistive technology training for Intermediate users, and peer coaching roles for Advanced users.

Finally, in terms of access to technological resources, laptops and computers were reported as the most accessible resource by 31 teachers, ranked first, followed by mobile devices and tablets reported by 26 teachers, ranked second, and internet access reported by 25 teachers, ranked third. Projectors and Smart TVs were the least accessible resource, reported by only 16 teachers and ranked fourth. It is important to note that no specialized assistive technologies were reported among the available resources. While general-purpose devices were widely available, the complete absence of specialized assistive technologies means that teachers may be attempting to support SEN learners using only mainstream, non-adapted tools, which severely limits accessibility. Michuy-Guingla et al. (2025) emphasized that the absence of specialized assistive technologies poses a significant challenge to individualized learning, as effective inclusive education requires not only general digital literacy but also specific assistive tools, a point reinforced by Ramírez-Solórzano and Navas (2024). This underscores the need for the action plan to prioritize conducting an assistive technology needs assessment and allocating resources for acquiring core assistive technologies such as screen readers, speech recognition software, and adjustable font tools.

Level of teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology in inclusive classrooms

The level of teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology in inclusive classrooms was examined through six constructs adapted from the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), namely Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facilitating Conditions, Behavioral Intentions, and Use Behavior. Performance Expectancy obtained the highest aggregate mean of 4.56 with a standard deviation of 0.58, interpreted as "Strongly Agree." Among its indicators, the statement that technology makes content accessible for visual and auditory impairments obtained the highest mean of 4.67 (SD=0.54), followed by the statements that technology tools enhance SEN students' lesson participation and that technology enables personalized instruction in mixed classes, both obtaining a mean of 4.64 (SD=0.55 and SD=0.49, respectively). Assistive apps accelerating SEN learning goal achievement and digital aids boosting academic results for diverse needs

both obtained a mean of 4.52 (SD=0.67 and SD=0.62, respectively), while gamified platforms engaging learners with ADHD or autism received the lowest, though still "Strongly Agree," mean of 4.39 (SD=0.61). The uniformly high scores indicate that teachers already believe strongly in technology's value for SEN learners, recognizing its potential to address accessibility and personalized instruction challenges. Ranzato et al. (2024) and Искакова (2023) confirmed that teachers strongly believe in technology's potential to facilitate learning for students with diverse needs, although other studies indicate that teachers often report insufficient knowledge regarding specific technological applications for SEN, as noted by Polat et al. (2024) and Yeboah et al. (2024). This finding suggests that the action plan need not invest resources in persuading teachers of technology's value, but should instead focus on implementation support, shifting from convincing teachers to equipping them with practical strategies, with the slightly lower confidence regarding gamified platforms indicating a targeted training opportunity on evidence-based gamification strategies for behavioral and attentional needs.

Effort Expectancy obtained an aggregate mean of 4.31 (SD=0.77), interpreted as "Strongly Agree." Teachers strongly agreed that inclusive lesson plans integrate technology tools easily, with a mean of 4.58 (SD=0.61), and that classroom technology interfaces suit teacher use, with a mean of 4.48 (SD=0.57). The item stating that initial training simplifies ongoing technology setup obtained a mean of 4.42 (SD=0.87), interpreted as "Strongly Agree," while the same mean of 4.42 (SD=0.66) was obtained for quickly learning new assistive technologies, interpreted as "Agree." Meanwhile, the statements that adapting apps for SEN requires minimal effort and that daily technology integration feels effortless both obtained the lowest mean of 3.97, interpreted as "Agree," with standard deviations of 0.88 and 1.02, respectively, the latter showing the highest variability among all Effort Expectancy indicators. While general technology integration was perceived as relatively easy, specific challenges remained in adapting applications for SEN learners and in sustaining daily effortless use, with considerable variation observed among teachers. Khasawneh (2024) and Искакова (2023) noted that while educators generally perceive electronic technologies positively, significant variability persists in preferences for specific technologies, underscoring the need for adaptable solutions and comprehensive training, a point further supported by Supermaniam and Hamdan (2025). This implies that the action plan should provide ready-to-use templates, pre-configured accessibility settings, curated application lists matched to specific disability categories, and step-by-step adaptation guides to reduce the perceived effort involved in SEN-specific technology use.

Social Influence obtained an aggregate mean of 4.24 (SD=0.78), interpreted as "Strongly Agree." The statement that colleagues promote technology use in inclusive settings obtained the highest mean of 4.39 (SD=0.70), followed by the statement that DepEd mandates support inclusive technology use, with a mean of 4.36 (SD=0.78). The item on networks sharing effective SEN technology practices obtained a mean of 4.27 (SD=0.80), interpreted as "Strongly Agree," while school administrators supplying SEN technology resources obtained a mean of 4.09 (SD=0.80), and parents endorsing technology for their SEN child obtained the lowest mean of 4.06 (SD=0.79), both interpreted as "Agree." Peer encouragement and policy directives emerged as the most potent social factors driving technology acceptance, while administrative resource support and parental backing were perceived as relatively weaker influences. Opaco (2026), Gracia (2026), and Jumawid (2026) confirmed that social influence is a critical factor affecting the technology utilization profiles of teachers in inclusive education, with peer support significantly impacting agreement across UTAUT constructs, a finding consistent with Şahin and Dursun (2022) and Taufiq-Hail et al. (2024). This implies that the

action plan should leverage the strong influence of peers by establishing professional learning communities and recognition systems for teachers who model innovative SEN technology practices, while also strengthening the weaker factors through administrative commitment letters and parent engagement strategies.

Facilitating Conditions obtained the lowest aggregate mean among the six constructs, at 4.04 (SD=0.91), interpreted as "Agree." Professional development programs targeting inclusive technology skills obtained the highest mean of 4.24 (SD=0.83), the only indicator under this construct reaching the "Strongly Agree" interpretation. The item on schools providing reliable devices and internet obtained a mean of 4.15 (SD=0.87), followed by technical support resolving classroom issues promptly, with a mean of 4.06 (SD=0.79). The statement that schedules allow technology planning time obtained a mean of 3.94 (SD=1.09), showing the highest variability across all Facilitating Conditions indicators, while budget covering SEN assistive tools obtained the lowest mean overall across all six UTAUT constructs, at 3.79 (SD=0.96), both interpreted as "Agree." While teachers felt reasonably supported by existing training opportunities, significant resource constraints in budget and planning time represented the primary barriers to optimal technology integration. Celeste and Osias (2024) and Quirao et al. (2025) highlighted that the availability of quality infrastructure and ongoing training for educators is essential for effective technology integration, as robust facilitating conditions within schools directly correlate with more frequent ICT use, a relationship also observed by Cabellos et al. (2023). This finding implies that the action plan must prioritize developing a dedicated budget line for SEN assistive technologies, exploring low-cost and open-source options, and restructuring school schedules to include protected weekly planning time specifically for technology integration in inclusive classrooms.

Behavioral Intentions obtained an aggregate mean of 4.45 (SD=0.64), interpreted as "Strongly Agree." The intention to recommend technology tools to peers and the intention to seek more training on SEN technologies both obtained the highest mean of 4.52 (SD=0.62), followed by the statement that technology integration fits the respondent's teaching philosophy, with a mean of 4.42 (SD=0.66). The intention to use technology routinely for SEN inclusion obtained the lowest, though still "Strongly Agree," mean of 4.33 (SD=0.65). Teachers expressed very strong intentions to use, recommend, and pursue further learning about technology for SEN inclusion, reflecting a collaborative and growth-oriented mindset. Alhwaiti (2024), Zraydi et al. (2026), and Amouri et al. (2025) confirmed that behavioral intention to use educational technology for inclusion is strongly predicted by perceived usefulness and positive attitudes, with social support and self-efficacy significantly shaping adoption intentions, findings corroborated by Weng et al. (2025) and Sanusi et al. (2023). This implies that the action plan should capitalize on this motivational state by implementing low-barrier initiatives that translate intention into action, such as structured peer-sharing mechanisms, differentiated professional development, and implementation intentions supported by checklists and coaching.

Use Behavior obtained an aggregate mean of 4.33 (SD=0.73), interpreted as "Strongly Agree," confirming that technology integration was already a regular practice among the respondents. Applying multiple technology types, including applications and devices, obtained the highest mean of 4.42 (SD=0.61), followed by current daily or weekly use of technology for SEN, with a mean of 4.36 (SD=0.74). The anticipated increase in technology frequency for the next semester obtained the lowest mean of 4.21 (SD=0.82), though still interpreted as "Strongly Agree." While teachers reported current, active use of technology for SEN, they showed tempered confidence regarding substantially expanding usage, likely due to perceived resource or time constraints. Khasawneh (2024) noted that while educators generally hold positive views toward technology and recognize its importance, challenges such as insufficient training and infrastructure can hinder seamless integration into special education systems, a concern echoed

by Santillán et al. (2024) and Ramírez-Solórzano and Navas (2024). This suggests that the action plan should establish explicit commitments for resource allocation and protected planning time before the start of the next semester, converting tentative expectations into assured facilitating conditions.

Taken together, the overall aggregate mean across all six UTAUT constructs was 4.32 (SD=0.73), interpreted as "Strongly Agree." Performance Expectancy ranked highest at 4.56, followed by Behavioral Intentions at 4.45, Use Behavior at 4.33, Effort Expectancy at 4.31, and Social Influence at 4.24, while Facilitating Conditions, at 4.04, was the only construct falling within the "Agree" range. This hierarchy reveals that teachers strongly believe in technology's usefulness and intend to use it, but that perceived systemic support, particularly in terms of budget and planning time, lags behind their motivational and attitudinal readiness. Agrusti and Bonavolontà (2022) confirmed that teachers demonstrate a general acceptance and positive disposition toward educational technology in inclusive settings, with strong endorsement of technology's utility for diverse learners, a conclusion supported by Xia et al. (2023) and D'Elia et al. (2025). This implies that the action plan must prioritize infrastructural improvements in facilitating conditions to bridge this gap, so that the already high levels of performance expectancy, behavioral intentions, and use behavior can be sustained and further elevated.

Level of accessibility and instructional support provided to learners with Special Educational Needs through technological integration

The level of accessibility and instructional support that teachers perceived as being provided to learners with SEN through technological integration obtained an aggregate mean of 4.45 (SD=0.63), interpreted as "Strongly Agree." The highest-rated indicator was that technology supports communication for learners with speech or language difficulties, obtaining a mean of 4.64 (SD=0.49), followed by digital tools helping monitor the progress of learners with SEN and technology enhancing collaboration between teachers, parents, and specialists, both obtaining a mean of 4.58 (SD=0.56 and SD=0.50, respectively). Technology supporting differentiated instruction for learners with SEN obtained a mean of 4.55 (SD=0.62), while technology strengthening learners' motivation and confidence obtained a mean of 4.48 (SD=0.62). Both learners with SEN participating equally in class activities through technology and the use of technology improving overall classroom inclusivity obtained a mean of 4.45 (SD=0.67 and SD=0.62, respectively). Digital content being adapted to meet the specific needs of learners with SEN obtained a mean of 4.36 (SD=0.70), while technology helping learners with SEN access instructional materials independently obtained a mean of 4.30 (SD=0.64). The lowest-rated indicator, though still interpreted as "Agree," was assistive tools reducing learning barriers in the classroom, which obtained a mean of 4.15 (SD=0.94), the highest standard deviation among all indicators under this construct. While technology was highly supportive for specific functions such as communication and progress monitoring, its core promise of barrier reduction was less consistently achieved, with substantial disagreement among teachers likely attributable to differences in tool availability, appropriateness, or teacher training. Исканова (2023) confirmed that while educators generally acknowledge the benefits of educational technology, specific challenges or differing levels of implementation expertise exist regarding certain technological applications for SEN students, a finding echoed by Öberg et al. (2024) and Alarba (2023). This implies that the action plan must conduct a classroom-level assistive technology needs assessment matching specific learner disabilities with

appropriate barrier-reducing tools, while professional development should shift from general technology integration toward disability-specific assistive technology applications.

Extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies by teachers in inclusive classrooms in terms of frequency, type, and purpose

The extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies by teachers in inclusive classrooms, examined in terms of frequency, type, and purpose, obtained an overall aggregate mean of 4.42 (SD=1.01), interpreted as "Always." Multimedia tools such as videos and interactive presentations and the use of technology to increase learner engagement and motivation both obtained the highest mean of 4.76 (SD=0.44), followed by the use of technology to improve learners' understanding of lessons, with a mean of 4.67 (SD=0.54), and the use of technology to support individualized instruction, with a mean of 4.61 (SD=0.61). The use of technology to monitor and assess learner progress obtained a mean of 4.58 (SD=0.76), while integrating technology in collaborative classroom activities obtained a mean of 4.55 (SD=0.67). The use of technology to enhance communication with learners with SEN, incorporating assistive technologies during lesson delivery, using technology on a daily basis in the inclusive classroom, and using technology for remediation and intervention purposes each obtained a mean of 4.48, 4.45, 4.45, and 4.45, respectively (SD=0.87, SD=0.67, SD=0.62, and SD=0.67, respectively), all interpreted as "Always." The use of learning management systems or online platforms obtained a mean of 4.33 (SD=0.78). Meanwhile, the use of specialized devices such as screen readers and adaptive keyboards obtained a mean of 4.15 (SD=1.18), the use of mobile applications designed for learners with SEN obtained a mean of 4.12 (SD=1.08), the use of digital tools when assessing learners with SEN obtained a mean of 4.03 (SD=0.88), and the use of assistive software such as text-to-speech and speech-to-text obtained the lowest mean of 3.91 (SD=0.98), with these four indicators interpreted as "Often" and exhibiting the highest variability among all items under this construct. This disparity reveals that while teachers readily integrate mainstream educational technology, the adoption of disability-specific assistive tools remains inconsistent and less frequent, with substantial variability likely due to differences in access, training, or learner needs. Lustica et al. (2025) confirmed that while basic digital tools are frequently employed, specialized assistive technologies remain underutilized due to factors such as availability and teacher expertise, limiting comprehensive support for diverse learning requirements, a conclusion also reached by Michuy-Guingla et al. (2025). This implies that the action plan must prioritize targeted capacity-building in assistive software, equitable distribution of specialized devices, and training in digital formative assessment tools adapted for SEN learners, ensuring that technology integration moves beyond mere engagement toward genuine accessibility.

Significant relationships among key variables

To determine the significant relationship between teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology and the level of accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed for each of the six UTAUT constructs, with the null hypothesis tested at the 0.05 level of significance. The results showed that Behavioral Intentions obtained the strongest correlation, at $r=0.765$ with a p-value of 0.000, followed by Performance Expectancy at $r=0.726$ with a p-value of 0.000, and Use Behavior at $r=0.718$ with a p-value of 0.000. Effort Expectancy obtained a correlation of $r=0.694$ with a p-value of 0.000, Social Influence obtained a correlation of $r=0.624$ with a p-value of 0.000, and Facilitating Conditions, while exhibiting the weakest, though still significant, correlation among the six constructs, obtained $r=0.546$ with a p-value of 0.001. Since all six p-values were

less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected for each construct, indicating that all six UTAUT constructs demonstrated positive and statistically significant correlations with the level of accessibility and instructional support for SEN learners. These significant positive correlations provide strong empirical evidence that teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology are meaningfully associated with the accessibility and instructional support experienced by SEN learners. Akbar et al. (2023) confirmed that educators' positive disposition toward and effective integration of technological tools are critical determinants in fostering an accessible and supportive learning environment for diverse learners, a finding consistent with Alanazy and Alrusaiyes (2021) and Yeboah et al. (2024). Since Behavioral Intentions demonstrated the strongest correlation, the action plan must prioritize interventions that strengthen teachers' intention to use technology, such as setting clear expectations, providing implementation prompts, and publicly recognizing teachers who consistently integrate technology for SEN.

To further examine the significant relationship between the level of accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN and the extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies by teachers in inclusive classrooms, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was likewise computed, with the null hypothesis tested at the 0.05 level of significance. The analysis revealed a moderate positive correlation, at $r=0.556$ with a p-value of 0.001, between the level of accessibility and instructional support perceived by teachers and the extent to which they utilized assistive and instructional technologies. Since the p-value of 0.001 was less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating a significant relationship between the two variables. While the relationship was statistically significant and positive, its moderate strength indicates that technology utilization is an important factor but not the sole determinant of accessibility and instructional support for SEN learners. Layachi and Pitchford (2024), Wulandari et al. (2024), and Polat et al. (2024) emphasized that comprehensive systemic factors beyond technology integration alone, including teacher training, infrastructure, and policy frameworks, are necessary to fully realize inclusive educational environments, a perspective also supported by Liu (2024) and Исканова (2023). This implies that the action plan must integrate technology use with Universal Design for Learning principles, evidence-based instructional strategies, and individualized education program implementation, ensuring that technology serves as an enabler rather than an end in itself.

Taken as a whole, the findings of this study demonstrate that the 33 teacher-respondents of Asian College of Technology Integrated School exhibited strongly favorable acceptance and utilization of technology in inclusive classrooms, with an overall aggregate UTAUT mean of 4.32, and perceived a strongly favorable level of accessibility and instructional support for learners with SEN, with an aggregate mean of 4.45, alongside a consistently high, though unevenly distributed, extent of utilization of assistive and instructional technologies, with an aggregate mean of 4.42. The significant positive correlations obtained, ranging from $r=0.546$ to $r=0.765$ for the first set of relationships and $r=0.556$ for the second, directly address the study's objectives by empirically demonstrating that teachers' psychological readiness, social support, and actual use of technology are meaningfully linked to the accessibility and instructional support experienced by SEN learners, and that this accessibility and support, in turn, is significantly associated with the breadth and consistency of technology utilization. However, the recurring pattern across all analyses, wherein Facilitating Conditions consistently emerged as the weakest construct and specialized assistive technologies remained comparatively underutilized, reveals a persistent gap between teachers' motivation and the systemic, resource-based support required to translate that motivation into fully accessible and

disability-specific instructional practice. These findings contribute to the field by affirming that technology acceptance frameworks such as UTAUT retain strong explanatory value in inclusive education contexts, while also highlighting that attitudinal readiness alone is insufficient without corresponding investment in infrastructure, budget, and specialized training. Taken together, these results provide the empirical foundation for the action plan that follows in the subsequent chapter, which is designed to address the specific gaps identified in facilitating conditions, assistive technology access, and specialized training, thereby strengthening the overall capacity of ACT-IS to deliver accessible, technology-integrated, and inclusive education to its learners with Special Educational Needs.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study, taken together, present a coherent picture of the current state of technological integration in inclusive classrooms at Asian College of Technology Integrated School during the school year 2025 to 2026. The teaching force at ACT IS is predominantly composed of young, female, and novice educators who possess an intermediate level of ICT competence and moderate access to general technological resources such as laptops and computers. Despite this relatively favorable disposition toward technology, the near absence of specialized assistive tools among available resources signals an early indication of the structural gaps that would later emerge more clearly in the study's results. These teachers demonstrated a consistently strong acceptance of technology, as reflected in the high aggregate mean across the constructs of the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology, particularly in performance expectancy and behavioral intentions. This suggests that teachers at ACT IS genuinely believe in the value of technology for supporting learners with Special Educational Needs and express strong intentions to use it meaningfully in their instructional practice.

However, this positive orientation toward technology was not uniformly matched by the conditions necessary to fully realize its benefits. Facilitating conditions emerged as the weakest construct among those measured, with the inadequacy of budgetary support for assistive tools standing out as the most pressing concern. This finding is significant because it identifies a specific and addressable barrier that limits the translation of teachers' favorable attitudes into consistent and effective practice. In parallel, while teachers reported a strong overall level of accessibility and instructional support for SEN learners, particularly in terms of technology's role in facilitating communication for those with speech or language difficulties, this same area revealed a critical weakness in the perceived ability of assistive tools to reduce learning barriers, a concern further underscored by the high variability in teacher responses on this indicator. Similarly, although the extent of technology utilization was rated as high overall, this was driven primarily by general instructional technologies rather than by specialized assistive software and devices, which were used comparatively less often. Taken together, these patterns point to a consistent and recurring theme throughout the findings, namely that general purpose technology integration is proceeding well, while the more specialized, disability specific dimension of technology use remains underdeveloped.

The statistical relationships established in this study lend further weight to these interpretations. The significant positive correlation between teachers' acceptance and utilization of technology and the level of accessibility and instructional support for SEN learners, particularly the strong association observed for behavioral intentions, indicates that teachers' willingness to engage with technology is a meaningful driver of accessibility outcomes in the classroom. Likewise, the significant positive correlation between accessibility and instructional support and the actual extent of technology utilization confirms that these two dimensions reinforce one another in practice. These relationships affirm that improvements in

one area are likely to yield corresponding improvements in the other, providing empirical justification for interventions that simultaneously target teacher readiness, institutional support, and the practical application of assistive technologies.

In light of these findings, it can be concluded that the extent of meaningful technological integration in inclusive classrooms at ACT IS is not primarily constrained by teacher attitudes or willingness, but rather by systemic gaps in resources, planning time, and specialized training. Bridging this gap between strong intention and actual practice requires deliberate institutional action. It is therefore recommended that the school administration, faculty, and stakeholders at ACT IS adopt and implement the proposed action plan, Project ACCESS: Advancing Competencies, Conditions, and Equity for SEN Students through Technology. This plan is designed to directly address the deficiencies identified in this study by improving the budget and resources allocated to assistive technologies, providing teachers with protected planning time for technology integration, strengthening professional development focused specifically on assistive software and devices, and establishing a more supportive infrastructure for inclusive technology use. Through the systematic implementation of the strategies, activities, and timelines outlined in this action plan, ACT IS can move beyond favorable attitudes toward technology and achieve tangible, equitable improvements in the learning experiences of all students with Special Educational Needs.

REFERENCES

- Abdelrasheed, N. S. G., & Saeed, M. A. (2025). Supportive educational technology and teacher attitudes toward the inclusion of children with special needs. *International Journal of Linguistics Literature & Translation*, 8(4), 64. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2025.8.4.8>
- Adewale, M. D., Azeta, A. A., Abayomi-Alli, A., & Sambo-Magaji, A. (2024). Impact of artificial intelligence adoption on students' academic performance in open and distance learning: A systematic literature review. *Heliyon*, 10(22). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e40025>
- Adigun, O. T., Tijani, F. A., Haihambo, C. K., & Enock, S. L. (2025). Understanding pre-service teachers' intention to adopt and use artificial intelligence in Nigerian inclusive classrooms. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1519472>
- Agrusti, F., & Bonavolontà, G. (2022). Educational robotics for special needs students: Teachers' perspectives on pre-service training. *Journal of Educational Cultural and Psychological Studies (ECPS Journal)*, 26. <https://doi.org/10.7358/ecps-2022-026-agbo>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.59613/global.v1i3.35>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.56953>

- Alanazy, M. M., & Alrusaiyes, R. F. (2021). Saudi pre-service special education teachers' knowledge and perceptions toward using computer technology. *International Education Studies*, 14(3), 125. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v14n3p125>
- Alegre, E. M. (2023). Technology-driven education: Analyzing the synergy among innovation, motivation, and student engagement. *International Journal of Membrane Science and Technology*, 10(2), 1477. <https://doi.org/10.15379/ijmst.v10i2.1507>
- Alhwaiti, M. (2024). Using virtual classroom for teaching special needs students in inclusive classrooms during and beyond COVID-19: Teachers' perspectives. *Anales de Psicología*, 40(1), 95. <https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.523331>
- Altakhaineh, A. R. M., Alkhatib, R. N., & Awad, T. (2026). Integrating artificial intelligence to enhance inclusive education for students with special needs in Jordan and the UAE: Perspectives of teachers and parents. *Acta Psychologica*, 263, 106252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2026.106252>
- Amouri, H., Haroud, S., Ouchaouka, L., & Saqri, N. (2025). Acceptability of artificial intelligence in inclusive education: A TAM2-based study among preservice teachers. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 1616327. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1616327>
- Angara, S. (2025, January 21). Digital, AI support pushed for learners with disabilities. Philippine News Agency. <https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1248962>
- Arguson, A. C., Mabborang, M. P., & Paculan, R. S. (2023). The acceptability of generative AI tools of selected senior high school teachers in Schools Divisions Office-Manila, Philippines. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Neural Network*, 36, 1. <https://doi.org/10.55529/jaimlenn.36.1.10>
- Ateş, H., & Kölemen, C. Ş. (2024). Integrating theories for insight: An amalgamated model for gamified virtual reality adoption by science teachers. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12892-9>
- Ayanwale, M. A. (2023). Can experience determine the adoption of Industrial Revolution 4.0 skills in 21st century mathematics education? *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 8(1), 74. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2023.6>
- Azizoğlu, B., & Çakır, R. (2025). Examination of special education teachers' ICT attitudes, digital material design competencies, and generative artificial intelligence literacy. *DergiPark* (Istanbul University). <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/neueefd/issue/90458/1683328>
- Blando, H. D. (2025). Bridging the digital divide: A systematic review of teacher preparedness and technology integration in the Matatag curriculum. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15113816>
- Cabellos, B., Siddiq, F., & Scherer, R. (2023). The moderating role of school facilitating conditions and attitudes towards ICT on teachers' ICT use and emphasis on developing students' digital skills. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 150, 107994. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107994>

Campado, R. J., Toquero, C. M. D., & Ulanday, D. M. P. (2023). Integration of assistive technology in teaching learners with special educational needs and disabilities in the Philippines. *International Journal of Professional Development Learners and Learning*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.30935/ijpdll/13062>

Castalone, A.-P. M., Verula, M. P., Sabangan, Q. M. D., Golla, D. K. B., & Bulalacao, V. R. G. (2026). Special education in the Philippines: A meta-synthesis of teacher narratives and inclusive practices. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18681580>

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>

Celeste, R. J., & Osias, N. (2024). Challenges and implementation of technology integration: Basis for enhanced instructional program. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 3(2), 106. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajahs.v3i2.2656>

Chanthiran, M., Mariappan, P., Govinndasamy, P., & Kanawazi, K. (2025). Interpreting the role of artificial intelligence (AI) tools and assistive technologies in enhancing accessibility in primary school special education. *Muallim Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 53. <https://doi.org/10.33306/mjssh/365>

Co, S. J. (2025a). Artificial intelligence in Philippine education: A narrative review of applications, perceptions, and challenges. *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management*, 5(2), 25. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15902950>

Dalyanci, A. A., Mast, L., Krushinskaia, K., & Raes, A. (2025). Detecting innovators in the field: Teachers' perceptions and adoption of generative AI in education. *The Open/Technology in Education, Society, and Scholarship Association Journal*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.18357/otessaj.2025.5.1.89>

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. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijrm/v12i10.el03>

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/educ.2024.1447489>

Department of Education. (2020). DM No. 203, s. 2020: Guidelines on the use of the curricula for learners with disabilities during crisis situations. <https://www.depeddasma.edu.ph/dm-no-203-s-2020-guidelines-on-the-use-of-the-curricula-for-learners-with-disabilities-during-cris>

Department of Education. (2025). DO_s2025_013: Support for the responsible, inclusive, and strategic integration of AI. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2025_013.pdf

Doria, J. O. (2024). The double-edged sword: A review of artificial intelligence integration in the Philippine educational system. *Southeast Asian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(1), 257. <https://www.sajst.org/online/index.php/sajst/article/view/341>

Efthymiou, E. (2023). Examining teachers' perspectives on equitable digital education. In *Advances in educational technologies and instructional design book series* (p. 97). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-8504-0.ch005>

Fernández-Batanero, J. M., Rueda, M. M., & Cerero, J. F. (2022). Are primary education teachers trained for the use of the technology with disabled students? *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-022-00195-x>

Fernández-Batanero, J. M., Rueda, M. M., Cerero, J. F., & García-Martínez, I. (2022). Assistive technology for the inclusion of students with disabilities: A systematic review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 70(5), 1911. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-022-10127-7>

Fitas, R. (2025a). Inclusive education with AI: Supporting special needs and tackling language barriers. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5366398>

Fteiha, M., Al-Rashaida, M., & Ghazal, M. (2025). General and special education teachers' readiness for artificial intelligence in classrooms: A structural equation modeling study of knowledge, attitudes, and practices in select UAE public and private schools. *PLoS ONE*, 20(9). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0331941>

Fudalan, A. (2025). Can AI replace teachers? The value of artificial intelligence in Philippine education. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 43(4), 449. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.430405>

Gomez, M. A. C., Miranda, P. A., & Espinosa, A. A. (2025). Mind the gap: Bridging the divide between designing and implementing inclusion policies in the Philippines. *SSRN*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5186085

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>

Gracia, E. D. (2026). Teachers' technology utilization profile in inclusive education. *Pantao, International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.69651/pijhss0501732>

Graván, P. R., Cerero, J. F., Rueda, M. M., & Reyes-Rebollo, M. M. (2023). University teaching skills in ICT and disability. The case of the Autonomous Community of Madrid. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(10), 12653. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12314-2>

Hamid, M. S., et al. (2025). Impact of digital competencies and assistive technologies on learning outcomes for students with learning disabilities in Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1640556>

Jumawid, M. (2026). Exploring the technology utilization profile of teachers in inclusive education. *Pantao, International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.69651/pijhss0501736>

Karagianni, E., & Drigas, A. (2023). New technologies for inclusive learning for students with special educational needs. *International Journal of Online and Biomedical Engineering (iJOE)*, 19(5), 4. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijoe.v19i05.36417>

Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2024). Evaluating the efficacy of tablet-based assistive technology in Saudi special education settings. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(6), 547. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.6.25>

Kheng, M., & Rusli, N. A. (2025). Teacher training programs: The perspectives of special educational needs (SEN) teachers. *International Journal of Instruction*, 18(4), 335. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2025.18419a>

Khotimah, H., Hidayat, N., & Nor-Khaizura, M. A. R. (2025). The essential role of teacher self-efficacy and teacher acceptance for differentiated learning. *Profesi Pendidikan Dasar*, 97. <https://doi.org/10.23917/ppd.v12i2.9215>

Kunjiapu, S., Sinnappan, P., Salim, F. A. A., & Kunasegaran, M. (2025). Challenges and dilemmas of digitalization in Philippine education: A grassroots perspective. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 14(2), 232. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v14i2.22325>

Layachi, A., & Pitchford, N. (2024). Formative evaluation of an interactive personalised learning technology to inform equitable access and inclusive education for children with special educational needs and disabilities. *Technology Knowledge and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09739-0>

Li, J., Yan, Y., & Zeng, X. (2025). Exploring artificial intelligence in inclusive education: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Applied Sciences*, 15(23), 12624. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app152312624>

Li, M. (2024). Exploring the digital divide in primary education: A comparative study of urban and rural mathematics teachers' TPACK and attitudes towards technology integration in post-pandemic China. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12890-x>

Liu, H.-H. (2024). Exploring key factors influencing the willingness of elementary school resource class teachers to integrate technology into teaching: A mixed-methods approach. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 14(4), 581. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2024.14.4.2080>

Lustica, Z., et al. (2025). Improving learning outcomes of students through technology integration in special needs education programs. *British Journal of Teacher Education and Pedagogy*, 4(9), 1. <https://doi.org/10.32996/bjtep.2025.4.9.1>

Machkour, M., Lamalif, L., Faris, S., Mansouri, K., & Akef, F. (2023). Framework of ICT integration into learning using Udl for learning approach. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 58(6). <https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.58.6.9>

Mekheimer, M. A. (2025). Effective technology integration in higher education: A mixed-methods study of professional development. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13750-y>

Michuy-Guingla, T. E., et al. (2025). La tecnología educativa en el proceso de aprendizaje de estudiantes con necesidades educativas específicas. *Revista Científica Ciencia y Método*, 3(3), 42. <https://doi.org/10.55813/gaea/rcym/v3/n3/59>

Montes, C. del P. G., et al. (2023). Opinions, training and requirements regarding ICT of educators in Florence and Granada for students with functional diversity. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 23(2), 889. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-023-00977-0>

Moraleda, D., Gonzales, R., V. Infante, E., Sta. Cruz, M., Bauza, J., Monzon, H., Babasa, A., Taguiang, A., Flores, E., M. Añonuevo, K., Bersales, J., Francesca A. Birung, P., Joseph P. Cabauatan, M., de Lara Co, M., Supreme B. Comia, R., M. Del Valle-Ramoso, Ma. G., D. Enrile, C., A. Iellamo, E., Zenne O. Genandoy, J., ... Kevin Rivera, J. (2025). EDCOM II YEAR TWO REPORT FIXING THE FOUNDATIONS A Matter of National Survival.

Mpu, Y. (2023). Bridging the knowledge gap on special needs learner support: The use of artificial intelligence (AI) to combat digital divide post-COVID-19 pandemic and beyond – A comprehensive literature review. In *IntechOpen eBooks*. IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.113054>

Navas-Bonilla, C. del R., Guerra-Arango, J. A., Oviedo-Guado, D. A., & Murillo-Noriega, D. E. (2025). Inclusive education through technology: A systematic review of types, tools and characteristics. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1527851>

Niu, H., & Niranjana, M. (2025). Teacher digital competence in New Zealand primary schools: A qualitative study of integration practices, challenges, and cultural considerations. *The Australian Educational Researcher*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-025-00912-7>

Öberg, J., Fors, U., & Zdravković, J. (2024). Teachers' perspectives on using technology to facilitate pupil participation. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, 19(2), 14. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v19i02.45931>

Opaco, N. J. (2026). Delineating the technology utilization profile of teachers in inclusive education. *Pantao, International Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.69651/pijhss0501731>

Pérez-Jorge, D., et al. (2024). Challenges and opportunities in inclusive education with ICT: Teachers' perspectives in the Canary Islands during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Education Sciences*, 14(3), 283. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030283>

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.
<https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.1355239>

Ramírez-Solórzano, F. L., & Navas, C. D. H. (2024). Inclusión Educativa: Desafíos y Oportunidades para la Educación de Estudiantes con Necesidades Especiales. *Revista Científica Zambos.*, 3(3), 44. <https://doi.org/10.69484/rcz/v3/n3/57>

Ranes, B. (2025). AI integration in facilitating learning: Its benefits, challenges and strategies for enhancement. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities (DWIJMH)* (ISSN 2980-4817), 4(3), 2095. <https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v4i3.181>

Ranzato, E., Holloway, C., & Bandukda, M. (2024). Use of educational technology in inclusive primary education: Protocol for a systematic review (Preprint). <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.65045>

Republic of the Philippines. (2022). Republic Act No. 11650: An Act instituting a policy of inclusion and services for learners with disabilities. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2022/ra_11650_2022.html

Şahin, F., & Dursun, Ö. Ö. (2022). Does innovativeness matter in technology adoption? Addressing pre-service teachers' intention to use ITs. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, 5(3), 676. <https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.1125238>

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

Santillán, C. M. T., et al. (2024). Formación Docente en el Uso de Herramientas Tecnológicas para el Apo-yo a las Necesidades Educativas Especiales en el Aula. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*, 8(3), 3768. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v8i3.11588

Santos, S. M. A. V., Silva, C. G. D., Carvalho, I. E. D., Castilho, L. P. D., Meroto, M. B. das N., Tavares, P. R., Pires, R. dos R., & Moniz, S. S. de O. R. (2024). The art of personalization of education: Artificial Intelligence on the stages of special education. *Contribuciones a Las Ciencias Sociales*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.17n.2-008>

Sanusi, I. T., Ayanwale, M. A., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2023). Investigating the moderating effects of social good and confidence on teachers' intention to prepare school students for artificial intelligence education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(1), 273. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12250-1>

Sarpong, G., Bonsu, M. O. T., & Adu-Poku, A. (2023). Evaluating digital technology access and usage among teachers. *MANAGERIA Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 8(1), 21. <https://doi.org/10.14421/manageria.2023.81-02>

Savior, M. A. F., Sitoy, R. E., Espina, R. C., Tenerife-Cañete, J. J. L., Capuno, R. G., Vera, J. D., Tandag, J. M., & Mamites, I. O. (2025). Key Stage 1 teachers' preparedness in handling

learners with special educational needs. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(10), 1035. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.910000088>

Setiawan, P. Y., & Kusumadewi, N. M. W. (2023). Exploring the role of perceived enjoyment integration in the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology: A descriptive study. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 140(8), 78. <https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2023-08.08>

Shaheen, H. R. A. (2025). The role of assistive technology in enhancing learning outcomes for students with educational disabilities: Teachers' perceptions in Amman schools. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 15(6), 208. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2025-0209>

Shen, L., Qiu, N., & Wang, Z. (2025). Psychological safety and trust as drivers of teachers' continued use of AI tools in classrooms. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-13789-4>

Simos, C., & Katsiampoura, I. (2025). The use of digital tools to enhance inclusion in the classroom. *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, 17(1), 465. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjaets.2025.17.1.1446>

Supermaniam, M., & Hamdan, N. F. (2025). Utilizing educational technology in empowering special education: Experiences and challenges of students and teachers. *International Journal of Modern Education*, 7(26), 559. <https://doi.org/10.35631/ijmoe.726037>

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>

Taufiq-Hail, G. A.-M., et al. (2024). Exploring factors influencing Gen Z's acceptance and adoption of AI and cloud-based applications and tools in academic attainment. *Emerging Science Journal*, 8(3), 815. <https://doi.org/10.28991/esj-2024-08-03-02>

Teng, K. Y., Liden, A. Y., Girrie, C. R. J., Dinggat, J. N., & Lee, H. Y. (2025). The role of digital technologies in enhancing inclusive education: A systematic review of current trends. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bitara UPSI*, 18, 178. <https://doi.org/10.37134/bitara.vol18.sp.16.2025>

Toyokawa, Y., Horikoshi, I., Majumdar, R., & Ogata, H. (2023). Challenges and opportunities of AI in inclusive education: A case study of data-enhanced active reading in Japan. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00286-2>

UNESCO. (2023). Technology in education: A case study on the Philippines. UNESCO Digital Library. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000387743>

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3), 425–478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540>

Venzon, W. C., & Venzon, M. E. (2025). Advancing senior high school research skills through the integration of artificial intelligence tools. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 13(5), 4117. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2025.70174>

Villarino, R. T. H. (2024). Rural Philippine college students' perspectives and experiences on AI tools in education: A mixed-method research.

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. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2024.61593>

Walia, P., & GUHA, S. (2025). Efficacy of tech-integrated instruction in science education: Educators' perspectives to support students with specific learning disabilities in inclusive classrooms.

Weng, K. H., et al. (2025). A model for the adoption of artificial intelligence in inclusive education: An exploratory study of key factors and expert insights. *Journal of Information Technology Education Research*, 24, 27. <https://doi.org/10.28945/5612>

Wohlfart, O., & Wagner, I. (2024). Longitudinal perspectives on technology acceptance: Teachers' integration of digital tools through the COVID-19 transition. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(5), 6091. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12954-y>

Wulandari, C. E., Firdaus, F. A., & Saifulloh, F. (2024). Promoting inclusivity through technology: A literature review in educational settings [Review of Promoting Inclusivity Through Technology: A Literature Review in Educational Settings]. *The Journal of Learning and Technology*, 3(1), 19. Universitas Terbuka. <https://doi.org/10.33830/jlt.v3i1.9731>

Xia, X., Chen, B., Feng, M., & Jing, Y. (2023). A study on educational technology acceptance of special education teachers in language teaching based on TAM model. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 13(10), 1591. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2023.13.10.1966>

Yıldız, E., & Arpacı, İ. (2024). Understanding pre-service mathematics teachers' intentions to use GeoGebra: The role of technological pedagogical content knowledge. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(14), 18817. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12614-1>

Yılmaz, Y., et al. (2021). Determination of the education technology competencies of special education teachers. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejse.v7i2.3734>

Yusuf, F. A. (2025). Trends, opportunities, and challenges of artificial intelligence in elementary education - A systematic literature review. *Journal of Integrated Elementary Education*, 5(1), 109. <https://doi.org/10.21580/jieed.v5i1.25594>

Zawawi, N. A. W. A., & Hashim, H. (2024). Special education integration program: Teacher's insights on utilizing technology in ESL classroom. SHS Web of Conferences, 182, 1013. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202418201013>

Искакова, М. К. (2023). Electronic technologies to ensure individual learning of education seekers with special needs. 4. <https://doi.org/10.57125/fs.2023.03.20.01>