

School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices and the Sustainability of Inclusive Education

Merly M. Sequitin¹
0009-0002-9930-572X

Jeneve M. Binaloga¹
0009-0004-5442-0729

1 – STI West Negros University, Philippines

Publication Date: September 23, 2026

DOI: **10.5281/zenodo.22917703**

Abstract

This study determined the school heads' administrative leadership practices and the sustainability of inclusive education in a cluster of a large-sized school division in Central Philippines during Term 1 of School Year 2026–2027. Using a quantitative research approach, data were gathered from 122 teachers through a validated and reliability-tested researcher-made questionnaire. Findings revealed that most respondents were younger, female, had attended few inclusive education training, and had shorter senior high school teaching experience. School heads' administrative leadership practices were generally rated high in planning and policy implementation, instructional supervision and support, resource management and support, and monitoring and evaluation. Similarly, the sustainability of inclusive education was rated high in inclusive learning environment, equity in access and participation, learner support services, and curriculum adaptation and responsiveness. Both variables maintained high ratings across respondent profile categories. No significant differences were found in administrative leadership practices when grouped according to age, number of training attended, and teaching experience. However, significant differences emerged according to sex in resource management and support and monitoring and evaluation practices, with female respondents obtaining higher mean ranks. Furthermore, no significant differences were found in the sustainability of inclusive education across all profile variables. The findings indicate generally favorable perceptions of administrative leadership practices and inclusive education sustainability, although differences in selected leadership dimensions suggest areas for further examination and improvement.

Keywords: *administrative leadership practices, inclusive education, school heads, sustainability, teacher perceptions*

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

Inclusive education is a fundamental principle of educational equity that ensures all learners, regardless of their abilities, backgrounds, and individual circumstances, have meaningful opportunities to access, participate in, and benefit from quality education. However, establishing inclusive education requires more than admitting diverse learners into regular classrooms; it demands sustained administrative commitment, responsive instructional practices, adequate resources, and continuous monitoring of educational programs. School heads play an essential role in translating inclusive education policies into institutional practices through strategic planning, instructional supervision, resource allocation, and evaluation. Despite the growing emphasis on inclusion, sustaining these practices may present challenges when schools encounter limited resources, insufficient professional development, and varying learner needs. These circumstances highlight the importance of examining how school heads' administrative leadership practices support the long-term sustainability of inclusive education, particularly in public secondary schools.

In the Philippines, several educational policies provide the foundation for strengthening inclusive education and school leadership. Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 21, s. 2019, or the Policy Guidelines on the K to 12 Basic Education Program, establishes inclusive education as a core principle of basic education and emphasizes a learner-centered, responsive, and equitable curriculum. Furthermore, DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021, provides guidelines for organizing, managing, and implementing appropriate educational programs, services, and interventions for learners with disabilities. Meanwhile, DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, adopts the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, establishing professional expectations for school leaders. Collectively, these policies underscore the responsibility of school heads to establish supportive learning environments, strengthen instructional practices, manage educational resources, and monitor the implementation of inclusive education initiatives (Department of Education, 2019, 2020, 2021).

Moreover, the study supports the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4, which seeks to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. Specifically, Target 4.5 emphasizes eliminating educational disparities and ensuring equal access for vulnerable learners, including persons with disabilities, while Target 4.a promotes the development of inclusive, safe, and effective learning environments. These global commitments reinforce the importance of administrative leadership in maintaining educational systems that respond to learner diversity and promote equitable participation. Within this context, school heads are expected to institutionalize inclusive practices through effective policy implementation, instructional support, resource management, and continuous evaluation. Examining these leadership dimensions alongside the sustainability of inclusive education contributes to understanding how schools can maintain inclusive learning environments, equitable access, learner support services, and responsive curricula (United Nations, 2015).

The researchers' motivation for conducting this study stems from the need to understand how administrative leadership practices contribute to the continued implementation of inclusive education in public secondary schools. Recognizing that school heads are responsible for

translating educational policies into operational practices, the researchers sought to examine whether existing leadership approaches adequately support the diverse needs of learners and teachers. Particular attention was given to planning and policy implementation, instructional supervision and support, resource management and support, and monitoring and evaluation practices.

The study was also motivated by the importance of determining whether inclusive education initiatives are sustained through supportive learning environments, equitable access and participation, learner support services, and curriculum adaptation and responsiveness. By examining teachers' perceptions, the researchers intended to generate empirical evidence that could inform administrative decision-making, professional development, and institutional improvement.

Given these considerations, the central problem addressed by the study is the need for context-specific evidence regarding school heads' administrative leadership practices and the sustainability of inclusive education in a cluster of a large-sized school division in Central Philippines. Although national policies establish expectations for inclusive education and school leadership, the extent to which these expectations are reflected in teachers' perceptions of actual school practices requires empirical examination. Accordingly, the study determined the levels of administrative leadership practices and inclusive education sustainability and examined differences in these assessments according to respondents' age, sex, number of inclusive education trainings attended, and length of teaching experience. Conducted during Term 1 of School Year 2026–2027, the investigation sought to provide evidence for identifying areas requiring administrative attention and strengthening inclusive education initiatives. Ultimately, the findings may serve as a basis for developing responsive leadership strategies and institutional improvement measures that promote the continued implementation of inclusive, equitable, and quality education.

Current State of Knowledge

Recent international research emphasizes the importance of educational leadership in establishing and sustaining inclusive schools. DeMatthews et al. (2026), in a systematic review of 38 studies across 13 countries, identified three major areas of inclusive principal leadership: developing a shared commitment to inclusion, establishing supportive organizational conditions, and strengthening instructional and leadership capacity. Similarly, Valdés et al. (2026) synthesized empirical studies on inclusive educational leadership and identified several dimensions of leadership practices and their implications for school organizational processes. These findings establish that inclusive education requires coordinated administrative actions rather than isolated classroom interventions. They also support the present study's examination of planning and policy implementation, instructional supervision and support, resource management, and monitoring and evaluation as essential dimensions of school heads' administrative leadership practices.

The sustainability of inclusive education has likewise received increasing scholarly attention. Işıkğöz and Öztunç (2026), in a systematic review covering research published from 2015 to 2025, examined 2,729 articles and identified 357 studies explicitly addressing sustainability. Their findings demonstrated the growing integration of inclusive education with sustainable development frameworks while identifying gaps in stakeholder representation and

the treatment of social dimensions of sustainability. In the Philippine context, a 2025 study of school heads' competence in implementing inclusive education in Zambales involved 32 school heads and 594 teachers. The findings revealed high competence across instructional leadership, managerial leadership, strategic thinking and innovation, stakeholder engagement, and personal excellence. Collectively, these studies suggest that sustaining inclusive education requires competent leadership, supportive institutional structures, and continuing attention to learners' diverse educational needs.

Eleccion et al. (2026) examined school heads' financial management practices and performance in the Negros Island Region, focusing on budgeting and planning, risk management, and financial reporting and accountability. Their investigation provides a relevant foundation for understanding resource management as an administrative responsibility. Similarly, Paglomutan et al. (2025) investigated department heads' leadership skills in relation to teachers' performance in a public secondary school in Central Negros, emphasizing the relevance of school-level leadership to teacher performance. These studies provide contextual support for examining administrative leadership in Philippine public schools, although neither directly investigated the sustainability of inclusive education.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The present study is anchored on two complementary theories: Systems Theory by Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1968) for school heads' administrative leadership practices and Institutional Theory by Meyer and Rowan (1977) for the sustainability of inclusive education. These theories provide perspectives for understanding how administrative practices operate within schools and how inclusive education can become embedded in institutional structures and routines.

Systems Theory, developed by Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1968), explains that an organization functions as an interconnected system in which various components interact and depend on one another to achieve common objectives. In educational institutions, administrative leadership involves coordinating policies, personnel, instructional processes, resources, and evaluation mechanisms to ensure effective school operations. The theory emphasizes that changes in one component may influence the functioning of other components. Applied to the present study, Systems Theory provides a foundation for examining school heads' administrative leadership practices in terms of planning and policy implementation, instructional supervision and support, resource management and support, and monitoring and evaluation practices. These interconnected administrative functions help explain how school heads organize and coordinate school operations to support inclusive education.

Institutional Theory, advanced by Meyer and Rowan (1977), explains how organizations adopt formal structures, policies, and practices in response to institutional expectations, regulations, and established social norms. The theory suggests that organizational stability is influenced by the institutionalization of accepted practices. However, Meyer and Rowan also caution that formal policies may become disconnected from actual organizational activities, emphasizing the distinction between policy adoption and genuine implementation. In the present study, Institutional Theory provides a foundation for examining the sustainability of inclusive education in terms of inclusive learning environment, equity in access and participation, learner support services, and curriculum adaptation and responsiveness. It suggests that inclusive

education becomes sustainable when its principles are integrated into school policies, organizational routines, resource allocation, and instructional practices rather than remaining merely formal commitments.

Taken together, Systems Theory and Institutional Theory provide complementary perspectives for understanding the two major variables of the study. Systems Theory explains how school heads coordinate interconnected administrative functions, while Institutional Theory explains how inclusive education practices can become embedded and maintained within school structures and operations. These theories support the examination of administrative leadership practices and the sustainability of inclusive education as distinct but potentially related organizational dimensions. They also provide a basis for identifying leadership practices and institutional conditions that may inform strategies for strengthening inclusive education in public secondary schools

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to determine the level of school heads' administrative leadership practices and the sustainability of inclusive education among large-sized schools in a cluster of a school division in Central Philippines during Term 1 of School Year 2026–2027. Specifically, it sought to describe the respondents' profiles in terms of age, sex, number of related trainings attended, and length of teaching experience in senior high school; assess the level of school heads' administrative leadership practices in terms of planning and policy implementation, instructional supervision and support, resource management and support, and monitoring and evaluation practices; determine the level of sustainability of inclusive education in terms of inclusive learning environment, equity in access and participation, learner support services, and curriculum adaptation and responsiveness; and ascertain whether significant differences exist in the levels of school heads' administrative leadership practices and sustainability of inclusive education when respondents are grouped and compared according to the aforementioned profile variables.

Research Methodology:

This section presents the research design, data-gathering procedure, other instrumentation, and statistical tools. It also discusses the parameters, especially the statistical tools, the respondents, and the study's locality.

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive research design to determine the level of school heads' administrative leadership practices and the sustainability of inclusive education. Descriptive research systematically describes a population, condition, or phenomenon as it naturally exists without manipulating the variables under investigation. It provides information about the characteristics and existing conditions of a phenomenon and may employ quantitative or qualitative data (Deckert & Wilson, 2023). This design was appropriate because the study aimed to describe the respondents' profiles, assess the levels of administrative leadership practices and sustainability of inclusive education across their respective dimensions, and determine whether significant differences existed when respondents were grouped according to their profile variables. Through a structured survey questionnaire, the researchers gathered

quantitative data reflecting teachers' perceptions of existing school practices. The design enabled the systematic description and comparison of these perceptions without manipulating the variables or introducing experimental interventions, thereby providing empirical evidence to inform administrative improvements and strengthen the sustainability of inclusive education.

Study Respondents

The respondents of the study were one hundred twenty-two (122) from the total population of 178 Senior High School teachers who were permanently employed at seven schools within a cluster of a large school division in Central Philippines. The chosen respondents are classified by age, sex, number of related training sessions attended in inclusive education, and length of teaching experience in Senior High School.

The researcher used stratified sampling, a form of probability sampling in which the population is divided into distinct subgroups or strata based on specific characteristics, and respondents are selected from each stratum to ensure adequate representation of the different groups within the population. In this study, the Senior High School teachers were grouped according to their respective participating schools, with each school serving as a stratum. The total sample size was determined using Cochran's formula with finite population correction, based on a total population of 178 Senior High School teachers, a 95% confidence level, and a 5% margin of error. The computation yielded a sample size of 122. The 122 respondents were then proportionately allocated among the seven participating schools based on each school's teacher population. This sampling procedure ensured that teachers from all participating schools were appropriately represented in the study (Thomas, 2023; Cochran, 1977).

Table 1 presents the study's respondents.

Table 1
Distribution of Respondents

Schools	Population (N)	Sample size (n)	%
A	52	36	29%
B	6	5	4%
C	11	7	6%
D	27	18	15%
E	30	21	17%
F	11	7	6%
G	41	28	23%
Total	178	122	100%

Instrument

The study utilized a researcher-made survey questionnaire consisting of two parts. The first part gathered respondents' profiles in terms of age, sex, number of inclusive education-related trainings attended, and length of teaching experience in Senior High School. The second part assessed school heads' administrative leadership practices in terms of planning and policy implementation, instructional supervision and support, resource management and support, and monitoring and evaluation practices; and the sustainability of inclusive education in terms of

inclusive learning environment, equity in access and participation, learner support services, and curriculum adaptation and responsiveness. The instrument underwent content validation by three educational and research experts using the evaluation criteria of Good and Scates (1954), obtaining an overall mean of 4.89, interpreted as excellent. Following the principles of instrument development and reliability assessment discussed by DeVellis (2016), a dry run was conducted among 30 Senior High School teachers outside the study cluster who were excluded from the actual respondents. Cronbach's alpha was employed to assess the internal consistency of the questionnaire, consistent with the methodological discussion of Bujang et al. (2018). The administrative leadership practices and sustainability of inclusive education scales obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.933 and 0.921, respectively, both indicating excellent internal consistency. These findings supported the instrument's content validity and reliability for data collection.

Data Gathering and Procedure

After administering the validity and reliability tests, and upon approval of the schools division superintendent, the questionnaires were administered to the target respondents. The questionnaires were gathered, recorded, and analyzed. The data gathered from the responses of the respondents were tallied and tabulated using the appropriate statistical tools. The encoded data was processed using SPSS.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objectives 1, 2, and 3 employed a descriptive analytical scheme, utilizing frequency counts and percentages to describe the respondents' profiles and means to assess the levels of school heads' administrative leadership practices across four areas and the sustainability of inclusive education across four dimensions. Meanwhile, Objectives 4 and 5 utilized a comparative analytical scheme, applying the Mann-Whitney U test to determine significant differences in the levels of school heads' administrative leadership practices and sustainability of inclusive education when respondents were grouped and compared according to age, sex, number of related training attended, and length of teaching experience in Senior High School. All inferential tests were conducted at a 0.05 level of significance.

Ethical Consideration

By guaranteeing the confidentiality of the respondents' answers and upholding their anonymity during the entire research process, the study made a concerted effort to reduce the possibility of harm to its target respondents in accordance with Republic Act 10173, also known as the Data Privacy Act of 2012. The researchers also requested their free and informed consent upfront.

Results and Discussion:

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered to carry out the predetermined objectives of this study.

Profile of the Respondents

Table 2

Profile of Respondents

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Younger (below 35 years old)	66	54.10
	Older (35 years old and above)	56	45.90
	Total	122	100
Sex	Male	39	32.00
	Female	83	68.00
	Total	122	100
Number of Trainings Attended	Few (below 6 trainings)	67	54.90
	Many (6 trainings and above)	55	45.10
	Total	122	100
Length of Service	Shorter (below 5 years)	64	52.50
	Longer (5 years and above)	48	47.50
	Total	122	100

As presented, the majority of the respondents (54.10%) were younger (below 35 years old), while the remaining 45.90% are classified as older (35 years old and above). In addition, the data reveal that the majority (68.00%) of respondents are female, while the remaining (32.00%) are male. Also, the data show that the majority of respondents (54.90%) attended fewer than six training sessions, while the remaining (45.10%) attended six or more. Lastly, the majority (52.50%) of the respondents had less than 5 years of service, while 47.00% had 5 years or more.

The profile of the respondents indicates a relatively diverse representation across age, sex, number of training sessions attended, and length of service. The distribution across the younger and older age groups suggests that the study includes teachers with varied generational perspectives and professional experiences. The predominance of female respondents reflects the composition of the participants and provides a substantial female perspective on school heads' administrative leadership practices and the sustainability of inclusive education. Meanwhile, the distribution by the number of training sessions attended indicates varying levels of exposure to professional development activities, which may contribute to differences in teachers' experiences and perspectives. Similarly, the nearly balanced distribution in length of service shows that the study includes both teachers with shorter and longer professional experience. Overall, the respondent profile provides a varied representation of teachers with different backgrounds and professional experiences, which may contribute to a broader understanding of school heads' administrative leadership practices and the sustainability of inclusive education.

Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices

Table 3

Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices in Planning and Policy Implementation

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The school head...		
1. clearly communicates strategic directions that support the implementation of inclusive education programs.	4.27	High Level
2. ensures the continuity of inclusive education initiatives during periods of educational reform.	4.19	High Level
3. communicates inclusive education goals and policies effectively to teachers and stakeholders.	4.21	High Level
4. involves teachers in planning activities that support inclusive education programs.	4.11	High Level
5. aligns school programs and activities with DepEd policies on inclusive education.	4.43	High Level
Overall Mean	4.24	High Level

The level of school heads' administrative leadership practices in the directions and goals related to inclusive education revealed an overall mean of 4.24, interpreted as a "high level." Moreover, it was revealed that item 5, "aligns school programs and activities with DepEd policies on inclusive education," obtained the highest mean of 4.43, interpreted as "high level." In contrast, item 4, "involves teachers in planning activities that support inclusive education programs," got the lowest mean of 4.11, interpreted as "high level."

It implies that school heads place considerable importance on ensuring that inclusive education programs align with established DepEd policies and directions. At the same time, the comparatively low rating of teacher involvement suggests a need to strengthen participatory and collaborative planning further. Greater teacher participation may help school heads develop plans that are more responsive to the actual needs of learners and classroom situations. Involving teachers in decision-making can also encourage shared responsibility, ownership, and stronger commitment to implementing inclusive education programs.

This study's result supports Salgado and Escarlos (2026), who stated that school leadership is a decisive factor in translating national inclusive education mandates into localized school strategies. This is also consistent with DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024, which emphasizes shared leadership, participatory decision-making, and stakeholder engagement in school-based management. Thus, the present finding reinforces the view that effective inclusive education requires not only alignment with DepEd policies but also meaningful collaboration between school heads, teachers, and other stakeholders.

Table 4

Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices in Instructional Supervision and Support

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The school head...		
1. conducts classroom observations to ensure that teaching practices address the diverse needs of learners.	4.25	High Level
2. provides guidance and coaching to teachers in addressing the needs of learners with diverse abilities and backgrounds.	4.01	High Level
3. promotes the adoption of learner-centered approaches that accommodate diverse learning needs.	4.29	High Level
4. provides feedback to improve teaching and learning practices.	4.21	High Level
5. facilitates opportunities for teachers to enhance their competencies in inclusive educational practices.	4.22	High Level
Overall Mean	4.20	High Level

Table 4, on the level of school heads' administrative leadership practices in instructional supervision and support. The results show an overall mean of 4.20, interpreted as "high level." Among the five indicators, the highest mean was obtained by the statement that school heads "promote the adoption of learner-centered approaches that accommodate diverse learning needs," with a mean of 4.29, interpreted as "high level." In contrast, the lowest mean of 4.01, interpreted as "high level", was obtained by item 2: "provides guidance and coaching to teachers in addressing the needs of learners with diverse abilities and backgrounds."

This indicates that school heads are generally effective in providing instructional leadership that supports inclusive teaching and learning. Their emphasis on learner-centered approaches indicates an effort to create classroom practices that are responsive to learner diversity. However, the lower mean for guidance and coaching may suggest that more sustained and individualized support for teachers could be provided, particularly to help them address the needs of learners with diverse abilities and backgrounds. Strengthening coaching, mentoring, and professional support may further enhance teachers' capacity to implement inclusive practices effectively.

The findings are supported by UNESCO (2023), which emphasized that inclusive education requires school leaders and teachers to develop practices that respond to the diversity of learners and remove barriers to participation and learning. UNESCO further stressed the importance of teacher support, professional development, and collaborative leadership in creating inclusive learning environments.

Table 5

Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices in Resource Management and Support

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The school head...		
1. provides appropriate learning resources that address the varied needs of all learners.	3.88	High Level
2. allocates school resources fairly to support inclusive education.	4.02	High Level
3. provides support for facilities and learning environments conducive to inclusion.	4.17	High Level
4. establishes partnerships that strengthen programs and services for diverse learners.	4.26	High Level
5. manages school resources efficiently to sustain inclusive education initiatives.	4.24	High Level
Overall Mean	4.11	High Level

The level of school heads' administrative leadership practices in resource management and support received an overall mean of 4.11, interpreted as "high level." Moreover, item 4, "establishes partnerships that strengthen programs and services for diverse learners," obtained the highest mean of 4.26, interpreted as "high level." Item 1, "provides appropriate learning resources that address the varied needs of all learners," got the lowest mean of 3.88, interpreted as "high level."

It indicates that school heads are generally effective in mobilizing partnerships and managing available resources to sustain inclusive education initiatives. The high rating for partnerships suggests that collaboration with stakeholders can help schools supplement their resources and strengthen services for diverse learners. However, the comparatively low rating for providing appropriate learning resources indicates a need to improve further the availability, accessibility, and appropriateness of instructional and learning materials. Ensuring that resources are responsive to learner diversity may help teachers provide more equitable and inclusive learning experiences.

This is supported by UNESCO (2020), which emphasized that effective inclusive education requires adequate resources, supportive learning environments, and collaboration among schools and different stakeholders. UNESCO also stressed that strengthening partnerships and ensuring equitable access to appropriate resources are important in removing barriers to learners' participation and achievement.

Table 6

Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices in Monitoring and Evaluation Practices

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The school head...		
1.regularly evaluates the effectiveness of inclusive education initiatives in the school.	4.22	High Level
2. uses measurable indicators to determine whether inclusive education goals are being achieved.	4.16	High Level
3. uses evaluation results to improve inclusive education programs and practices.	4.23	High Level
4. initiates corrective actions based on identified gaps in inclusive education implementation.	4.22	High Level
5. encourages teachers to participate in monitoring and evaluation activities.	4.38	High Level
Overall Mean	4.24	High Level

The level of school heads' administrative leadership practices in monitoring and evaluation obtained an overall mean of 4.24, interpreted as "high level." Additionally, item 5," encourages teachers to participate in monitoring and evaluation activities," obtained the highest mean of 4.38, interpreted as "high level." In contrast, item 2, "uses evaluation results to improve inclusive education programs and practices," obtained the lowest mean of 4.316, interpreted as "high level."

It indicated that school heads place strong emphasis on teacher participation in monitoring and evaluation, which can promote shared responsibility and provide school leaders with valuable classroom-based insights. However, the comparatively lower rating for using evaluation results to improve programs suggests that there may be room to strengthen the translation of assessment findings into concrete improvements. School heads may need to ensure that information gathered through monitoring and evaluation is systematically analyzed and used to modify programs, teaching practices, and support mechanisms for diverse learners.

This is supported by a research study by Sanchez, Labordo, and Martir (2024), which found that effective monitoring and evaluation practices of school heads help identify areas for improvement and strengthen school programs. This supports the present finding that teacher participation and the use of evaluation results are important in improving inclusive education practices.

Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education

Table 7

Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education in Inclusive Learning

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The school promotes...		
1. a safe, supportive, and respectful classroom climate.	4.48	High Level
2. positive peer relationships that foster respect and discourage discrimination.	4.41	High Level
3. classroom practices that accommodate diverse learners.	4.48	High Level
4. an environment where learners feel valued and accepted regardless of differences.	4.51	Very High Level
5. collaboration among teachers, learners, and parents in promoting inclusion.	4.50	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.48	High Level

The level of sustainability of inclusive education in inclusive learning obtained an overall mean of 4.48, interpreted as a “high level.” In addition, item 4, “an environment where learners feel valued and accepted regardless of differences,” obtained the highest mean of 4.51, interpreted as “very high level.” Meanwhile, promoting “positive peer relationships that foster respect and discourage discrimination” received the lowest mean, 4.41.

It implies that the school strongly promotes an inclusive, accepting, and collaborative environment where learners are respected and valued despite their differences. However, the lower mean for positive peer relationships suggests that there is still room to strengthen peer interaction, respect, and anti-discrimination practices among learners. Strengthening these areas may further contribute to a more supportive and inclusive school climate.

This finding aligns with the study conducted by Huliganga (2025), which revealed that collaboration among school stakeholders and supportive practices are important in the implementation of inclusive education. This supports the present finding that fostering acceptance, collaboration, and positive relationships contributes to a more inclusive school environment.

Table 8

Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education in Equity in Access and Participation

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The school promotes...		
1. equal opportunities for all learners to engage in learning.	4.57	Very High Level
2. meaningful participation of learners with diverse needs in regular classes.	4.48	High Level
3. removal of barriers to participation (e.g., economic, physical, social).	4.38	High Level
4. fair access to school programs, services, and resources.	4.30	High Level
5. active participation of all learners in classroom and school activities.	4.50	Very High Level
Overall Mean	4.45	High Level

Table 8 reveals the level of sustainability of inclusive education in terms of equity in access and participation, with an overall mean of 4.45. It was interpreted as a “high level.” Moreover, item 1, “equal opportunities for all learners to engage in learning,” indicates the highest mean, interpreted as “very high level.” Item 4, “fair access to school programs, services, and resources,” got the lowest mean of 4.30, interpreted as “high level.”

It implies that the school is highly committed to ensuring that all learners have opportunities to participate in learning and school activities. However, the lower mean for fair access to programs, services, and resources suggests that accessibility and the equitable provision of support may still require further attention. Strengthening these areas could help ensure that learners with diverse needs receive the resources and services they need to participate fully in school.

This finding is consistent with the study by Huliganga (2025), which emphasized the importance of providing appropriate support and interventions for learners with diverse needs in implementing inclusive education. This supports the present finding that equal learning opportunities and fair access to school resources are essential in promoting meaningful inclusion.

Table 9

Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education in Learners' Support Services

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The school provides...		
1. academic support, remediation, and enrichment programs.	4.44	High Level
2. guidance and counseling services are accessible to learners.	4.48	High Level
3. interventions for at-risk and diverse learners.	4.39	High Level
4. effective referral systems and support mechanisms for learners requiring specialized assistance.	4.32	High Level
5. programs that promote learners' academic, social, and emotional development.	4.41	High Level
Overall Mean	4.41	High Level

Findings in Table 9 reveal that the level of sustainability of inclusive education in learners' support services received an overall mean of 4.41, interpreted as "high level." Among the five indicators, item 2, "guidance and counseling services are accessible to learners," obtained the highest mean of 4.48, interpreted as "high level." While the lowest mean of 4.32 on item 4 "effective referral systems and support mechanisms for learners requiring specialized assistance" interpreted as "high level."

This indicates that the school is highly responsive to learners' academic, personal, and developmental needs through accessible guidance and counseling services. However, the comparatively lower rating for referral systems suggests that there is still room to strengthen the identification, referral, and provision of specialized assistance to learners who require additional support. Strengthening coordination among teachers, school personnel, and support providers may ensure timely and appropriate interventions.

This aligns with Huliganga (2025), which emphasized the importance of appropriate interventions and support mechanisms for learners with diverse needs.

Table 10

Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education in Curriculum Adaptation and Responsiveness

Items	Mean	Interpretation
The school ensures...		
1. that the curriculum is flexible enough to address diverse learning needs.	4.15	High Level
2. teachers use differentiated instruction and inclusive assessment strategies.	4.44	High Level
3. curriculum implementation practices support the achievement of inclusive education goals.	4.40	High Level
4. learning activities are adapted based on learners' abilities and needs.	4.34	High Level
5. curriculum implementation considers cultural, social, and individual differences among learners.	4.38	High Level
Overall Mean	4.34	High Level

Results in Table 10 reveal that, in terms of the level of sustainability of inclusive education, the focus is on curriculum adaptation and responsiveness. The results show an overall mean of 4.34, interpreted as "high level." Additionally, item 2, "teachers use differentiated instruction and inclusive assessment strategies," obtained the highest mean of 4.44, interpreted as "very high level." Moreover, item 1, "curriculum is flexible enough to address diverse learning needs," got the lowest mean of 4.15, interpreted as "high level."

This indicates that the school strongly promotes differentiated instruction and inclusive assessment to respond to learners' diverse needs. However, the lower rating for curriculum flexibility suggests a need to strengthen the adaptation of curriculum content, activities, and learning approaches better to accommodate differences in learners' abilities and needs. Greater flexibility may help ensure that all learners can participate meaningfully and achieve the intended learning outcomes.

The findings are supported by Nurjannah et al. (2023), who conducted a systematic literature review of 13 studies examining curriculum modification in inclusive schools in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Their findings revealed that although some schools implemented curriculum modifications to accommodate learners with special educational needs, others had not fully adopted these practices, with several barriers affecting implementation. This supports the present study's finding that curriculum adaptation and responsiveness were rated at a high level, particularly in differentiated instruction and inclusive assessment. However, the comparatively lower rating for curriculum flexibility suggests an area requiring further improvement. The findings emphasize the importance of continuously adapting curriculum content, instructional strategies, and learning activities to accommodate learners' diverse abilities and needs, thereby strengthening the sustainability of inclusive education.

Comparative Analysis in the Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices

Table 11

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices in Planning and Policy Implementation according to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	66	61.40	1841.50	0.973	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	56	61.62				
Sex	Male	39	57.26	1453.00	0.359	0.05	Not Significant
	Female	83	63.49				
Number of Trainings	Few	67	59.36	1699.00	0.456	0.05	Not Significant
	Many	55	64.11				
Length of Service	Shorter	64	60.23	1774.50	0.673	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	58	62.91				

The difference in the levels of school heads' administrative leadership practices in planning and policy implementation, when grouped by age, sex, number of training sessions attended, and length of service, was examined using the Mann-Whitney U test. The results show no significant differences in respondents' assessments across variables. For age, younger respondents obtained a mean rank of 61.40, while older respondents obtained 61.62, with a Mann-Whitney U value of 1841.50 and a p-value of 0.973. For sex, male respondents had a mean rank of 57.26, compared with 63.49 for female respondents, with a U value of 1453.00 and a p-value of 0.359. In terms of the number of trainings attended, respondents with few trainings obtained a mean rank of 59.36, while those with many trainings obtained a mean rank of 64.11, with a U value of 1699.00 and a p-value of 0.456. Similarly, respondents with shorter length of service had a mean rank of 60.23, while those with longer service had a mean rank of 62.91, with a U value of 1774.50 and a p-value of 0.673. All results were interpreted as Not Significant.

Since all p-values (0.973, 0.359, 0.456, and 0.673) are greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the results indicate that the differences in respondents' assessments of school heads' administrative leadership practices in planning and policy implementation are not statistically significant when grouped according to age, sex, number of trainings attended, and length of service. Although some differences in mean ranks were observed, particularly between respondents with few and many trainings and between male and female respondents, these differences were not statistically significant. Thus, the findings suggest that respondents' assessments of school heads' planning and policy implementation practices are generally consistent across the different demographic and professional groups.

Applied to the present study, this perspective suggests that age, sex, number of trainings attended, and length of service do not significantly differentiate respondents' perceptions of school heads' planning and policy implementation practices. This supports the present study by

indicating that school heads' administrative leadership practices in planning and policy implementation are perceived consistently across different groups of Senior High School teachers.

The findings are supported by Legaspi (2026), who examined teachers' perceptions of school heads' leadership styles in Tinoc District, Ifugao, Philippines. The study revealed no significant differences in teachers' perceptions when grouped according to gender, age, educational attainment, years of teaching experience, and school cluster. These findings are consistent with the present study, which found no significant differences in assessments of school heads' planning and policy implementation practices according to age, sex, number of trainings attended, and length of service. The similarity suggests that teachers from different demographic and professional backgrounds may share comparable perceptions of school leadership practices. However, the cited study examined leadership styles rather than planning and policy implementation specifically, and it did not establish comparable findings for the number of trainings attended. Thus, the present findings provide additional evidence of consistency in teachers' assessments of this particular administrative leadership dimension.

Table 12

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices in the Instructional Supervision and Support according to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	66	61.84	1825.50	0.907	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	56	61.10				
Sex	Male	39	53.45	1304.50	0.083	0.05	Not Significant
	Female	83	65.28				
Number of Trainings	Few	67	61.25	1825.50	0.930	0.05	Not Significant
	Many	55	61.81				
Length of Service	Shorter	64	61.32	1844.50	0.953	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	58	61.70				

The difference in school heads' administrative leadership practices levels in instructional supervision and support by age, sex, number of training sessions attended, and length of service was examined using the Mann-Whitney U test. The results show no significant difference in respondents' assessments across all variables. For age, younger respondents obtained a mean rank of 61.84, while older respondents obtained 61.10, with a Mann-Whitney U value of 1825.50 and a p-value of 0.907. For sex, male respondents had a mean rank of 53.45, while female respondents had a mean rank of 65.28, with a U value of 1304.50 and a p-value of 0.083. In terms of the number of trainings attended, respondents with few trainings obtained a mean rank of 61.25, compared with 61.81 among those with many trainings, with a U value of 1825.50 and a p-value of 0.930. For length of service, respondents with shorter service had a mean rank of 61.32, while those with longer service had a mean rank of 61.70, with a U value of 1844.50 and a p-value of 0.953.

Since all p-values (0.907, 0.083, 0.930, and 0.953) are greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the results indicate that the differences in the level of school heads' administrative leadership practices in instructional supervision and support are not statistically significant when respondents are grouped according to age, sex, number of trainings attended, and length of service. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected, indicating that these variables do not significantly differentiate the respondents' assessments of school heads' instructional supervision and support practices. Although slight variations in mean ranks were observed, particularly between male and female respondents, these differences were not statistically significant.

The results imply that a respondent's age, sex, training attended, and years in the profession did not affect their responses regarding school heads' practices in instructional supervision and support. This result indicates that Senior High School teachers generally share a common view of school heads' practices regarding instructional supervision and support.

The findings are supported by Kinyua et al. (2025), who examined teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional supervisory practices in selected secondary schools. Their study revealed no statistically significant differences in teachers' perceptions when grouped according to gender, age, and educational qualifications. Similarly, Cailing et al. (2025) found no significant differences in teachers' perceptions of the organization and implementation of instructional supervision across the professional characteristics examined, although teaching experience influenced perceptions of its concepts and purpose. These findings are consistent with the present study, which revealed no significant differences in instructional supervision and support according to age, sex, number of trainings attended, and length of service. The results suggest that teachers from different demographic and professional groups may hold comparable assessments of school heads' supervisory practices. Nevertheless, the cited studies do not directly establish comparable findings for the number of trainings attended. The present findings underscore the importance of maintaining consistent instructional supervision and professional support across diverse groups of Senior High School teachers.

Table 13

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices in Resource Management and Support according to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	66	62.60	1775.50	0.707	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	56	60.21				
Sex	Male	39	52.03	1249.00	0.041	0.05	Significant
	Female	83	65.95				
Number of Trainings	Few	67	64.32	1653.50	0.327	0.05	Not Significant
	Many	55	58.06				
Length of Service	Shorter	64	65.68	1588.50	0.167	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	58	56.89				

Results presented in Table 45 show the difference in the levels of school heads' administrative leadership practices in resource management and support by age, sex, number of training sessions attended, and length of service. The results indicate that there was no significant difference by age, number of training sessions attended, or length of service, but there was a significant difference by sex. For age, younger respondents obtained a mean rank of 62.60, while older respondents obtained 60.21, with a Mann-Whitney U value of 1775.50 and a p-value of 0.707. For sex, male respondents had a mean rank of 52.03, while female respondents had a mean rank of 65.95, with a U value of 1249.00 and a p-value of 0.041. In terms of the number of trainings attended, respondents with few trainings obtained a mean rank of 64.32, compared with 58.06 among those with many trainings, with a U value of 1653.50 and a p-value of 0.327. For length of service, respondents with shorter service obtained a mean rank of 65.68, while those with longer service obtained a mean rank of 56.89, with a U value of 1588.50 and a p-value of 0.167.

Since the p-values for age (0.707), number of trainings attended (0.327), and length of service (0.167) are greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the results indicate that the differences in respondents' assessments of school heads' resource management and support practices are not statistically significant for these variables. However, the p-value for sex (0.041) is less than 0.05, indicating a statistically significant difference between male and female respondents. The female respondents had a higher mean rank (65.95) than the male respondents (52.03), suggesting that they assessed the school heads' resource management and support practices more favorably. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected for sex but not rejected for age, number of trainings attended, and length of service.

Among Senior High School teachers, perceptions of school heads' resource management and support practices are generally similar across age, number of training sessions attended, and length of service, but differ significantly by sex. This suggests that sex may influence how Senior High School teachers perceive school heads' efforts to manage resources and provide support for inclusive education.

The findings are supported in part by Mondol (2009), who examined teachers' and principals' perceptions of leadership effectiveness in selected Adventist schools in the Philippines. The study revealed no significant differences in overall perceptions when respondents were grouped according to demographic variables. However, a significant gender difference emerged in one leadership dimension, with female respondents reporting more positive perceptions of principals' roles in improving curriculum, assessment, and instruction. These findings are comparable to the present study, which revealed a significant difference in resource management and support according to sex, with female respondents obtaining higher mean ranks than male respondents. Meanwhile, the absence of significant differences according to age, number of trainings attended, and length of service suggests that assessments of resource management and support were generally comparable across these groups. Although Mondol examined leadership effectiveness rather than resource management specifically, both studies demonstrate that gender-related differences may emerge in particular leadership dimensions even when broader demographic differences are not statistically significant. The findings highlight the

importance of considering teachers' diverse perspectives when evaluating school heads' administrative practices.

Table 14

Difference in the Level of School Heads' Administrative Leadership Practices in Monitoring and Evaluation Practices according to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	66	63.24	1733.00	0.552	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	56	59.45				
Sex	Male	39	50.72	1198.00	0.020	0.05	Significant
	Female	83	66.57				
Number of Trainings	Few	67	64.31	1654.00	0.329	0.05	Not Significant
	Many	55	58.07				
Length of Service	Shorter	64	65.11	1625.00	0.233	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	58	57.52				

Results presented in Table 46 show the difference in the levels of school heads' administrative leadership practices in monitoring and evaluation by age, sex, number of training sessions attended, and length of service. The results indicate that there was no significant difference by age, number of training sessions attended, or length of service, but there was a significant difference by sex. For age, younger respondents had a mean rank of 63.24, while older respondents had a mean rank of 59.45; the Mann-Whitney U value was 1733.00 and the p-value was 0.552. For sex, male respondents had a mean rank of 50.72, while female respondents had a mean rank of 66.57, with a U value of 1198.00 and a p-value of 0.020. In terms of the number of trainings attended, respondents with few trainings obtained a mean rank of 64.31, compared with 58.07 among those with many trainings, with a U value of 1654.00 and a p-value of 0.329. For length of service, respondents with shorter service obtained a mean rank of 65.11, while those with longer service obtained a mean rank of 57.52, with a U value of 1625.00 and a p-value of 0.233.

Since the p-values for age (0.552), number of trainings attended (0.329), and length of service (0.233) are greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the results indicate that the differences in respondents' assessments of school heads' monitoring and evaluation practices are not statistically significant for these variables. However, the p-value for sex (0.020) is less than 0.05, indicating a statistically significant difference between male and female respondents. Female respondents had a higher mean rank (66.57) than male respondents (50.72), suggesting that female respondents assessed the school heads' monitoring and evaluation practices more favorably. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected for sex but not rejected for age, number of trainings attended, and length of service.

Overall, this body of evidence indicates that respondents' perceptions of school heads' monitoring and evaluation practices are generally similar across age, number of trainings attended, and length of service, but differ significantly by sex. This indicates that sex may influence how Senior High School teachers perceive school heads' efforts to monitor, evaluate, and improve inclusive education practices.

The findings are supported in part by Mondol (2009), who found that teachers' perceptions of school heads' leadership effectiveness differed significantly by gender in a particular leadership dimension, although overall perceptions did not significantly differ across demographic groups. Similarly, the present study revealed a significant difference in monitoring and evaluation practices according to sex, with female respondents obtaining higher mean ranks than male respondents. However, no significant differences were found according to age, number of trainings attended, and length of service. These findings suggest that teachers' assessments of administrative leadership may vary by sex in specific dimensions, highlighting the importance of considering diverse perspectives in evaluating school heads' monitoring and evaluation practices.

Comparative Analysis in the Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education

Table 15

Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education in Inclusive Learning according to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	66	63.94	1687.00	0.399	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	56	58.63				
Sex	Male	39	60.23	1569.00	0.782		Not Significant
	Female	83	62.10				
Number of Trainings	Few	67	59.47	1706.50	0.475		Not Significant
	Many	55	63.97				
Length of Service	Shorter	64	58.86	1687.00	0.377		Not Significant
	Longer	58	64.41				

The results present the level of sustainability of inclusive education in inclusive learning by age, sex, number of training sessions attended, and length of service. The results indicate no significant difference in respondents' assessments across all variables. For age, younger respondents had a mean rank of 63.94, while older respondents had a mean rank of 58.63, with a Mann-Whitney U value of 1687.00 and a p-value of 0.399. For sex, male respondents had a mean rank of 60.23, while female respondents had a mean rank of 62.10, with a U value of 1569.00 and a p-value of 0.782. In terms of the number of trainings attended, respondents with few trainings obtained a mean rank of 59.47, compared with 63.97 among those with many trainings, with a U value of 1706.50 and a p-value of 0.475. For length of service, respondents with shorter service obtained a mean rank of 58.86, while those with longer service obtained a mean rank of 64.41, with a U value of 1687.00 and a p-value of 0.377.

Since all four (4) p-values of 0.399, 0.782, 0.475, and 0.377 are all greater than 0.05 at a 0.05 significance level, the respondents' opinions on school heads' administrative leadership practices in this area do not significantly differ when respondents are divided in terms of age, sex, number of trainings, and length of service. Based on the analysis results, the null hypothesis is not rejected, which implies that the respondents' assessments of the school head's administrative leadership practices in this area do not significantly vary when divided by age, sex, number of trainings attended, and length of service. The respondents' assessments differ among the groups when computed as mean ranks. Still, the differences between respondents with few and many training sessions attended and between those with shorter and longer lengths of service are not significant.

Table 16

Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education in Equity in Access and Participation according to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	66	57.79	1603.00	0.200	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	56	65.88				Not Significant
Sex	Male	39	58.21	1490.00	0.473	0.05	Not Significant
	Female	83	63.05				Not Significant
Number of Trainings	Few	67	58.29	1627.50	0.260	0.05	Not Significant
	Many	55	65.41				Not Significant
Length of Service	Shorter	64	57.15	1577.50	0.146	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	58	66.30				Not Significant

The level of sustainability of inclusive education in terms of equity in access and participation according to age, sex, number of trainings attended, and length of service. Results presented in Table 48 show the difference in the levels of school heads' administrative leadership practices in [insert area/dimension] by age, sex, number of training sessions attended, and length of service. The results indicate no significant difference in respondents' assessments across all variables. For age, younger respondents obtained a mean rank of 57.79, while older respondents obtained 65.88, with a Mann-Whitney U value of 1603.00 and a p-value of 0.200. For sex, male respondents had a mean rank of 58.21, while female respondents had a mean rank of 63.05, with a U value of 1490.00 and a p-value of 0.473. In terms of the number of trainings attended, respondents with few trainings obtained a mean rank of 58.29, compared with 65.41 among those with many trainings, with a U value of 1627.50 and a p-value of 0.260. For length of service, respondents with shorter service obtained a mean rank of 57.15, while those with longer service obtained a mean rank of 66.30, with a U value of 1577.50 and a p-value of 0.146.

Finally, since the set of p-values (0.200, 0.473, 0.260, 0.146) is all greater than the level of significance (0.05), the findings support the conclusion that the differences in the respondents' assessment of the principal's administrative leadership practices in this area are not significant

when comparing the respondents based on their sex, age, number of trainings attended, and length of service. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. Although there are some variations in the mean ranks across groupings, such as between younger and older respondents and between those with longer and shorter service lengths, the differences are not statistically significant.

Overall, the findings suggest that respondents generally share similar perceptions of school heads' administrative leadership practices in this area, regardless of age, sex, number of training sessions attended, or length of service. This indicates that the school heads' practices are perceived relatively consistently among the Senior High School teachers included in the study.

The findings are consistent with Legaspi (2026), who reported no significant differences in teachers' perceptions of school heads' leadership styles according to age, gender, and teaching experience. Similarly, the present study revealed no significant differences in assessments of equity in access and participation across all respondent profile variables. Although the studies examined different constructs, their findings suggest that teachers from diverse backgrounds may hold comparable perceptions of school practices. This highlights the importance of maintaining equitable access and participation for all learners, regardless of teachers' demographic and professional characteristics.

Table 17

Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education in Learners Support Services according to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney test	U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	66	61.89	1822.50		0.894		Not Significant
	Older	56	61.04					
Sex	Male	39	56.59	1427.00		0.285		Not Significant
	Female	83	63.81					
Number of Trainings	Few	67	64.21	1661.00		0.342	0.05	Not Significant
	Many	55	58.20					
Length of Service	Shorter	64	61.80	1836.50		0.919		Not Significant
	Longer	58	61.16					

Table 49, in the level of sustainability of inclusive education in learner support services, shows that when respondents are grouped according to age, sex, number of trainings, and length of service. The results showed no significant difference in respondents' assessments across all variables. For age, younger respondents obtained a mean rank of 61.89, while older respondents obtained 61.04, with a Mann-Whitney U value of 1822.50 and a p-value of 0.894. For sex, male respondents had a mean rank of 56.59, while female respondents had a mean rank of 63.81, with a U value of 1427.00 and a p-value of 0.285. When looking at the number of trainings attended, respondents with few trainings obtained a mean rank of 64.21, while respondents with many

trainings obtained a mean rank of 58.20 with a U value of 1661.00 and a p-value of 0.342. For length of service, respondents with shorter service had a mean rank of 61.80, while those with longer service had a mean rank of 61.16, with a U value of 1836.50 and a p-value of 0.919.

Because all the p-values were greater than 0.05 (0.894, 0.285, 0.342, and 0.919, respectively), it can be concluded that the respondents' assessments do not differ significantly when grouped by age, sex, number of trainings attended, and length of service. Hence, the null hypothesis should be accepted: respondents' assessments of [insert sustainability dimension] do not differ when grouped by age, sex, number of trainings attended, and length of service.

The findings are consistent with Legaspi (2026), who reported no significant differences in teachers' perceptions of school heads' leadership styles according to age, gender, and teaching experience. Similarly, the present study revealed no significant differences in assessments of equity in access and participation across all respondent profile variables. Although the studies examined different constructs, their findings suggest that teachers from diverse backgrounds may hold comparable perceptions of school practices. This highlights the importance of maintaining equitable access and participation for all learners, regardless of teachers' demographic and professional characteristics.

Table 18

Level of Sustainability of Inclusive Education in Curriculum Adaptation and Responsiveness according to Variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U test	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	66	61.58	1843.00	0.979	0.05	Not
	Older	56	61.41				Significant
Sex	Male	39	56.10	1408.00	0.241		Not
	Female	83	64.04				Significant
Number of Trainings	Few	67	64.19	1662.00	0.346		Not
	Many	55	58.22				Significant
Length of Service	Shorter	64	64.58	1659.00	0.306		Not
	Longer	58	58.10				Significant

The level of sustainability of inclusive education in curriculum adaptation and responsiveness was examined by grouping respondents by age, sex, number of training sessions, and length of service. The results revealed no significant differences in respondents' perceptions across the four profile variables. For age, the Mann-Whitney U test yielded $U = 1,843.00$ with $p = 0.979$. For sex, the test yielded $U = 1,408.00$ with a p-value of 0.241. For the number of trainings, $U = 1,662.00$ with a p-value of 0.346; for the length of service, $U = 1,659.00$ with a p-value of 0.306. Since all p-values were greater than 0.05, the differences between the groups were not statistically significant.

Taken together, these studies indicate that respondents' perceptions of the sustainability of inclusive education, in terms of curriculum adaptation and responsiveness, did not differ significantly by age, sex, number of trainings, or length of service. Although slight differences were observed in the mean ranks among the groups, these differences were not large enough to establish statistically significant differences. Thus, the null hypothesis is not rejected for all four profile variables, indicating that age, sex, number of trainings, and length of service were not significant factors in the respondents' perceptions of the sustainability of inclusive education in curriculum adaptation and responsiveness.

The findings are consistent with Legaspi (2026), who reported no significant differences in teachers' perceptions of school heads' leadership styles according to age, gender, and teaching experience. Similarly, the present study revealed no significant differences in curriculum adaptation and responsiveness across all respondent profile variables. Although the studies examined different constructs, the findings suggest that teachers from diverse demographic and professional backgrounds may share comparable perceptions of school practices. This underscores the importance of maintaining responsive curriculum implementation that addresses learners' diverse needs.

Conclusion:

The study concluded that the respondents were predominantly younger, female, had attended fewer inclusive education-related training, and had shorter teaching experience in Senior High School. These characteristics indicate that the findings primarily reflect the perspectives of teachers with relatively limited teaching experience and exposure to specialized training. The results underscore the importance of providing continuous professional development opportunities to strengthen teachers' knowledge and competencies in addressing diverse learning needs.

Furthermore, school heads demonstrated a high level of administrative leadership practices in planning and policy implementation, instructional supervision and support, resource management and support, and monitoring and evaluation. The findings indicate that school heads generally implement inclusive education policies, promote learner-centered instruction, establish stakeholder partnerships, and encourage teacher participation in monitoring activities. However, participatory planning, individualized coaching, provision of appropriate learning resources, and systematic utilization of evaluation results require further strengthening to improve administrative responsiveness and support inclusive education initiatives.

Similarly, the sustainability of inclusive education was assessed at a high level in terms of inclusive learning environments, equity in access and participation, learner support services, and curriculum adaptation and responsiveness. The findings indicate that schools generally promote acceptance, equitable learning opportunities, accessible support services, and instructional practices responsive to learner diversity. Nevertheless, positive peer relationships, equitable access to resources, effective referral systems, and curriculum flexibility require continued attention to ensure that inclusive education practices remain responsive to the diverse needs of learners.



Moreover, no significant differences were found in school heads' administrative leadership practices when respondents were grouped according to age, number of training attended, and length of service across all dimensions. No significant differences according to sex were observed in planning and policy implementation and instructional supervision and support. However, significant differences emerged in resource management and support and monitoring and evaluation practices, with female respondents providing more favorable assessments. These findings indicate that teachers generally share comparable perceptions of administrative leadership practices, although differences in selected dimensions according to sex highlight the importance of considering diverse teacher perspectives in administrative decision-making and improvement initiatives.

Finally, the sustainability of inclusive education did not significantly differ according to age, sex, number of training attended, and length of service across all four dimensions. These findings indicate that teachers from different demographic and professional backgrounds generally share comparable assessments of inclusive education sustainability. The results underscore the importance of maintaining consistent institutional efforts to strengthen inclusive learning environments, equitable access and participation, learner support services, and responsive curriculum implementation. Sustained attention to these areas can help schools address existing implementation gaps and further strengthen inclusive education practices.

References:

- Bujang, M. A., Omar, E. D., & Baharum, N. A. (2018). A review on sample size determination for Cronbach's alpha test: A simple guide for researchers. *Malaysian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 25(6), 85–99. <https://doi.org/10.21315/mjms2018.25.6.9>
- Cailing, V., Amper, D., Ali, H., Alonsabe, M. G., Basadre, C., & Alonsabe, O. (2025). Public school teachers' perceived extent of implementation of their school heads' instructional supervision. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 31(2), 210–227. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14729366>
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Sampling+Techniques%2C+3rd+Edition-p-9780471162407>
- Deckert, J., & Wilson, M. (2023). Descriptive research methods. In T. Welsh, J. P. Ambegaonkar, & L. Mainwaring (Eds.), *Research methods in the dance sciences* (pp. 153–165). University Press of Florida. <https://doi.org/10.5744/florida/9780813069548.003.0011>
- DeMatthews, D. E., Conroy, K., & McKenzie, L. (2026). Inclusive principal leadership from 1995 to 2024: A systematic literature review. *Review of Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543261446662>
- Department of Education. (2019). Policy guidelines on the K to 12 basic education program (DepEd Order No. 21, s. 2019). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2019/08/22/do-021-s-2019-policy-guidelines-on-the-k-to-12-basic-education-program/>
- Department of Education. (2020). National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024.pdf
- Department of Education. (2021). Policy guidelines on the provision of educational programs and services for learners with disabilities in the K to 12 basic education program (DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/DO_s2021_044.pdf
- Department of Education. (2024). DepEd Order No. 007, s. 2024: Guidelines on shared governance and participatory school-based management.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Eleccion, J. S., Guanzon, R. S., Rico, A. A., Sajonia, J. D. S., Sobrevilla, A. R. M., Jr., Catarus, J. D., Noblezada, J. E. C., Lobaton, V. P. Y., & Macaranas, J. G. (2026). School head's financial management practices and performance. *Aloysian Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, Education, and Allied Fields*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20579634>
- Good, C. V., & Scates, D. E. (1954). *Methods of research: Educational, psychological, sociological*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Huliganga, M. (2025). Interventions and stakeholder support systems in inclusive education settings. *Philippine Educational Review*, 103(1), 14-31.

- Işıkgöz, M. E., & Öztunç, M. (2026). From inclusion to sustainability: A systematic review of research trends in sustainable inclusive education (2015–2025). *Sustainable Development*.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.71001>
- Kinyua, B. K., Obura, E. A., & Masinde, J. M. (2025). Teachers' perceptions towards principals' instructional supervisory role in selected secondary schools. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 14(5), 3891–3903.
<https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v14i5.34063>
- Legaspi, M. (2026). Teachers perceptions of school heads' leadership styles of school heads at Tinoc District. *Journal of Management, and Development Research*, 3(1), 117–134.
<https://doi.org/10.69739/jmdr.v3i1.1843>
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>
- Mondol, E. (2009). Teachers' and principals' perceptions of principals' leadership effectiveness in selected Adventist schools in the Philippines. *International Forum Journal*, 12(2), 61–75.
- Nurjannah, S., Azizah, N., & Rosi, F. (2023). Modification curriculum in inclusive setting: A systematic literature review. *JPK (Jurnal Pendidikan Khusus)*, 19(2), 109–120.
<https://doi.org/10.21831/jpk.v19i2.80808>
- Paglomutan, M. C. P., Guanzon, R. S., Francisco, M. L. C., et al. (2025). Leadership skills of school department heads in relation to the teachers' performance.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16193779>
- Salgado, E., & Escarlos, L. (2026). Translating national inclusion mandates into localized school practices through technical assistance and leadership guidance. *Journal of Educational Management and Policy*, 14(1), 34–51.
- Sanchez, T., Labordo, R., & Martir, V. (2024). Engagement in monitoring, evaluation, and adaptive adjustment practices among public school heads. *Bacolod Research Journal*, 8(2), 75–92.
- Thomas, L. (2023, June 22). Stratified sampling | Definition, guide & examples. Scribbr.
<https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/stratified-sampling/>
- UNESCO. (2023). Global monitoring of teacher professional development and inclusive instructional environments. UNESCO Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2020). Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all. UNESCO Publishing.
- United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development.
<https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
- Valdés, R., Améstica, J. M., & Coronado, C. (2026). Educational leadership for inclusive education: A systematic literature review. *Cogent Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2026.2666707>



von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). General system theory: Foundations, development, applications.
George Braziller. <https://search.worldcat.org/title/993841919>