Public Elementary School Teachers' Preparedness in Implementing Inclusive Education, Instructional Supervision and Supervisory Assistance

Benjie N. Domider
Zyrus Ceasar N. Uminga
Guillan A. Dajero

Abstract — This study examined the relationship between teachers' level of preparedness for inclusive education and the supervisory assistance provided by school administration, including instructional supervision and resource allocation. Using a descriptive-correlational design, data were gathered from 146 public school teachers. The study assessed five domains of teacher preparedness cognitive readiness, pedagogical skills, adaptive competency, collaborative readiness, and affective readiness and examined their association with supervisory variables such as policy and climate, capacity building, resource allocation, and strategic leadership. Results of the Pearson r correlation analysis revealed that teacher preparedness indicators were strongly and positively interrelated, particularly in adaptive competency, collaborative readiness, and affective readiness. However, relationships between teacher preparedness and instructional supervision variables were generally weak and not statistically significant. Similarly, supervisory assistance variables showed minimal correlation with preparedness outcomes, despite strong internal relationships among supervision components. Multiple regression analysis further confirmed that demographic variables had no significant influence on teacher preparedness or perceived supervisory assistance. Findings suggest that while teachers demonstrate strong internal readiness for inclusive education, current supervisory practices and administrative support systems are not effectively contributing to their preparedness. This indicates a gap between policy implementation and classroom-level support. The study highlights the need to shift instructional supervision from compliance-based monitoring toward developmental, coaching-oriented, and resource-responsive approaches. The study underscores the importance of strengthening supervisory systems to better

support inclusive education. Enhancing teacher preparedness requires not only individual competence but also effective institutional support structures that translate policies into meaningful instructional practices.

Keywords: Inclusive Education, Instructional Supervision, Teacher Preparedness, Supervisory Assistance, School Leadership

I. INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education is globally recognized as a cornerstone of equitable, high-quality schooling, yet its success hinges on teacher readiness. International studies reveal persistent gaps in teacher preparation, with curricula often neglecting inclusive pedagogy and disability studies, making professional development and systemic support essential. Research highlights that teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and self-efficacy strongly influence implementation, but disparities in training and institutional backing hinder effectiveness. In the Philippines, despite R.A. 11650 mandating inclusion, teachers show favorable attitudes yet limited competencies in areas such as Universal Design for Learning, adaptive technologies, and individualized education plans. Local studies emphasize that readiness is shaped not only by personal attributes but also by institutional frameworks, supervisory support, and resource allocation. Overall, teacher preparedness for inclusion is a multidimensional construct requiring curricular reform, sustained professional development, and strategic school leadership to translate policy into genuine classroom practice.

Statement of the Problem

School teachers' preparedness in implementing inclusive education, instructional supervision, and supervisory assistance provided in District 9, DepEd School Division of General Santos City during the School Year 2025-2026 with the end view of proposing a program. Particularly, it aims to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:

1.1. age;

1.2. sex;

1.3. civil status;

1.4 highest educational attainment;

1.5 school;

1.7 grade level taught/handled;

1.7 number of years in service, and

1.8 number of seminars/trainings attended?

2. As perceived by the respondents, what is their level of preparedness for inclusive education in terms of:

2.1 cognitive readiness;

2.2 pedagogical skills;

2.3 adaptive competency;

2.4 collaborative readiness, and

2.5 Affective readiness?

3. As perceived by the respondents, what is the instructional supervision provided by school administration in terms of:

3.1. Frequency of classroom observations;

3.2. Quality of supervisory feedback;

3.3. Professional development support;

3.4. Coaching and mentoring practices; and

3.5. Monitoring of inclusive teaching practices?

4. As perceived by the respondents, what is the supervisory assistance provided by the school along the following areas:

4.1 policy and climate;

4.2 capacity building;

4.3 resource allocation, and

4.4 strategic leadership?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and their level of preparedness for inclusive education?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and the instructional supervision provided by school administration?

7. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and the supervisory assistance provided by the school?

8. Is there a significant relationship between the level of preparedness for inclusive education and the instructional supervision provided by school administration and the supervisory assistance provided by the school?

9. Based on the findings of the study, what program can be proposed?

II. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive–correlational research design. It described teachers' profiles and assessed their preparedness, instructional supervision, and school administration in

implementing inclusive education using survey questionnaires. It also examined the relationships between teachers' preparedness, instructional supervision, and school administration without establishing causation. The findings provided evidence to improve supervisory practices and administrative decisions in inclusive education programs.

Procedure

The research process began with developing the proposal, including the problem statement, design, hypotheses, and instruments, grounded in theory and related studies. A structured questionnaire was developed, adapted from validated tools, and reviewed by experts to ensure clarity and relevance. It was pilot-tested, and reliability was established using Cronbach's alpha before final revisions were made.

After validation, permission was secured from school authorities, and qualified teacher-respondents were selected through appropriate sampling. Data were collected through questionnaires administered in person or online, then checked, coded, and organized for analysis.

Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation) were used to summarize teacher profiles and key variables, while inferential statistics (Pearson's r or Spearman's rho) determined relationships among variables. Results were interpreted based on the research questions, compared with existing studies and theories, and presented in tables and narratives. Conclusions and recommendations were then formulated to improve instructional supervision and school administration in support of inclusive education.

Data Processing

The researcher utilized both descriptive and inferential statistical methods to analyze the data. Frequency count described respondents' demographic profiles, while the mean determined the average responses and overall patterns. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) was used to assess teachers' preparedness in relation to instructional supervision and school

administration, considering multiple variables simultaneously. These methods ensured a comprehensive analysis and accurate interpretation of the results.

III. RESULTS

This section presents the Profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, School Assignment, Grade Level Taught, Years in Service, and Seminars Attended.

The demographic profile of the 146 respondents shows a teaching force largely composed of individuals in middle to late adulthood, with the largest group aged 44–50 years (28.1%), followed closely by those aged 51–57 years (26%). This indicates a workforce with substantial professional maturity and experience. In terms of sex, males slightly outnumber females (54.8% vs. 45.2%), which contrasts with the usual female-dominated trend in basic education. A significant majority of respondents are married (73.3%), suggesting that family responsibilities may influence their perspectives on workload and professional development. Educational attainment is notably high, with 31.5% holding doctorate degrees and 39% master's degrees, while another 29.4% are pursuing graduate studies, reflecting strong academic qualifications and commitment to professional growth. Most teachers are assigned to non-central schools (93.2%), ensuring representation from diverse educational contexts. Grade level distribution shows a higher concentration in Key Stage 2 (60.3%), which may reflect staffing priorities or enrollment patterns. Regarding years in service, nearly half (43.8%) have 4–6 years of experience, while 34.2% have more than 7 years, indicating a balanced mix of mid-career and veteran educators. Professional development exposure is evident, with the majority (57.5%) attending 4–6 seminars, though fewer have engaged in extensive training beyond six seminars (23.3%). Overall, the respondents represent a highly educated, experienced, and professionally active teaching force, well-positioned to implement educational reforms, though opportunities for broader international exposure and sustained training remain areas for growth

TABLE 2 - 9
PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS IN TERMS OF AGE, SEX, CIVIL STATUS, EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT, SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT, GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT, YEARS IN SERVICE, AND SEMINARS ATTENDED

Category	Sub-category	Frequency	Percent
Age	30–36	9	6.2%
	37–43	27	18.5%
	44–50	41	28.1%
	51–57	38	26.0%
	58 and above	31	21.2%
Sex	Male	80	54.8%
	Female	66	45.2%
Civil Status	Single	36	24.7%
	Married	107	73.3%
	Separated	2	1.4%
	Widowed	1	0.7%
Educational Attainment	Doctorate Degree	46	31.5%
	Doctorate Degree Units	37	25.3%
	Master's Degree	57	39.0%
	Master's Degree Units	6	4.1%
School Assignment	Central	10	6.8%
	Non-Central	136	93.2%
Grade Level Taught	Key Stage 1	58	39.7%
	Key Stage 2	88	60.3%
Years in Service	1–3 years	32	21.9%
	4–6 years	64	43.8%
	7 years and above	50	34.2%
Seminars Attended	1–3	28	19.2%
	4–6	84	57.5%
	7 and above	34	23.3%

Table 15 indicated that teachers were generally prepared for inclusive education, with an overall mean of 3.41 ("Preferred"). They demonstrated strong affective readiness and pedagogical skills, while cognitive readiness, adaptive competency, and collaborative readiness were only moderately developed. This suggested that although teachers showed positive attitudes and teaching capability, gaps remained in knowledge, adaptability, and collaboration. The findings aligned with previous studies, highlighting that preparedness in inclusive education was not yet fully comprehensive. Variations in responses also indicated differences in training, experience,

and resources. Overall, the results emphasized the need for continuous professional development and targeted support to strengthen all areas of teacher preparedness.

TABLE 15
SUMMARY RESULTS ON LEVEL OF PREPAREDNESS FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Cognitive Readiness	146	3.32	0.97	Moderately Preferred
Pedagogical Skills	146	3.55	1.02	Preferred
Adaptive Competency	146	3.32	1.04	Moderately Preferred
Collaborative Readiness	146	3.18	0.90	Moderately Preferred
Affective Readiness	146	3.68	1.14	Preferred
Grand Mean	146	3.41	1.01	Preferred

Legend	Range	Description
	4-21-5-00	Highly Preferred
	3.41-4.20	Preferred
	2.61-3.40	Moderately Preferred
	1.81-2.60	Slightly Preferred
	1.00-1.80	Not Preferred

Table 21 showed that the overall level of instructional supervision was moderate (M = 3.04), indicating that support for inclusive education was present but not strong enough for effective implementation. Classroom observations were relatively more frequent, but consistency and follow-through were limited. Other areas, such as supervisory feedback, monitoring practices, professional development, and coaching, also remained moderate, with the lowest ratings in professional development and mentoring.

These findings suggested that teachers did not receive sufficient training and continuous support, contributing to gaps between their willingness and capability to implement inclusive practices. The results aligned with existing studies emphasizing the need for sustained professional development and collaboration. Overall, the moderate supervision levels highlighted the need to strengthen observation practices, feedback mechanisms, and mentoring systems to better support teachers and improve inclusive education outcomes.

TABLE 21
SUMMARY RESULTS ON LEVEL OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION PROVIDED BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
frequency of classroom observations	146	3.39	0.84	Moderate
quality of supervisory feedback	146	3.09	0.94	Moderate
professional development support	146	2.73	0.98	Moderate
coaching and mentoring practices	146	2.88	0.85	Moderate
monitoring of inclusive teaching practices	146	3.09	1.02	Moderate
Grand Mean	146	3.04	0.93	Moderate

Legend	Range	Description
	4-21-5-00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Table 26 showed that the overall level of supervisory assistance was moderate (M = 2.97), indicating limited effectiveness in supporting inclusive education. All key areas—policy and climate, capacity building, resource allocation, and strategic leadership—were only partially implemented. Strategic leadership and capacity building obtained slightly higher means, while resource allocation was the lowest, highlighting it as the most critical area for improvement.

The findings suggested that although policies and support systems were present, they were not fully operational or consistently implemented. Professional development efforts existed but were not sufficiently impactful, and limited resources further constrained effective implementation. Leadership practices also remained moderate, indicating the need for stronger, more transformative approaches.

Overall, the results showed that teacher readiness was influenced by both individual competencies and the quality of administrative support. The study emphasized the need for improved policy implementation, enhanced training, better resource allocation, and stronger leadership to effectively support inclusive education.

TABLE 26
SUMMARY RESULTS ON THE LEVEL OF SUPERVISORY ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL

Indicators	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Policy and Climate	146	3.00	0.82	Moderate
Capacity Building	146	3.01	0.84	Moderate
Resource Allocation	146	2.83	1.00	Moderate
Strategic Leadership	146	3.02	0.64	Moderate
Grand Mean	146	2.97	0.83	Moderate

Legend	Range	Description
	4-21-5-00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Table 27 showed that respondents' demographic variables had a negligible relationship with their preparedness for inclusive education. The very weak correlation (R = 0.091) and low explanatory power (R^2 = 0.008) indicated that only a minimal portion of preparedness was explained by profile characteristics, while the negative adjusted R^2 further confirmed the model's lack of predictive value. The high standard error also suggested considerable unexplained variation.

These findings implied that teachers' preparedness was not significantly influenced by age, sex, experience, or other personal factors, but rather by external and systemic conditions. Consistent with existing literature, factors such as training quality, institutional support, resources, and practical experience played a more critical role. Overall, the results emphasized the need to focus on organizational support and professional development rather than demographic characteristics in improving teacher preparedness for inclusive education.

TABLE 27
MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.091a	.008	-.050	1.63106

Table 28 showed that the regression model was not statistically significant (F = 0.143, p = 0.997), indicating that respondents' profile variables did not significantly predict their

preparedness for inclusive education. The very small regression sum of squares compared to the residual sum of squares further confirmed that most variability in preparedness was explained by factors outside the model.

These findings suggested that demographic characteristics had no meaningful influence on teacher preparedness. Instead, preparedness was shaped by systemic and institutional factors such as professional development, resources, and administrative support. Consistent with existing studies, the results emphasized that improving teacher readiness required focusing on training, support systems, and resource provision rather than on demographic variables.

TABLE 28
ANOVA ANALYSIS

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.044	8	.380	.143	.997b
	Residual	364.470	137	2.660		
	Total	367.514	145			

Table 29 showed that none of the teacher profile variables—age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, school, grade level taught, years in service, or seminars attended—significantly predicted preparedness for inclusive education (all $p > .05$). Although some variables had higher beta values, their effects were not statistically meaningful, confirming that demographic characteristics do not determine readiness. Instead, preparedness is shaped by systemic and contextual factors such as training, collaboration, resources, and institutional support. These findings highlight the need to prioritize professional development and institutional interventions over individual demographics in strengthening inclusive education.

TABLE 29
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON TEST OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR LEVEL OF PREPAREDNESS FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Variables	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	.219	.464	Not Significant
Sex	-.168	.472	Not Significant
Civil Status	-.112	.499	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	.086	.741	Not Significant
School	-.084	.461	Not Significant
Grade Level Taught	.002	.984	Not Significant
Years in service	-.014	.910	Not Significant
Number of Seminars Attended	-.030	.803	Not Significant

Table 30 showed a very weak relationship between respondents' demographic and professional profiles and the level of instructional supervision ($R = .162$, $R^2 = .026$). Only 2.6% of the variance in supervision was explained by profile variables, while the Adjusted R^2 was negative (-.031), confirming the model's lack of predictive power. This indicates that characteristics such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, school assignment, and grade level taught, years in service, and seminars attended do not meaningfully influence supervisory practices. Instead, supervision is shaped by institutional systems, leadership structures, and organizational policies. The findings align with literature emphasizing that instructional supervision is systemic and standardized across personnel, highlighting the need for systemic interventions—such as leadership development, policy strengthening, and enhanced professional learning structures—rather than relying on teacher demographics.

TABLE 30
MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.162[a]	.026	-.031	1.15736

Table 31 confirmed that respondents' demographic and professional profiles do not significantly predict instructional supervision ($F = .461$, $p = .882$). The regression sum of squares was negligible compared to the residual, and the model explained only 2.6% of variance, with a negative Adjusted R^2 reinforcing its weakness. These results indicate that supervision practices are

not shaped by teacher characteristics but are standardized and driven by institutional mechanisms. Consistent with inclusive education literature, supervision appears compliance-oriented rather than developmental, highlighting the need for systemic reforms that emphasize coaching, professional support, and responsive leadership to strengthen instructional quality.

TABLE 31
ANOVA ANALYSIS

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4.936	8	.617	.461	.882[b]
	Residual	183.509	137	1.339		
	Total	188.445	145			

Table 32 showed that none of the teacher profile variables—age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, school assignment, grade level taught, years in service, or seminars attended—significantly predicted instructional supervision (all $p > .05$). Beta coefficients were weak and inconsistent, with civil status ($\beta = -.206$, $p = .209$) emerging as the strongest but still insignificant predictor. These results confirm that supervisory practices are uniformly implemented across teacher groups and shaped more by institutional systems than by individual characteristics. The findings highlight that professional development opportunities, such as seminars, do not directly alter supervision levels unless integrated into systemic, differentiated frameworks. Improving instructional supervision therefore requires strengthening leadership, resource systems, and professional learning structures rather than relying on demographic factors

TABLE 32
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON TEST OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION PROVIDED BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Variables	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	.112	.706	Not Significant
Sex	-.086	.709	Not Significant
Civil Status	-.206	.209	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	.134	.605	Not Significant
School	.020	.858	Not Significant
Grade Level Taught	.092	.381	Not Significant
Years in service	.032	.790	Not Significant
Number of Seminars Attended	-.045	.711	Not Significant

Table 33 showed a very weak relationship between respondents' demographic and professional profiles and supervisory assistance ($R = .127$, $R^2 = .016$). Only 1.6% of the variance in supervisory assistance was explained by profile variables, while the negative Adjusted R^2 (-.041) confirmed the model's lack of predictive power. These results indicate that supervisory assistance is not shaped by teacher characteristics such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, school assignment, grade level taught, years in service, or seminars attended. Instead, assistance is standardized and system-driven, guided by institutional policies, leadership practices, and school culture. The findings highlight that improving supervisory assistance requires systemic interventions—such as stronger leadership, enhanced professional development systems, and better resource allocation—rather than demographic-based adjustments.

TABLE 33
MODEL SUMMARY

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.127[a]	.016	-.041	.62262

Table 34 confirmed that respondents' demographic and professional profiles do not significantly predict supervisory assistance ($F = .281$, $p = .971$). The regression sum of squares was negligible compared to the residual, and the model explained virtually none of the variance, with most variation left unexplained. These results reinforce that supervisory assistance is standardized and system-driven, applied uniformly across teachers regardless of background. Consistent with inclusive education literature, supervision appears compliance-oriented rather than developmental, ensuring fairness but limiting responsiveness to individual teacher needs. Strengthening supervisory assistance therefore requires systemic reforms that emphasize coaching, differentiated support, and resource-driven interventions

TABLE 34
ANOVA ANALYSIS

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.871	8	.109	.281	.971[b]
	Residual	53.109	137	.388		
	Total	53.979	145			

Table 35 showed that none of the teacher profile variables—age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, school assignment, grade level taught, years in service, or seminars attended—significantly predicted supervisory assistance (all $p > .05$). Beta coefficients were weak and inconsistent, with age ($\beta = .287$, $p = .336$) emerging as the highest but still insignificant predictor. These results confirm that supervisory assistance is not shaped by individual teacher characteristics but is instead standardized and system-driven, guided by institutional policies and leadership structures. Consistent with broader literature, the findings highlight that effective supervisory assistance depends more on leadership capacity, professional development systems, and institutional responsiveness than on demographic-based differentiation

TABLE 35
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS ON TEST OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THE SUPERVISORY ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY THE SCHOOL

Variables	Beta	p-value	Decision
Age	.287	.336	Not Significant
Sex	-.028	.905	Not Significant
Civil Status	-.007	.964	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	-.101	.698	Not Significant
School	-.006	.961	Not Significant
Grade Level Taught	-.106	.319	Not Significant
Years In Service	-.037	.757	Not Significant
Number Of Seminars Attended	-.056	.643	Not Significant

Table 36 revealed that teacher preparedness domains—cognitive readiness, pedagogical skills, adaptive competency, collaborative readiness, and affective readiness—are strongly and positively interrelated, with particularly high correlations between collaborative and affective readiness ($r = .983$, $p < .01$) and adaptive competency with collaborative readiness ($r = .910$, $p < .01$). Overall preparedness was most strongly linked to affective ($r = .964$), collaborative ($r = .943$), and adaptive ($r = .860$) readiness, underscoring the central role of emotional commitment, collaboration, and adaptability in inclusive education. In contrast, correlations between preparedness and instructional supervision or supervisory assistance variables were weak, negative, or insignificant,

indicating that current supervisory systems are internally consistent but not effectively enhancing teacher readiness. These findings highlight a critical gap: while teachers' internal competencies are highly interconnected, external supervisory mechanisms remain procedural and compliance-oriented. Strengthening inclusive education therefore requires shifting supervision toward developmental, coaching-based, and resource-responsive models that directly support classroom practice.

Variables		Cognitive Readiness	Pedagogical Skills	Adaptive Competency	Collaborative Readiness	Affective Readiness	Level Of Preparedness For Inclusive Education	3.1 Frequency Of Classroom Observations	3.2 Quality Of Supervisory Feedback	3.3 Professional Development Support	3.4 Coaching And Mentoring Practices	Monitoring Of Inclusive Teaching Practices	Level Of Instructional Supervision Provided By School Administration	4.1 Policy And Climate	4.2 Capacity Building	Resource Allocation	Strategic Leadership	Level Of Supervisory Assistance Provided By The School
cognitive readiness	Pearson Correlation	1	.886**	.557**	.390**	.365**	.273**	.265**	.342**	.285**	.252**	.022	.026	.050	.016	.023	.119	.058
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.001	.000	.000	.002	.795	.755	.551	.845	.782	.152	.486
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
pedagogical skills	Pearson Correlation	.886**	1	.789**	.634**	.614**	.581**	.517**	.578**	.542**	.507**	.073	-.016	-.033	-.070	-.031	.121	.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.382	.846	.691	.402	.713	.147	.379
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
adaptive competency	Pearson Correlation	.557**	.789**	1	.910**	.895**	.860**	.845**	.818**	.737**	.687**	.161	-.009	-.050	-.112	-.089	.093	.070
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.053	.915	.550	.176	.285	.262	.398
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
collaborative readiness	Pearson Correlation	.390**	.634**	.910**	1	.983**	.943**	.928**	.895**	.810**	.771**	.140	-.014	-.079	-.136	-.121	.049	.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.092	.869	.343	.102	.146	.556	.903
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
affective readiness	Pearson Correlation	.365**	.614**	.895**	.983**	1	.964**	.944**	.918**	.826**	.741**	.121	-.031	-.091	-.145	-.130	.029	-.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.146	.709	.277	.080	.117	.726	.909
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
level of preparedness for inclusive education	Pearson Correlation	.273**	.581**	.860**	.943**	.964**	1	.929**	.895**	.810**	.724**	.104	-.058	-.110	-.142	-.115	.019	-.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.212	.490	.186	.088	.166	.824	.920
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146

frequency of classroom observations	Pearson Correlation	.265**	.517**	.845**	.928**	.944**	.929**	1	.979**	.879**	.794**	.114	-.067	-.104	-.145	-.133	-.012	-.041
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.170	.420	.212	.082	.110	.888	.621
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
quality of supervisory feedback	Pearson Correlation	.342**	.578**	.818**	.895**	.918**	.895**	.979**	1	.906**	.825**	.103	-.101	-.137	-.171*	-.146	-.026	-.058
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.218	.225	.100	.039	.078	.757	.487
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
professional developm ent support	Pearson Correlation	.285**	.542**	.737**	.810**	.826**	.810**	.879**	.906**	1	.915**	.092	-.041	-.091	-.141	-.113	.016	-.031
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.269	.621	.275	.089	.174	.851	.712
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
coaching and mentoring practices	Pearson Correlation	.252**	.507**	.687**	.771**	.741**	.724**	.794**	.825**	.915**	1	.145	-.053	-.139	-.178*	-.134	.006	-.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.082	.525	.094	.032	.108	.941	.745
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
monitoring of inclusive teaching practices	Pearson Correlation	.022	.073	.161	.140	.121	.104	.114	.103	.092	.145	1	.525**	.087	-.383**	-.553**	.183*	.249**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.795	.382	.053	.092	.146	.212	.170	.218	.269	.082		.000	.299	.000	.000	.027	.002
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
Level of instructional supervision provided by school administration	Pearson Correlation	.026	-.016	-.009	-.014	-.031	-.058	-.067	-.101	-.041	-.053	.525**	1	.746**	.264**	-.080	.306**	.173*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.755	.846	.915	.869	.709	.490	.420	.225	.621	.525	.000		.000	.001	.338	.000	.037
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
policy and climate	Pearson Correlation	.050	-.033	-.050	-.079	-.091	-.110	-.104	-.137	-.091	-.139	.087	.746**	1	.812**	.505**	.418**	.281**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.551	.691	.550	.343	.277	.186	.212	.100	.275	.094	.299	.000		.000	.000	.000	.001
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
capacity building	Pearson Correlation	.016	-.070	-.112	-.136	-.145	-.142	-.145	-.171*	-.141	-.178*	-.383**	.264**	.812**	1	.859**	.340**	.228**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.845	.402	.176	.102	.080	.088	.082	.039	.089	.032	.000	.001	.000		.000	.000	.006
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
resource allocation	Pearson Correlation	.023	-.031	-.089	-.121	-.130	-.115	-.133	-.146	-.113	-.134	-.553**	-.080	.505**	.859**	1	.515**	.394**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.782	.713	.285	.146	.117	.166	.110	.078	.174	.108	.000	.338	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
strategic leadership	Pearson Correlation	.119	.121	.093	.049	.029	.019	-.012	-.026	.016	.006	.183*	.306**	.418**	.340**	.515**	1	.763**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.152	.147	.262	.556	.726	.824	.888	.757	.851	.941	.027	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146
Level of supervisory assistance provided by the school	Pearson Correlation	.058	.073	.070	.010	-.010	-.008	-.041	-.058	-.031	-.027	.249**	.173*	.281**	.228**	.394**	.763**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.486	.379	.398	.903	.909	.920	.621	.487	.712	.745	.002	.037	.001	.006	.000	.000	
	N	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

IV. DISCUSSIONS

Table 35 showed that teachers' preparedness domains—cognitive, pedagogical, adaptive, collaborative, and affective—are very strongly interrelated (all $r > .85$, $p < .01$), with affective, collaborative, and adaptive readiness most strongly linked to overall preparedness. This highlights that emotional commitment, collaboration, and adaptability are central to inclusive education readiness. In contrast, correlations between preparedness and supervisory variables (observations, feedback, professional development, coaching, monitoring) were weak and insignificant, indicating that current supervisory systems do not meaningfully enhance teacher preparedness. While supervisory structures are internally consistent, their limited impact underscores a disconnect between policy and classroom practice. The findings emphasize that teacher readiness is shaped more by internal competencies and supportive environments than by supervisory mechanisms, reinforcing the need for developmental, coaching-based, and resource-responsive supervision to strengthen inclusive education.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes that teachers exhibit strong and interrelated dimensions of preparedness for inclusive education, particularly in adaptive, collaborative, and affective domains. However, instructional supervision and supervisory assistance show weak and insignificant relationships with preparedness, revealing a gap between administrative support systems and classroom-level readiness. While supervisory structures are internally consistent, their impact remains limited and largely compliance-oriented. Strengthening inclusive education therefore requires shifting toward coaching-based, resource-driven, and developmental supervision that directly enhances teacher preparedness and instructional effectiveness

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. School administrators should redesign instructional supervision to emphasize coaching and mentoring rather than compliance monitoring.

2. Regular professional development programs focused on inclusive education strategies should be institutionalized.
3. Supervisors should provide structured, actionable, and individualized feedback to teachers after classroom observations.
4. Schools should strengthen collaboration between mentors and teachers through professional learning communities (PLCs).
5. Resource allocation for inclusive education should be prioritized, particularly for teaching materials and learning support tools.
6. Capacity-building programs should be tailored to address specific teacher needs in inclusive classroom management.
7. Monitoring systems should be linked with actual classroom support interventions rather than documentation alone.
8. School leaders should undergo training in inclusive instructional leadership to improve supervisory effectiveness.
9. Policies on inclusive education should be translated into clear, school-level implementation frameworks with measurable outcomes.
10. Future research should explore qualitative perspectives of teachers and supervisors to better understand gaps between supervision practices and classroom realities.

REFERENCES

[1.] Abuda, A., Pinili, L., Mangubat, R., Espina, R., Sitoy, R., & Taghoy, J. (2025). Understanding teacher support in inclusive learning environments. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, *8*(2), 92–99. https://doi.org/10.53935/2641533x.v8i2.335

[2.] Aghar, T. A., Hassanein, E. E. A., & Almarzooqi, A. a. a. A. (2025). Preservice teachers' preparedness for inclusive early childhood education: a mixed-methods study at a higher education institution in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2025.2603404

[3.] Agormedah, E. K., Henaku, E. A., AyiTe, D. M. K., & Ansah, E. A. (2020). Online Learning in Higher Education during COVID-19 Pandemic: A case of Ghana. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, *3*(3), 183–210. https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.726441

[4.] Alazemi, B., & Larkins, R. (2025). Teachers' Perceptions of Preparedness for Teaching Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities in Inclusive Education in Kuwait. *International Journal of Special Education (IJSE)*, *40*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.52291/ijse.2025.40.1

[5.] Alcosero, A., Carcueva, H., Abasolo, M. C., Arranchado, W. M., & Cabanilla, A., Jr. (2023). Preparedness of Regular Teachers in the Implementation of Inclusive Education in the Philippines: A Meta-synthesis. *Research Gate*. https://doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.2.17249.79205

[6.] Bermudo, H. L., Reyes, N. R. D., Cabigon, A. F., & Pinili, L. (2025). Preparedness of Filipino High School Educators For Inclusive Education of Students with Special Needs. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, *7*(7), 112–121. https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2025.7.7.13

[7.] Bouffard, L. (2017). Ryan, R. M. et Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-determination theory. Basic psychological needs in motivation, development and wellness. New York, NY : Guilford Press. *Revue Québécoise De Psychologie*, *38*(3), 231–234. https://doi.org/10.7202/1041847ar

[8.] Bualar, T. (2015). What has gone wrong with inclusive education in Thailand? *Journal of Public Affairs*, *16*(2), 156–161. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1563

[9.] Cabigas, M. B., Rallos, J. V., Delima, M. L. A., Abella, J. A., Kintanar, M. M. Z., & Zambrano, R. R. P. (2025). INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' COMPETENCE, PREPAREDNESS, AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD INCLUSIVE EDUCATION. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *11*(6). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejse.v11i6.6389

[10.] Calderon, J. F. (1993). *Methods of research and thesis writing*.

[11.] Chaudhary, M., & Chaudhary, V. K. (2025). Teacher Preparedness and Professional development for inclusive Classrooms: A Global and Indian perspective. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science*, *10*(10), 1287–1293. https://doi.org/10.51584/ijrias.2025.10100000112

[12.] Cola, J. M., Reyes, N. R. D., Cabigon, A. F., & Anero, M. (2025). Teachers' Level of Preparedness and Acceptance Towards the Inclusion of Learners with Special Educational Needs. *Research in Social Sciences*, *8*(3), 99–110. https://doi.org/10.53935/26415305.v8i3.404

[13.] Crispel, O., & Kasperski, R. (2019). The impact of teacher training in special education on the implementation of inclusion in mainstream classrooms. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *25*(9), 1079–1090. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1600590

[14.] Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective Teacher Professional Development. *Learning Policy Institute*. https://doi.org/10.54300/122.311

[15.] De Los Reyes, J., Reyes, N. R. D., Cabigon, A. F., & Pinili, L. (2025). Cultivating Inclusive Teaching: A study of Philippine Secondary school educators' preparedness. *Journal of Learning and Development Studies*, *5*(2), 88–103. https://doi.org/10.32996/jlds.2025.5.2.9

[16.] Dimri, D. (2025). Teacher Preparedness and Attitudes toward Inclusive Classrooms. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, *12*(9), 2827–2832. https://doi.org/10.51244/ijrsi.2025.120800249

[17.] Dontogan, T. G., Lunio-Toctocan, C. T., Ricardo, K. R. D., & Saldo, M. L. (2024). Inclusive Pedagogy: Systematic review on exploring stakeholder engagement in multigrade classroom

teaching. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *4*(4), 222–234. https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2024.v04i04.015

[18.] Englis, Y. C., Galgo, K. P. B., & Galindo, J. D. (2025). Exploring teachers' perspectives on their inclusive education preparedness. *International Journal of Economics Business and Management Research*, *09*(02), 243–264. https://doi.org/10.51505/ijebmr.2025.9219

[19.] Entrampas, M. R. M. (2024, June 12). *A study of Pre-Service Teachers' Preparedness for Inclusive Education*. https://ijisae.org/index.php/IJISAE/article/view/7142?

[20.] Finkelstein, S., Sharma, U., & Furlonger, B. (2019). The inclusive practices of classroom teachers: a scoping review and thematic analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *25*(6), 735–762. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1572232

[21.] Hancock, K. J., Lawrence, D., Shepherd, C. C. J., Mitrou, F., & Zubrick, S. R. (2017). Associations between school absence and academic achievement: Do socioeconomics matter? *British Educational Research Journal*, *43*(3), 415–440. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3267

[22.] Hansen, J. H., Carrington, S., Jensen, C. R., Molbæk, M., & Schmidt, M. C. S. (2020). The collaborative practice of inclusion and exclusion. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, *6*(1), 47–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1730112

[23.] Idul, E. U. (2025a). TEACHERS' READINESS IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: LEARNING RESOURCES AND PEDAGOGY IN TEACHING. *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15543290

[24.] Idul, E. U. (2025b). TEACHERS' READINESS IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: LEARNING RESOURCES AND PEDAGOGY IN TEACHING. *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15543290

[25.] Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (2024, February 16). *A history of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act*. Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. https://sites.ed.gov/idea/IDEA-History

[26.] Logroño, O. C., & Gongora, J. T. (2023). Readiness of Regular Teachers for the Inclusion of Learners with Special Education Needs. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *2*(11), 4459–4472. https://doi.org/10.55927/eajmr.v2i11.5149

[27.] Lucena-Rodríguez, C., Invernón-Gómez, A. I., Ortiz-Marcos, J. M., & Sánchez-Mendías, J. (2025). Preparing Future Teachers for Inclusive Practices and Disability: A Systematic Literature review. *International Journal of Instruction*, *18*(3), 59–78. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2025.1834a

[28.] Malter, J. (n.d.). *Preservice Teacher Preparedness to teach in the inclusive Classroom Setting: A Hermeneutical Phenomenological Study*. Scholars Crossing. https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/6627

[29.] Metsala, J. L., & Harkins, M. J. (2019). An examination of Preservice Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Beliefs about inclusive education. *Teacher Education and Special Education the Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, *43*(2), 178–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406419873060

[30.] Mintz, J. (2018). A comparative study of the impact of enhanced input on inclusion at pre-service and induction phases on the self-efficacy of beginning teachers to work effectively with children with special educational needs. *British Educational Research Journal*, *45*(2), 254–274. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3486

[31.] Moon, O. (2023). Teachers' readiness and teaching performance in Inclusive Education: Their relationship to the implementation of Inclusive Education Program. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, *6*, 65–110. https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v6i1.94

[32.] Mucherah, W., Finch, H., Bota, K., & Thomas, R. N. (2024). Teacher attitudes and perceived preparedness towards inclusive education in Kenya. *International Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Development*, *6*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijtepd.335922

[33.] Mwarari, C. N. (2016). TEACHERS AND HEAD TEACHERS' PREPAREDNESS FOR IMPLEMENTING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN PUBLIC PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF

MURANG'A COUNTY, KENYA. *Kenya Education Research Database*. http://ir.cuea.edu/jspui/handle/1/6823

[34.] Opoku-Nkoom, I., & Ackah-Jnr, F. R. (2023). Investigating inclusive education in primary schools in Ghana: what inclusive cultures, environment, and practices support implementation? *Support for Learning*, *38*(1), 17–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.12435

[35.] Pancsofar, N., & Petroff, J. G. (2016). Teachers' experiences with co-teaching as a model for inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *20*(10), 1043–1053. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2016.1145264

[36.] *Research design*. (2026, February 3). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/research-design/book270550

[37.] Rumjaun, A., & Narod, F. (2020). Social Learning Theory—Albert Bandura. In *Springer texts in education* (pp. 85–99). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43620-9_7

[38.] Savior, M. a. F., Sitoy, R. E., Espina, R. C., Tenerife-Cañete, J. J. L., Capuno, R. G., De Vera, J., 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), 1035–1060. https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.910000088

[39.] Seidman, E., Kim, S., Raza, M., Ishihara, M., & Halpin, P. F. (2018). Assessment of pedagogical practices and processes in low and middle income countries: Findings from secondary school classrooms in Uganda. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *71*, 283–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.017

[40.] Singh, A. P., & Kaswa, A. (2024). Assessing the Implementation and Preparedness for Inclusive Education in Schools: a Comprehensive Teacher Perspective. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i01.13230

[41.] Siriban, K. P. (2025). Practices and Challenges in the Implementation of Inclusive Education: Basis for Program Enhancement. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, *13*, 1–31. https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v13i1.195

[42.] Thomas, L., Tuytens, M., Devos, G., Kelchtermans, G., & Vanderlinde, R. (2018). Transformational school leadership as a key factor for teachers' job attitudes during their first year in the profession. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *48*(1), 106–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218781064

[43.] Vergara, M., Pinili, L., Reyes, N. R. D., Sitoy, R., Espina, R., & Saladaga, L. (2025a). Teachers' Preparedness for Inclusive Education: Analyzing knowledge, confidence, and classroom management. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, *8*(2), 54–64. https://doi.org/10.53935/2641533x.v8i2.323

[44.] Vergara, M., Pinili, L., Reyes, N. R. D., Sitoy, R., Espina, R., & Saladaga, L. (2025b). Teachers' Preparedness for Inclusive Education: Analyzing knowledge, confidence, and classroom management. *International Journal of Educational Studies*, *8*(2), 54–64. https://doi.org/10.53935/2641533x.v8i2.323

[45.] Villar, M., & Marcia, A. (2025). Receiving Teachers' Preparedness for Inclusive Classrooms: The Case of Learners with Special Needs in Valencia City Division. *Psychology and Education a Multidisciplinary Journal*, *44*(2), 225–238. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.440205

[46.] Yarullin, I. F., & Nasibullov, R. R. (2018). Pre-Service Teachers' Preparedness for Inclusive education. *˜the œEuropean Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 104–112. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.09.12

[47.] Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2016). Teacher Self-Efficacy and its Effects on Classroom Processes, Student Academic Adjustment, and Teacher Well-Being. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 981–1015. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801