



Knowledge and Competency Levels of Receiving Teachers in Handling Students with Special Needs Education in Public Junior High School in Congressional District 2, Valenzuela City

Jeramie G. Valdez ¹
1 – SDO - Valenzuela

Publication Date: July 4, 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21187426

Abstract

This study examined the knowledge and competency of receiving teachers in handling students with special needs, including the challenges they encounter and the relationship between knowledge and competency. It also explored how respondents' profiles influence their knowledge and competency, with the aim of proposing a training program to enhance inclusive education practices.

The study employed a descriptive–evaluative and descriptive–comparative research design. Data were gathered from receiving teachers through a structured survey questionnaire. Statistical tools such as weighted mean, standard deviation, t-test/ANOVA, and Pearson correlation were used to analyze the data in determining levels of knowledge, competency, significant differences across profile variables, and the relationship between knowledge and competency.

Findings revealed that respondents are generally knowledgeable in handling students with special needs, particularly in differentiated instruction and classroom management, while areas such as assistive technology use and policy interpretation require further enhancement. In terms of competency, respondents demonstrated a competent to more competent level across all domains, with strengths in learning environment management and learner diversity, but lower competency in individualized planning and research-based practices.

Significant differences in both knowledge and competency were found when respondents were grouped according to gender, bachelor's degree, teaching position, training exposure, and years of experience in handling students with special needs. Meanwhile, age, civil status, and highest educational attainment showed no significant differences. A very high positive relationship was also found between knowledge and competency ($r = 0.930$, $p < 0.05$), indicating a strong interdependence between the two variables.

Moreover, respondents reported more serious challenges in handling learners with special needs, particularly in addressing emotional and behavioral needs, managing diverse students, and adapting instruction. Despite these challenges, they strongly supported the need for professional development, collaboration, and instructional adaptation as key solutions.



The study concludes that while receiving teachers demonstrate adequate high levels of knowledge and competency in special needs education, gaps still exist in specialized instructional practices and support systems. The strong relationship between knowledge and competency highlights the importance of continuous professional development in improving inclusive teaching practices. The findings further emphasize the need for targeted training programs, enhanced institutional support, and strengthened collaboration among stakeholders to address challenges in inclusive education.

Keywords: *differentiated instruction, inclusive education, knowledge, training program, special needs education, teacher competency*



Introduction

Special education constitutes a vital part of the broader educational system, as it focuses on delivering individualized instruction and appropriate support to learners with varied needs. Rooted in the principle of equity, it guarantees that students with disabilities receive opportunities equivalent to those of their peers (Merrigan & Senior, 2021). Over time, special education has progressed globally toward a more inclusive orientation, where regular classrooms increasingly adopt strategies that accommodate diverse students regardless of ability (Department of Education, 2021).

Inclusive education supports the integration of students with special educational needs (SEN) into general education settings, thereby fostering acceptance of difference and a sense of belonging for all students. This strategy demonstrates a worldwide commitment to safeguarding the rights of those with disabilities. Nonetheless, the degree of implementation of inclusive education varies throughout countries, mostly determined by resource availability, teacher preparedness, and prevailing educational policy (Hanson, 2024).

In the Philippines, efforts to advance inclusive education have been reinforced through key legislative measures. Policies such as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Republic Act 10533) and the Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities (Republic Act 7277) demonstrate the government's commitment to equitable access to education. Additionally, the Department of Education operationalized inclusive practices through DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021, which outlines a framework for delivering services to students with disabilities. This policy also recognizes the role of general education teachers, often referred to as receiving teachers, who may assume responsibilities similar to Special Needs Education (SNED) teachers when adequately trained.

Further supporting this initiative, division memoranda such as DM No. 259, s. 2022; DM No. 454, s. 2023; and DM No. 211, s. 2025 emphasize the importance of strengthening the competencies of receiving teachers through targeted capacity-building programs. These directives acknowledge that many general education teachers are tasked with handling special educational needs students despite lacking formal SNED qualifications, thereby necessitating structured training and institutional support.

Despite these policy developments, several challenges remain. A significant number of Filipino teachers continue to encounter difficulties in effectively managing SNED students due to insufficient SNED training and limited access to specialized instructional materials, which may hinder the delivery of quality inclusive education (Yang, 2022; Alcosero et al., 2023).

Receiving teachers are vital for the effective implementation of inclusive education, as they directly support the learning of students with special needs in regular classrooms. Tayco & Motus (2024) note that although many receiving teachers do not possess formal SNED credentials, they endeavor to address learners' diverse needs through adaptive teaching strategies, collaboration with colleagues, and continuous professional development. Similarly, Alido et al. (2023) describe receiving teachers as general education instructors responsible for teaching SNED students, with their preparedness evaluated in areas such as collaboration, behavior management, curriculum accessibility, and instructional planning. Marinay & Delos Reyes (2024) further highlight their involvement in inclusive practices, including co-teaching, monitoring

learner progress, and providing both academic and psychosocial support, all of which contribute to improved learner outcomes.

Furthermore, receiving teachers are essential in implementing differentiated instruction and modifying teaching methodologies to accommodate the varied learning requirements seen in inclusive classrooms. Recent studies highlight that effective differentiation necessitates ongoing modification of instructional strategies, resources, and evaluation processes to guarantee that all learners may actively engage in the educational process (Basister et al., 2025). Moreover, teacher cooperation has been recognized as a crucial element in enhancing inclusive practices, as it facilitates the exchange of experience, co-designing of lessons, and the creation of novel solutions that address diverse student abilities.

Moreover, cooperation between general education and special education teachers is crucial for maintaining inclusive education. Recent studies indicate that structured collaboration, including involvement in professional learning communities and lesson study, improves instructional efficacy and facilitates the successful integration of students with disabilities in general education settings (Wilshire et al., 2025; Basister et al., 2025). These collaborative initiatives empower teachers to create more adaptive learning environments, promote seamless transitions for students with special needs, and guarantee ongoing academic and social assistance within inclusive contexts.

Given these demands, teacher preparedness remains a key determinant of successful inclusive education. Teachers must possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions to foster learning environments that promote participation and equity. However, despite ongoing global and national initiatives, gaps in professional development opportunities and institutional support continue to pose challenges (Muraleedharan & Joseph, 2020).

This study is also informed by the researcher's direct experience as a receiving teacher at Maysan National High School in Valenzuela City. Over time, the increasing number of students with special needs integrated into mainstream classrooms has highlighted the need for greater teacher preparedness. Observations indicate that while many receiving teachers demonstrate dedication and adaptability, they often face difficulties due to limited SNED training and insufficient access to specialized resources. These experiences served as the impetus for conducting this research, which aims to strengthen support systems, enhance training programs, and improve instructional readiness among receiving teachers.

The main aim of this study is to assess the knowledge and competencies of public junior high school teachers in handling students with special educational needs. Specifically, it seeks to identify their strengths, determine areas requiring further development, and recommend appropriate interventions and resources. The study ultimately seeks to enhance educational results for students with special needs by ensuring that teachers are sufficiently equipped to adopt inclusive approaches to teaching.

By addressing existing gaps in teacher training and support, this research aligns with both international and national efforts to advance inclusive education. The findings are expected to inform of policy improvements and targeted interventions that will promote inclusive teaching



practices and support the development of a more equitable education system in Valenzuela City and beyond.

Specifically, the study sought to address the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, civil status, bachelor's degree, highest educational attainment, teaching position, seminar and trainings attended and years of teaching in handling students with special educational needs?
2. What is the respondents' knowledge in handling students with special needs in terms of knowledge of Special Education policies, understanding students' needs, application of differentiated instruction, classroom management techniques, use of assistive technology and tools, and collaboration with parents?
3. What is the level of competency of the respondents in dealing with special needs education students in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, diversity of students, curriculum modification, systematic evaluation, and community linkages and professional development?
4. Is there a significant difference between the respondents' knowledge in handling special needs education students when their profile is considered?
5. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' level of competency in dealing with special needs education students when their profile is considered?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' knowledge and their level of competency in handling junior high school special needs education students?
7. What are the challenges receiving teachers encountered in handling special needs education students?
8. What are the recommended solutions to address the challenges encountered by receiving teachers in handling special needs education students?
9. What training program can be proposed to enhance the knowledge and competency level of the receiving teachers and to address the challenges they encounter?

2. Materials and Methods

This chapter presents the research design used in this study, the locale, population and the sample of the study, the instrumentation, and the data gathering procedures undertaken in the collection of pertinent data, the ethical considerations and the statistical treatment applied in the analysis of the data.

This study employed a descriptive-comparative and descriptive-correlational research design within a quantitative framework to determine the knowledge and competency levels of receiving teachers in handling students with special needs education in public junior high schools in Congressional District 2, Valenzuela City. These research designs were considered appropriate in addressing the objectives and Statement of the Problem of the study.

The descriptive research design was utilized to describe the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, civil status, bachelor's degree, highest educational attainment, teaching position, seminars and training attended, and years of experience in



handling learners with special educational needs. Likewise, this design was used to assess the respondents' level of knowledge in handling students with special needs in terms of knowledge of Special Education policies, understanding students' needs, application of differentiated instruction, classroom management techniques, use of assistive technology and tools, and collaboration with parents. Furthermore, it was used to determine the respondents' level of competency in dealing with special needs education students in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, diversity of students, curriculum modification, systematic evaluation, and community linkages and professional development.

The study also employed a descriptive-comparative research design to determine whether significant differences existed in the respondents' knowledge and competency levels when grouped according to their demographic profile variables. This design enabled the researcher to compare groups of respondents based on characteristics such as educational attainment, teaching position, seminars and trainings attended, and years of experience in handling students with special needs.

Moreover, a descriptive-correlational research design was utilized to determine the significant relationship between the respondents' knowledge and competency levels in handling students with special needs education. This design allowed the researcher to examine the degree of association between the variables without manipulating them.

In addition, the study included the identification of challenges encountered by receiving teachers in handling students with special needs education, as well as the recommended solutions to address these challenges. The findings served as the basis for proposing a training program aimed at enhancing the knowledge and competency levels of receiving teachers and improving inclusive education practices in public junior high schools.

Through the integration of these research designs, the study provided a comprehensive assessment of the preparedness, competencies, and challenges of receiving teachers in inclusive educational settings.

The study was conducted in selected public junior high schools in Congressional District II, Division of Valenzuela City, which implement inclusive education programs and accommodate students with special needs education (SNED). The area is located in the northern part of Metro Manila and is composed of diverse barangays with growing residential, commercial, and industrial communities. The schools are under the supervision of the Schools Division Office of Valenzuela, which actively supports the implementation of inclusive and equitable education programs.

Congressional District II of Valenzuela City is recognized for its continued efforts in promoting inclusive education in public schools through the integration of students with special needs into regular classroom settings. Public junior high schools within the district provide educational services and support mechanisms for students with diverse learning needs, allowing receiving teachers to directly handle and manage learners with special needs education in inclusive classrooms.

The district continuously strengthens its inclusive education programs through teacher training, professional development activities, provision of instructional resources, and



collaboration with Special Needs Education (SNED) teachers, parents, and community stakeholders. These initiatives aim to improve the knowledge and competency of receiving teachers in handling students with special needs education effectively.

In addition, some schools within the division have access to specialized instructional materials, assistive technologies, and support services designed to address the needs of learners with disabilities and other exceptionalities. The Schools Division Office also promotes policies and programs aligned with the Department of Education's goals for inclusive and learner-centered education.

The identified public junior high schools in Congressional District II, Valenzuela City were considered appropriate and relevant locales for the study because they provided the actual educational setting where receiving teachers handle students with special needs education. These conditions enabled the researcher to assess the knowledge and competency levels of receiving teachers in dealing with students with special needs education in inclusive junior high school environments.

The study covered all receiving teachers handling students with special needs education in public junior high schools in Congressional District II, Division of Valenzuela City. The total population of the study consisted of 257 receiving teachers from five public junior high schools within the district. Since the population size was manageable, the researcher utilized the total population; therefore, no sampling technique or sample size computation using Slovin's formula was employed.

The respondents were distributed across five schools, identified as School A, School B, School C, School D, and School E. School A had 40 receiving teachers, representing 15.56% of the total population. School B had 11 receiving teachers or 4.28% of the population. School C consisted of 54 receiving teachers, equivalent to 21.01% of the total population. Meanwhile, School D had 72 receiving teachers or 28.02%, while School E had the largest number with 80 receiving teachers, representing 31.13% of the total population.

By including all 257 receiving teachers in the study, the researcher ensured complete representation of the target population. This approach strengthened the reliability, validity, and comprehensiveness of the gathered data and provided a more accurate assessment of the knowledge and competency levels of receiving teachers in handling students with special needs education.

The research instrument utilized in this study was a researcher-developed questionnaire grounded in relevant literature, previous studies, and aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). The instrument was designed to collect data on the knowledge and level of competency of receiving teachers in handling learners with special needs (LWSN), as well as to determine the challenges they encountered and the possible interventions to strengthen inclusive education practices in public secondary schools.

The questionnaire was composed of five parts designed to address the objectives of the study. The first part focused on the demographic profile of the respondents and gathered information regarding their age, sex, civil status, Bachelors' Degree, highest educational attainment, length of teaching experience, and number of years handling students with special



needs. These variables provided a background of the respondents and served as a basis for analyzing possible differences in their knowledge and competency levels.

The second part assessed the knowledge of receiving teachers in handling learners with special needs. It contained items that measured teachers' understanding of Special Education concepts, principles, and practices, including the knowledge of Special Education policies, understanding of students' needs, application of differentiated instruction, classroom management techniques in inclusive settings, utilization of assistive technologies, and collaboration with parents. The indicators were anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), particularly Domain 3 (Diversity of Learners) and Domain 4 (Curriculum and Planning).

The third part determined the level of competency of receiving teachers in handling students with special needs. This section evaluated the extent to which teachers demonstrated the professional competencies required in inclusive education settings. The indicators were aligned with the seven domains of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), namely Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Learning Environment, Diversity of Students, Curriculum Modification, Systematic Evaluation, Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, and Personal Growth and Professional Development. The items measured how effectively teachers translated their knowledge into actual classroom practices and instructional decisions.

The fourth part identified the challenges encountered by receiving teachers in teaching learners with special needs. It included statements related to common barriers experienced in inclusive classrooms, such as limited instructional resources, insufficient training opportunities, lack of support and collaboration, difficulties in classroom management, and challenges in implementing inclusive education policies and practices. The responses provided insights into the factors that may affect teachers' effectiveness in handling diverse learners.

The fifth and final part focused on proposed training programs and interventions. Respondents were asked to provide recommendations on professional development activities and support mechanisms that could strengthen their knowledge and competencies in handling students with special needs. Suggested interventions included workshops on inclusive teaching strategies, seminars on specific disabilities and learning needs, training on assistive technologies, and collaborative planning sessions with SNED teachers and specialists. The information gathered from this section served as the basis for developing recommendations and intervention programs to enhance inclusive education practices in public junior high schools.

The instrument made use of a Likert-scale format, allowing respondents to express their level of agreement with a set of statements. This approach facilitated the collection of quantifiable and standardized data, enabling systematic analysis and comparison of responses.

The research instrument, a researcher-developed questionnaire, underwent a rigorous validation process to ensure that it accurately measured the intended constructs related to the knowledge and level of competency of receiving teachers handling learners with special needs. To establish content validity, the instrument was reviewed by three experts in the field of Special Needs Education. The validators assessed the clarity, relevance, appropriateness, and alignment



of each item with the objectives of the study. Their recommendations and suggestions served as the basis for revising and refining the questionnaire to improve its overall quality and validity.

The panel of validators was composed of three experts with extensive experience and expertise in Special Needs Education and inclusive teaching practices. The first validator was a Master Teacher II in English with a SPED background, currently assigned in one of the pioneer SPED-integrated junior high schools in Valenzuela. She has more than fifteen years of experience in handling learners with learning disabilities and behavioral difficulties. The second validator was the Division SPED Supervisor of the Schools Division Office of Valenzuela, who holds a Master's degree in Special Education and possesses extensive experience in supervising inclusive education programs. She provided valuable insights to ensure that the instrument was aligned with DepEd policies and relevant to the local educational context. The third validator was a College Professor in Special Education from a recognized state university in Metro Manila. Holding a doctorate in Education and specializing in teacher preparation and training for inclusive education, he ensured the theoretical and pedagogical soundness of the questionnaire.

After the expert validation process, the questionnaire was pilot-tested on a small group of receiving teachers outside the study locale to determine the clarity, comprehensibility, and suitability of the items. Feedback obtained during the pilot testing led to further refinements in the questionnaire's content and structure, ensuring its appropriateness for the actual conduct of the study.

To determine the reliability of the instrument, the revised questionnaire was pilot-tested among receiving teachers from selected schools in the First District of Valenzuela that were not included in the actual study. The responses gathered during the pilot testing were subjected to reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha coefficient to measure the internal consistency of the instrument.

The results revealed very high reliability coefficients across all domains. For the Knowledge in Handling Learners with Special Needs domain, Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.887 to 0.990. The Level of Competency of Receiving Teachers in Handling Learners with Special Needs domain yielded reliability coefficients ranging from 0.940 to 0.976. The Challenges Encountered subscale obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.934, while the Recommended Solutions subscale recorded a coefficient of 0.970.

Overall, the instrument obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.993, indicating excellent internal consistency and reliability. These results demonstrate that the questionnaire consistently measures the variables under investigation and is therefore suitable for use in the main data collection phase of the study.

The validation and reliability testing procedures ensured that the research instrument was both accurate and dependable, thereby enhancing the credibility, consistency, and trustworthiness of the data gathered in the study.

To ensure compliance with ethical and acceptable research standards, the study strictly followed established protocols that protected the rights and welfare of all participants. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Ethics Review Committee of Our Lady of Fatima University. In addition, formal written or email permissions were secured from the heads of the school divisions and institutions involved in the study. All prospective respondents were provided with an informed consent form that clearly explained the purpose, scope, possible risks, and benefits of the research. Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were free to



withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences to their professional status.

The study adhered to the ethical principle of beneficence by seeking to provide potential benefits to educational institutions and receiving teachers through insights into their level of knowledge and awareness in handling learners with special educational needs. Participation contributed to a better understanding of inclusive education practices, which may support improved instructional strategies and learner assistance. Although minimal risks such as discomfort or concern about perceived evaluation of competence were anticipated, these were addressed through strict confidentiality measures, assurance that individual performance would not be assessed, and the use of coded identifiers (e.g., VT01 for teacher-respondents and SA01 for school administrators) to ensure anonymity. These measures also upheld the principle of non-maleficence by ensuring that no harm would be caused to any participant.

Data collection was conducted primarily through the distribution of printed questionnaires on-site; however, Google Forms was utilized as an alternative when necessary to ensure convenience and reduce disruption to respondents' schedules. The questionnaire was prepared in English, which served as the professional language of the participants. No financial incentives were provided, although respondents were given a personalized note of appreciation for their participation.

Strict confidentiality was maintained throughout the research process, and all collected data were handled with full respect for privacy. Data were securely stored in a local drive and retained only until the completion and final defense of the study. Afterward, all digital and printed materials, including backups, were permanently deleted or destroyed.

Participants were also informed of their rights, including access to the study's results upon request. In cases where publication of the research was pursued, participants would be duly informed and additional consent would be sought for the use of data. Overall, the entire research process was designed to uphold fairness, respect, transparency, and integrity in accordance with ethical research standards.

The data gathering process followed a systematic procedure to ensure the reliability and validity of the information collected. Initially, the research instrument, a validated questionnaire, was reviewed by three experts in Special Education to ensure its clarity, relevance, and appropriateness. Based on their recommendations, necessary revisions were made to improve the quality of the instrument. A pilot test was then conducted in selected schools within the 2nd District of Valenzuela that were not part of the main study. The reliability of the instrument was determined using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, and only questionnaires that met the acceptable reliability threshold were used in the final data collection.

After finalizing the instrument, formal permissions were obtained from the Schools Division Office of Valenzuela City and the principals of the selected schools. The approval letters outlined the purpose and significance of the study to secure administrative support. Coordination with school heads facilitated the identification and recruitment of receiving teacher-respondents.

The finalized questionnaire was administered personally to the respondents. Clear instructions were provided to ensure proper understanding of the items, and a specific timeframe was given for completion and retrieval. Respondents were assured of confidentiality and anonymity to encourage honest and accurate responses. Once collected, all questionnaires were



carefully checked, and incomplete or invalid responses were excluded from the analysis.

The gathered data were then encoded and subjected to statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the respondents' demographic profiles as well as their levels of knowledge and competency, while inferential statistics were applied to answer the research questions, particularly in determining significant differences and relationships among variables. This structured process ensured that ethical standards were observed and that the data collected were complete, valid, and reliable.

To analyze the data gathered in this study, a range of statistical tools was employed in accordance with the research questions and the nature of the collected data. Descriptive statistics, including frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were used to summarize the demographic profile of the respondents. These included variables such as age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of service, and years of experience in handling learners with special needs. These descriptive measures provided a comprehensive overview of the participants' characteristics and served as a basis for further interpretation and analysis.

To determine the respondents' level of knowledge and competency in handling learners with special needs, the weighted mean was utilized. This statistical technique ensured that each indicator was appropriately represented and proportionately contributed to the overall interpretation of scores, allowing for an accurate and balanced assessment of responses.

To examine whether significant differences existed in knowledge and competency across demographic variables, inferential statistics were applied, specifically the t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The t-test was used for comparisons involving two groups, while ANOVA was employed for variables with three or more categories. These tests determined whether demographic factors significantly influenced the respondents' levels of knowledge and competency.

Furthermore, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to assess the relationship between respondents' knowledge and their level of competency. This analysis measured the strength and direction of the relationship between the two variables and determined whether higher knowledge was associated with higher competency.

Overall, the use of these statistical tools provided a comprehensive and systematic analysis of the data, ensuring that the study's objectives and research questions were appropriately addressed.

Table 2
Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
21-30	57	22.2
31-40	89	34.6
41-50	54	21.0
51-60	56	21.8
61 and Above	1	0.4
Total	257	100.0

3. Results

Table 3

Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	58	22.6
Female	194	75.5
Prefer not to say	5	1.9
Total	257	100.0

Table 4

Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Civil Status

Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage
Single	111	43.2
Married	145	56.4
Widow/Widower	1	0.4
Total	257	100.0

Table 5

Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Bachelor's Degree

Bachelor's Degree	Frequency	Percentage
BSED	224	87.2
Others	33	12.8
Total	257	100.0

Table 6

Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
College Graduate	35	13.6
Master's (units)	200	77.8
Master's Degree	20	7.8
Doctorate (units)	1	0.4
Doctorate Degree	1	0.4
Total	257	100.0

Table 7
Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Teaching Position

Teaching Position	Frequency	Percentage
Teacher I	80	31.1
Teacher II	35	13.6
Teacher III	115	44.7
Master Teacher I	14	5.4
Master Teacher II	13	5.1
Total	257	100.0

Table 8
Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Seminar and Trainings Attended

Seminar and Trainings Attended	Frequency	Percentage
1-5	236	91.8
6-10	5	1.9
11-15	11	4.3
16-20	5	1.9
Total	257	100.0

Table 9
Demographic Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Years of Experience in Handling Students with Special Educational Needs

Years of Experience in Handling Students with Special Educational Needs	Frequency	Percentage
1-3	129	50.2
4-6	62	24.1
7-9	8	3.1
10-12	35	13.6
13-15	5	1.9
More than 15 years	18	7.0
Total	257	100.0

Table 10

 Respondents' Knowledge in Handling Students with Special Needs in Terms of
 Knowledge of Special Education Policies

Knowledge of Special Education Policies	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. understand the unique learning needs of students with special education needs.	3.17	1.10	Knowledgeable
2. recognize the strengths and abilities of learners with special education needs.	3.38	1.04	Knowledgeable
3. identify the academic challenges experienced by students with special education needs.	3.32	1.05	Knowledgeable
4. understand the social and emotional needs of learners with special education needs.	3.26	1.04	Knowledgeable
5. recognize the behavioral characteristics that may affect students' learning and participation.	3.41	0.97	Knowledgeable
6. understand how different disabilities influence students' learning and classroom performance.	3.84	0.97	More Knowledgeable
7. identify the accommodations and modifications needed by students with special education needs.	3.33	1.01	Knowledgeable
8. recognize how students with special education needs respond to various instructional strategies.	3.60	0.99	More Knowledgeable
9. determine the factors that support or hinder the learning and development of students with special education needs.	3.16	1.06	Knowledgeable
10. interpret assessment results and classroom observations to better understand students' needs.	3.37	1.04	Knowledgeable

Average 3.38 1.03 Knowledgeable

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Knowledgeable, 1.50-2.49 Less Knowledgeable, 2.50-3.49 Knowledgeable, 3.50-4.49 More Knowledgeable, 4.50-5.00 Highly Knowledgeable

Table 11

Respondents' Knowledge in Handling Students with Special Needs in Terms of Understanding Students' Needs

Understanding Students' Needs	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. understand the unique learning needs of students with special education needs.	3.20	0.94	Knowledgeable
2. know the strengths and abilities of learners with special education needs.	3.03	0.90	Knowledgeable
3. determine the academic challenges experienced by students with special education needs.	3.26	1.04	Knowledgeable
4. comprehend the social and emotional needs of learners with special education needs.	3.15	1.00	Knowledgeable
5. recognize the behavioral characteristics that may affect students' learning and participation.	3.25	0.95	Knowledgeable
6. discern how different disabilities influence student's learning and classroom performance	2.68	1.13	Knowledgeable
7. grasp the accommodations and modifications needed by students with special education needs.	2.77	1.16	Knowledgeable
8. decipher how students with special education needs respond to various instructional strategies.	3.14	1.05	Knowledgeable
9. apprehend the factors that support or hinder the learning and development of students with special education needs.	3.16	1.10	Knowledgeable
10. follow assessment results and classroom observations to better understand students' needs.	3.11	1.09	Knowledgeable
Average	3.07	1.04	Knowledgeable

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Knowledgeable, 1.50-2.49 Less Knowledgeable, 2.50-3.49 Knowledgeable, 3.50-4.49 More Knowledgeable, 4.50-5.00 Highly Knowledgeable

Table 12

 Respondents' Knowledge in Handling Students with Special Needs in Terms of
 Application of Differentiated Instruction

Application of Differentiated Instruction	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. understand principles of differentiated instruction.	3.75	0.94	More Knowledgeable
2. select strategies for learners with diverse needs.	3.69	0.88	More Knowledgeable
3. adapt lesson plans to different learning styles.	3.63	0.89	More Knowledgeable
4. design activities for learners with varying abilities.	3.53	0.87	More Knowledgeable
5. use multiple assessment methods to measure progress.	3.61	0.95	More Knowledgeable
6. identify assistive technologies suitable for learning support.	3.54	0.95	More Knowledgeable
7. recognize strategies to manage inclusive classrooms.	3.47	0.92	More Knowledgeable
8. apply methods to promote positive behavior.	3.63	0.86	More Knowledgeable
9. incorporate techniques to increase student engagement.	3.68	0.87	More Knowledgeable
10. integrate technology to support learning objectives.	3.70	0.85	More Knowledgeable
Average	3.62	0.90	More Knowledgeable

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Knowledgeable, 1.50-2.49 Less Knowledgeable, 2.50-3.49 Knowledgeable, 3.50-4.49 More Knowledgeable, 4.50-5.00 Highly Knowledgeable

Table 13

 Respondents' Knowledge in Handling Students with Special Needs in Terms of
 Classroom Management Techniques

Classroom Management Techniques	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. collaborate with parents to support students.	3.71	1.05	More Knowledgeable
2. communicate with teachers to coordinate instructional strategies.	3.77	0.99	More Knowledgeable
3. work with special education specialists and therapists.	3.23	1.01	Knowledgeable
4. coordinate with school counselors for emotional support.	3.48	1.05	Knowledgeable
5. advocate for students' needs in school and community settings.	3.45	0.96	Knowledgeable
6. understand the roles of multidisciplinary teams.	3.46	1.03	Knowledgeable
7. participate in meetings to discuss learner progress.	3.73	0.95	More Knowledgeable
8. share information with administrators for resource planning.	3.50	0.96	Knowledgeable
9. monitor compliance with individualized learning plans.	3.44	0.95	Knowledgeable
10. engage with community organizations to support learning.	3.46	1.03	Knowledgeable
Average	3.52	1.00	More Knowledgeable

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Knowledgeable, 1.50-2.49 Less Knowledgeable, 2.50-3.49 Knowledgeable, 3.50-4.49 More Knowledgeable, 4.50-5.00 Highly Knowledgeable

Table 14

Respondents' Knowledge in Handling Students with Special Needs in Terms of Use of Assistive Technology and Tools

Use of Assistive Technology and Tools	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. integrate assistive technology tools to support students' learning needs.	3.54	0.86	More Knowledgeable
2. utilize software and apps to enhance communication for students with speech or language difficulties.	3.11	1.05	Knowledgeable
3. employ devices such as audio recorders or text-to-speech programs for students with reading challenges.	3.09	1.11	Knowledgeable
4. apply adaptive technologies to facilitate participation in classroom activities for students with physical disabilities.	3.28	1.04	Knowledgeable
5. incorporate visual aids and digital platforms to assist in learning for students with visual impairments.	3.42	1.15	Knowledgeable
6. modify learning materials using technology to meet the specific needs of diverse learners.	3.43	1.10	Knowledgeable
7. utilize assistive listening devices to improve auditory access for students with hearing impairments.	3.14	1.09	Knowledgeable
8. train students to use assistive technology tools effectively to promote independence.	3.11	1.07	Knowledgeable
9. evaluate the effectiveness of different assistive technologies in supporting students' academic performance.	3.25	1.11	Knowledgeable
10. collaborate with specialists to select and implement appropriate assistive tools for individual learners.	3.17	1.19	Knowledgeable
Average	3.25	1.08	Knowledgeable

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Knowledgeable, 1.50-2.49 Less Knowledgeable, 2.50-3.49 Knowledgeable, 3.50-4.49 More Knowledgeable, 4.50-5.00 Highly Knowledgeable

Table 15

 Respondents' Knowledge in Handling Students with Special Needs in Terms of
 Collaboration with Parents

Collaboration with Parents	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. collaborate with parents to create individualized plans for students with special needs.	3.31	1.09	Knowledgeable
2. communicate regularly with other teachers to share strategies and insights for supporting learners.	3.46	1.00	Knowledgeable
3. partner with multidisciplinary teams and special education professionals to address specific learning challenges.	3.31	0.99	Knowledgeable
4. work with school counselors to support the emotional and social needs of students.	3.43	0.95	Knowledgeable
5. engage with administrators to ensure the appropriate resources are available for special education programs.	3.37	0.93	Knowledgeable
6. consult with healthcare providers to understand students' medical needs and accommodations.	3.28	1.02	Knowledgeable
7. facilitate open communication channels between home and school to monitor student progress.	3.42	0.95	Knowledgeable
8. participate in team meetings to discuss and plan for students' educational goals.	3.43	0.99	Knowledgeable
9. advocate for students' needs during collaborative discussions with stakeholders.	3.48	0.94	Knowledgeable
10. share relevant student information with multidisciplinary teams to create holistic support systems.	3.50	1.04	More Knowledgeable
Average	3.40	0.99	Knowledgeable

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Knowledgeable, 1.50-2.49 Less Knowledgeable, 2.50-3.49 Knowledgeable, 3.50-4.49 More Knowledgeable, 4.50-5.00 Highly Knowledgeable

Table 16

 Level of Competency of the Respondents in Dealing with Special Needs Education
 Students in Terms of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. apply knowledge of students' disabilities to plan lessons.	3.30	0.99	Competent
2. utilize IEPs to guide instructional activities.	3.16	0.97	Competent
3. implement differentiated instruction in practice.	3.48	0.87	Competent
4. integrate assistive technologies into learning tasks.	3.37	0.94	Competent
5. employ strategies to address cognitive, emotional, and social challenges.	3.43	0.86	Competent
6. use positive behavioral interventions (PBIS) in classrooms.	3.42	0.87	Competent
7. adjust lessons to meet learners' individual goals.	3.53	0.91	More Competent
8. collaborate with colleagues to enhance instructional effectiveness.	3.60	0.97	More Competent
9. analyze assessment data to inform teaching decisions.	3.42	0.97	Competent
10. align instructional content with students' developmental needs.	3.48	0.94	Competent
Average	3.42	0.93	Competent

 Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Competent, 1.50-2.49 Less Competent, 2.50-3.49 Competent,
 3.50-4.49 More Competent, 4.50-5.00 Highly Competent

Table 17

 Level of Competency of the Respondents in Dealing with Special Needs Education
 Students in Terms of Learning Environment

Learning Environment	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. create a physically accessible and inclusive classroom.	3.66	0.85	More Competent
2. ensure safety and support for all learners.	3.93	0.84	More Competent
3. use structured routines and clear instructions for classroom management.	3.80	0.86	More Competent
4. provide accommodation for sensory processing difficulties.	3.49	0.90	Competent
5. promote collaboration and respectful interactions among students.	3.86	0.97	More Competent
6. implement seating arrangements that meet learners' needs.	3.86	0.88	More Competent
7. apply classroom management strategies to maintain order.	3.80	0.86	More Competent
8. adapt classroom materials and layout for effective learning.	3.62	0.89	More Competent
9. foster a positive culture that values diversity.	3.88	0.90	More Competent
10. encourage student independence within the learning environment.	3.81	0.84	More Competent
Average	3.77	0.88	More Competent

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Competent, 1.50-2.49 Less Competent, 2.50-3.49 Competent, 3.50-4.49 More Competent, 4.50-5.00 Highly Competent

Table 18

 Level of Competency of the Respondents in Dealing with Special Needs Education
 Students in Terms of Diversity of Students

Diversity of Students	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. design lesson plans with appropriate accommodations and modifications.	3.54	0.91	More Competent
2. align learning objectives with individual learner goals.	3.60	0.89	More Competent
3. select instructional materials that meet diverse needs.	3.65	0.92	More Competent
4. develop differentiated assessments for learners.	3.58	0.90	More Competent
5. incorporate multi-sensory approaches into lessons.	3.42	0.92	Competent
6. review and revise curriculum based on students' performance.	3.55	0.97	More Competent
7. apply formative and alternative assessment methods.	3.75	0.95	More Competent
8. provide constructive feedback to guide learner improvement.	3.60	0.96	More Competent
9. record and track learner performance accurately.	3.73	0.99	More Competent
10. communicate assessment results effectively to stakeholders.	3.67	0.93	More Competent
Average	3.61	0.93	More Competent

 Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Competent, 1.50-2.49 Less Competent, 2.50-3.49 Competent,
 3.50-4.49 More Competent, 4.50-5.00 Highly Competent

Table 19

 Level of Competency of the Respondents in Dealing with Special Needs Education
 Students in Terms of Curriculum Modification

Curriculum and Planning	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. collaborate with parents to support student learning.	3.70	1.01	More Competent
2. engage community resources for learner support.	3.45	0.96	Competent
3. participate in workshops and training to enhance skills.	3.49	1.08	Competent
4. apply new teaching strategies learned from professional development.	3.60	0.97	More Competent
5. advocate for inclusive education practices in school and community.	3.57	0.94	More Competent
6. seek mentorship to improve teaching effectiveness.	3.55	0.97	More Competent
7. share experiences and best practices with colleagues.	3.52	0.99	More Competent
8. lead initiatives to support learners outside the classroom.	3.38	0.89	Competent
9. conduct action research to improve instructional methods.	3.11	1.14	Competent
10. evaluate professional growth to enhance teaching quality.	3.54	0.89	More Competent
Average	3.49	0.98	Competent

 Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Competent, 1.50-2.49 Less Competent, 2.50-3.49 Competent,
 3.50-4.49 More Competent, 4.50-5.00 Highly Competent

Table 20

 Level of Competency of the Respondents in Dealing with Special Needs Education
 Students in Terms of Systematic Evaluation

Assessment and Reporting	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. utilize a variety of assessment tools and strategies appropriate for students with special needs.	3.43	0.91	Competent
2. modify assessments to accommodate the diverse learning abilities of students with disabilities.	3.36	0.90	Competent
3. implement formative assessments to monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.	3.51	0.94	More Competent
4. provide clear and constructive feedback to support student growth and learning.	3.56	0.95	More Competent
5. use alternative assessment methods such as portfolios, observations, and performance-based tasks.	3.51	0.96	More Competent
6. maintain accurate and confidential records of student performance and progress.	3.74	0.93	More Competent
7. collaborate with special education teachers, therapists, and parents to assess student learning outcomes.	3.45	0.98	Competent
8. adhere to legal and ethical guidelines in reporting student progress and assessment results.	3.62	0.90	More Competent
9. interpret and utilize assessment data to inform instructional planning and interventions.	3.47	0.91	Competent
10. communicate assessment results effectively to stakeholders, including parents and school administrators.	3.49	0.91	Competent
Average	3.51	0.93	More Competent

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Competent, 1.50-2.49 Less Competent, 2.50-3.49 Competent, 3.50-4.49 More Competent, 4.50-5.00 Highly Competent

Table 21

 Level of Competency of the Respondents in Dealing with Special Needs Education Students
 in Terms of Community Linkages and Professional Development

Community Linkages and Professional Development	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I...			
1. actively engage with parents and guardians to support the learning and well-being of students with special needs.	3.53	0.98	More Competent
2. collaborate with community organizations to provide additional resources and support for special education learners.	3.31	0.93	Competent
3. participate in professional development programs related to special education practices and inclusive teaching strategies.	3.32	0.91	Competent
4. attend workshops, seminars, and training sessions to enhance knowledge and skills in handling students with disabilities.	3.23	0.87	Competent
5. build partnerships with local agencies to improve services and opportunities for students with special needs.	3.18	0.93	Competent
6. advocate for policies and programs that promote inclusive education and equal opportunities for learners with disabilities.	3.26	0.90	Competent
7. seek mentorship and guidance from special education experts to improve teaching effectiveness.	3.24	0.87	Competent
8. apply new strategies and techniques learned from professional development activities in classroom instruction.	3.35	0.90	Competent
9. engage in research or action-based learning to enhance the quality of special education teaching.	3.17	0.94	Competent
10. share best practices and experiences with colleagues to foster a collaborative and inclusive school environment.	3.31	0.86	Competent
Average	3.29	0.91	Competent
Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Competent, 1.50-2.49 Less Competent, 2.50-3.49 Competent, 3.50-4.49 More Competent, 4.50-5.00 Highly Competent			

Table 22 Significant Difference Between the Respondents' Knowledge in Handling Special Needs Education Students when their Profile is Considered

Profile	Knowledge					
	Understanding Students' Needs	Knowledge of Special Education Policies	Application of Differentiated Instruction	Classroom Management Techniques	Use of Assistive Technology and Tools	Collaboration with Parents
Age	0.177 NS	0.148 NS	0.152 NS	0.168 NS	0.218 NS	0.148 NS
Gender	0.000 S *Prefer not to say	0.002 S *Prefer not to say	0.004 S *Prefer not to say	0.003 S *Prefer not to say	0.003 S *Prefer not to say	0.130 NS
Civil Status	0.111 NS	0.127 NS	0.101 NS	0.133 NS	0.141 NS	0.221 NS
Bachelor's Degree	0.000 S *BSED	0.000 S *BSED	0.000 S *BSED	0.000 S *BSED	0.000 S *BSED	0.000 S *BSED
Highest Educational Attainment	0.170 NS	0.615 NS	0.863 NS	0.642 NS	0.097 NS	0.332 NS
Teaching Position	0.000 S *Master Teacher I	0.000 S *Master Teacher I	0.000 S *Master Teacher I	0.000 S *Master Teacher I	0.000 S *Master Teacher I	0.000 S *Master Teacher I
Seminars and Trainings Attended	0.000 S *16-20	0.000 S *16-21	0.000 S *16-22	0.000 S *16-23	0.000 S *16-24	0.000 S *16-25
Years of Experience in Handling Students with Special	0.000 S *13-15	0.000 S *13-16	0.000 S *13-17	0.000 S *13-18	0.000 S *13-19	0.000 S *13-20

Educational
Needs

Legend: Significant (S) at $P < 0.05$, Not Significant (NS), *Highest Assessment

Table 23
Significant Difference in the Respondents' Level of Competency in Dealing with Special Needs Education Students when their Profile is Considered

Profile	Competency				Systematic Evaluation	Community Linkages and Professional Development
	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Learning Environment	Diversity of Students	Curriculum Modification		
Age	0.178 NS	0.195 NS	0.114 NS	0.188 NS	0.165 NS	0.156 NS
Civil Status	0.240 NS	0.224 NS	0.360 NS	0.099 NS	0.372 NS	0.089 NS
Bachelor's Degree Highest Educational Attainment	0.000 S *BSED	0.000 S *BSED	0.001 S *BSED	0.000 S *BSED	0.000 S *BSED	0.000 S *BSED
Teaching Position	0.661 NS	0.283 NS	0.343 NS	0.798 NS	0.900 NS	0.606 NS
	0.000 S *Master Teacher I	0.007 S Master Teacher I *	0.005 S *Master Teacher I	0.000 S *Master Teacher I	0.000 S *Master Teacher I	0.000 S *Master Teacher I

Seminar and Trainings Attended	0.002 S *16-20	0.002 S *16-20	0.000 S *16-20	0.000 S *16-20	0.000 S *16-20	0.000 S *16-20
Years of Experience in Handling Students with Special Educational Needs	0.000 S *13-15	0.000 S *13-16	0.000 S *13-17	0.000 S *13-18	0.000 S *13-19	0.000 S *13-20

Legend: Significant (S) at $P < 0.05$, Not Significant (NS), *Highest Assessment

Table 24

Significant Relationship Between the Respondents' Knowledge and their Level of Competency in Handling Junior High School Special Needs Education Students

Knowledge	Competency			
	Pearson r	Qualitative Description	P-Value	Remark
	0.930	Very High Positive Relationship	0.000	Significant

Legend: 0 No Relationship, $\pm 0.01 - \pm 0.20$ Negligible Relationship, $\pm 0.21 - \pm 0.40$ Low Relationship, $\pm 0.41 - \pm 0.70$ Moderate Relationship, $\pm 0.71 - \pm 0.90$ High Relationship, $\pm 0.91 - \pm 0.99$ Very High Relationship, ± 1.00 Perfect Relationship, *Significant at $P < 0.05$

Table 25

Challenges Receiving Teachers Encountered in Handling Special Needs Education Students

Challenges	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher it is challenging for me to...			
1. address the diverse needs of learners with varying disabilities.	3.72	0.89	Significant Challenge
2. manage challenging behaviors exhibited by students with special needs.	3.61	0.86	Significant Challenge
3. adapt teaching strategies to accommodate different learning abilities.	3.61	0.85	Significant Challenge



4. provide adequate time to plan individualized lessons and activities.	3.61	0.86	Significant Challenge
5. access appropriate resources and materials for special education learners.	3.61	0.89	Significant Challenge
6. collaborate effectively with parents and specialists to support learners.	3.52	0.91	Significant Challenge
7. balance the needs of special education students with the demands of other pupils.	3.60	0.90	Significant Challenge
8. implement inclusive practices in classrooms with limited training or support.	3.64	0.90	Significant Challenge
9. navigate communication barriers with non-verbal learners or those with language delays.	3.68	0.84	Significant Challenge
10. respond to emotional and social challenges faced by special needs students.	3.75	0.89	Significant Challenge
Average	3.63	0.88	Significant Challenge

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not a Challenge, 1.50-2.49 Slight Challenge 2.50-3.49 Moderate Significant Challenge, 3.50-4.49 Significant Challenge 4.50-5.00 Very Significant Challenge

Table 26

Recommended Solutions to Address the Challenges Encountered by Receiving Teachers in Handling Special Needs Education Students

Recommended Solutions	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
As a Receiving Teacher I should...			
1. provide individualized attention to meet the unique needs of special education students.	4.21	0.87	Agree
2. collaborate with parents, specialists, and colleagues to create effective interventions.	4.19	0.88	Agree
3. attend professional development sessions on special education practices and strategies.	4.23	0.83	Agree
4. utilize assistive technologies and tools to support diverse learning needs.	4.17	0.88	Agree

5. adapt teaching methods to accommodate learners with varying abilities and challenges.	4.23	0.88	Agree
6. create an inclusive and supportive classroom environment for all pupils.	4.19	0.92	Agree
7. advocate for sufficient resources and support to improve special education practices.	4.17	0.94	Agree
8. develop and implement Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) tailored to each learner.	4.06	0.94	Agree
9. promote understanding and acceptance of diversity within the classroom.	4.08	0.94	Agree
10. foster emotional and social growth by providing consistent encouragement and support.	4.19	0.86	Agree
Average	4.17	0.89	Agree

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Strongly Disagree 1.50-2.49 Disagree, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Agree, 3.50-4.49 Agree 4.50-5.00 Strongly Agree

4. Discussions

This chapter presents a comprehensive analysis and interpretation of the data collected from Special Needs Education (SNED) teachers in public junior secondary schools in the Division of Valenzuela, Philippines. It systematically discusses the findings in relation to the study's research questions, focusing on the respondents' levels of knowledge and competencies of receiving teachers in handling students with special needs.

The results presented in Table 2 indicate that the highest proportion of respondents belongs to the 31–40 age bracket, with 89 individuals or 34.6%, making it the dominant group among all categories. This is followed by respondents aged 21–30 years old, who account for 57 participants or 22.2%, and those aged 51–60 years old, with 56 respondents or 21.8%. Closely comparable is the 41–50 age group, comprising 54 individuals or 21.0%. In contrast, the least represented group is those aged 61 years and above, with only 1 respondent or 0.4%. Overall, the study includes a total of 257 respondents (100%), showing that most participants are concentrated in the middle-adulthood stage (31–50 years old), while senior respondents are minimally represented. No grand mean is included in this table.

The data presented in Table 3 show that most respondents are female, comprising 194 individuals or 75.5%, which represents the largest proportion among all gender categories. This is followed by male respondents, who account for 58 individuals or 22.6%. Meanwhile, a small fraction of respondents, 5 individuals or 1.9%, preferred not to disclose their gender. Overall, the



study includes a total of 257 respondents (100%). The results clearly indicate a marked gender imbalance, where female participants significantly dominate the sample, while males and non-disclosing respondents represent a much smaller proportion. No grand mean is presented in this table.

The results shown in Table 4 reveal that most respondents are married, comprising 145 individuals or 56.4%, which represents the highest proportion among all categories of civil status. This is followed by single respondents, with 111 individuals or 43.2%. In contrast, the widow/widower group is the least represented, with only 1 respondent or 0.4%. Overall, the study includes a total of 257 respondents (100%). These findings suggest that most participants are currently in marital relationships, while a considerable portion remains single, and only a very small number belong to the widowed category. No grand mean is presented in this table.

The results presented in Table 5 indicate that most of the respondents are graduates of the Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) program, comprising 224 individuals or 87.2%, which represents the dominant category. On the other hand, respondents with other bachelor's degrees account for 33 individuals or 12.8%, making them the least represented group. Overall, the study includes a total of 257 respondents (100%). These findings suggest that the sample is predominantly composed of BSED graduates, while only a small portion comes from other academic disciplines. No grand mean is reflected in this table.

The data in Table 6 indicates that most respondents have earned Master's units, with 200 individuals or 77.8%, representing the highest proportion among all categories. This is followed by college graduates with 35 respondents (13.6%), and those who have completed a Master's degree with 20 respondents (7.8%). The least represented groups are those with Doctorate (units) and Doctorate degree, each with only 1 respondent or 0.4%. The total number of respondents is 257 (100.0%). These results show that most participants are engaged in postgraduate studies but have not yet completed their Master's degrees, while only a very small proportion have reached the doctoral level. No grand mean is reflected in the table.

The data in Table 7 reveal that most respondents hold the position of Teacher III, with 115 individuals or 44.7%, representing the highest proportion among all categories. This is followed by Teacher I with 80 respondents (31.1%), and Teacher II with 35 respondents (13.6%). Meanwhile, Master Teacher I and Master Teacher II comprise smaller proportions, with 14 respondents (5.4%) and 13 respondents (5.1%), respectively. The total number of respondents is 257 (100.0%). These findings indicate that most participants are positioned at the mid-level teaching rank, while fewer have advanced to master teacher roles. No grand mean is reflected in the table.

The data in Table 8 show that most respondents have attended 1–5 seminars and trainings, with 236 individuals or 91.8%, representing the highest proportion among all categories. This is followed by those who attended 11–15 seminars and trainings with 11 respondents (4.3%). Meanwhile, the groups who attended 6–10 and 16–20 seminars and trainings both have 5 respondents each, accounting for 1.9% respectively, making them the least represented categories. The total number of respondents is 257 (100.0%). These results indicate that most participants have limited exposure to seminars and trainings, while only a small proportion have attended a higher number of professional development activities. No grand mean is reflected in the table.



The data in Table 9 reveal that most respondents have 1–3 years of experience in handling students with special educational needs, with 129 individuals or 50.2%, representing the highest proportion among all categories. This is followed by those with 4–6 years of experience, comprising 62 respondents (24.1%). Next are respondents with 10–12 years of experience at 35 (13.6%), and those with more than 15 years at 18 (7.0%). Meanwhile, respondents with 7–9 years of experience account for 8 individuals (3.1%), and the least represented group is those with 13–15 years of experience, with only 5 respondents (1.9%). The total number of respondents is 257 (100.0%). These results indicate that most participants are relatively early in their experience of handling students with special educational needs, while fewer have long-term or extensive experience in this area. No grand mean is reflected in the table.

The data in Table 10 show that respondents are generally knowledgeable in terms of their knowledge of special education policies, with an overall weighted mean of 3.38 and a standard deviation of 1.03. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is maintaining confidentiality standards for learners (WM = 3.84), which is interpreted as more knowledgeable, followed by implementing classroom practices compliant with special education policies (WM = 3.60), also rated as more knowledgeable. Other indicators fall under the “knowledgeable” category, including recognizing teacher responsibilities according to special education laws (WM = 3.41), identifying learners’ rights under policies (WM = 3.38), analyzing policy implications for instruction (WM = 3.37), interpreting rules on accommodations and modifications (WM = 3.33), applying inclusive education principles (WM = 3.32), following procedures for IEP development and implementation (WM = 3.26), understanding key provisions of IDEA and related laws (WM = 3.17), and explaining the legal basis for equitable access to education (WM = 3.16). Overall, the results suggest that respondents demonstrate a solid understanding of special education policies, with stronger competence observed in ethical compliance and classroom implementation compared to foundational legal knowledge.

The data in Table 11 indicate that respondents are generally knowledgeable in understanding students’ needs, with an overall weighted mean of 3.07 and a standard deviation of 1.04. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is determining students’ academic strengths and weaknesses (WM = 3.26), followed closely by recognize the behavioral characteristics that may affect students’ learning and participation (WM = 3.25), and understand the unique learning needs (WM = 3.20). Other indicators such as apprehend the factors that support the learning and development (WM = 3.16), comprehend the social and emotional needs (WM = 3.15), decipher how students’ responses to teaching strategies (WM = 3.14), follow students’ performance across domains (WM = 3.11), and know behavioral patterns (WM = 3.03) also fall within the “knowledgeable” range. On the other hand, the lowest-rated indicators are grasp students based on developmental levels (WM = 2.77) and discern the medical or psychological reports (WM = 2.68), though both are still interpreted as “knowledgeable.” Overall, the results show a consistent level of knowledge across all variables, with slight variation in more technical competencies.

The data in Table 12 indicate that respondents are generally more knowledgeable in the application of differentiated instruction, with an overall weighted mean of 3.62 and a standard deviation of 0.90. Most indicators fall under the “more knowledgeable” category, with the highest-rated item being understanding the principles of differentiated instruction (WM = 3.75). This is followed by integrating technology to support learning objectives (WM = 3.70), selecting



strategies for learners with diverse needs (WM = 3.69), and incorporating techniques to increase student engagement (WM = 3.68). Other indicators also rated as “more knowledgeable” include adapting lesson plans to different learning styles (WM = 3.63), applying methods to promote positive behavior (WM = 3.63), using multiple assessment methods (WM = 3.61), identifying assistive technologies (WM = 3.54), and designing activities for learners with varying abilities (WM = 3.53). Meanwhile, recognizing strategies to manage inclusive classrooms obtained the lowest mean (WM = 3.47) and was interpreted as “knowledgeable.” Overall, the results suggest strong competency in differentiated instruction, particularly in instructional design, engagement strategies, and technology integration.

The data in Table 13 indicate that respondents are generally more knowledgeable in classroom management techniques for learners with special needs, as shown by the overall weighted mean of 3.52 with a standard deviation of 1.00. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is communicating with teachers to coordinate instructional strategies (WM = 3.77), followed by participating in meetings to discuss learner progress (WM = 3.73) and collaborating with parents to support learners (WM = 3.71), all of which are interpreted as “more knowledgeable.” These results suggest strong competency in collaborative and school-based coordination practices. Meanwhile, several indicators are rated as “knowledgeable,” including sharing information with administrators for resource planning (WM = 3.50), coordinating with school counselors for emotional support (WM = 3.48), understanding the roles of multidisciplinary teams (WM = 3.46), engaging with community organizations (WM = 3.46), advocating for learners’ needs (WM = 3.45), monitoring individualized learning plans (WM = 3.44), and working with special education specialists and therapists (WM = 3.23), which obtained the lowest mean. Overall, the findings show that respondents are more confident in direct collaboration within the school environment, particularly with teachers and parents, while relatively less knowledgeable in coordination with specialists and external support systems.

The data in Table 14 show that respondents are generally knowledgeable in the use of assistive technology and tools for learners with special needs, with an overall weighted mean of 3.25 and a standard deviation of 1.08. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is integrating assistive technology tools to support students’ learning needs (WM = 3.54), which is interpreted as “more knowledgeable.” This is followed by modifying learning materials using technology to meet diverse learners’ needs (WM = 3.43) and incorporating visual aids and digital platforms to assist learners with visual impairments (WM = 3.42). Other indicators fall under the “knowledgeable” category, including applying adaptive technologies for physical disabilities (WM = 3.28), evaluating the effectiveness of assistive technologies (WM = 3.25), collaborating with specialists in selecting tools (WM = 3.17), utilizing assistive listening devices (WM = 3.14), utilizing communication software for speech or language difficulties (WM = 3.11), training students to use assistive technology (WM = 3.11), and employing devices such as audio recorders and text-to-speech programs (WM = 3.09), which obtained the lowest mean. Overall, the results indicate that while respondents are generally capable of using assistive technologies in instruction, their proficiency is stronger in basic integration than in specialized or skill-intensive applications.



The data in Table 15 indicates that respondents are generally knowledgeable in terms of collaboration with stakeholders, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 3.40 with a standard deviation of 0.99. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is sharing relevant student information with multidisciplinary teams to create holistic support systems (WM = 3.50), which is interpreted as “more knowledgeable.” This is followed by advocating for students’ needs during collaborative discussions with stakeholders (WM = 3.48) and communicating regularly with other teachers to share strategies and insights (WM = 3.46), both of which are also relatively high. Other indicators fall under the “knowledgeable” category, including participating in team meetings to discuss educational goals (WM = 3.43), working with school counselors (WM = 3.43), facilitating home–school communication (WM = 3.42), engaging with administrators for resource support (WM = 3.37), collaborating with parents to create individualized plans (WM = 3.31), partnering with multidisciplinary teams (WM = 3.31), and consulting with healthcare providers (WM = 3.28), which obtained the lowest mean. Overall, the results suggest that respondents demonstrate consistent knowledge in stakeholder collaboration, with slightly stronger competence in information sharing and advocacy compared to coordination with external professionals such as healthcare providers.

The data in Table 16 indicate that respondents are generally competent in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy in dealing with learners with special needs, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 3.42 and a standard deviation of 0.93. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is collaborating with colleagues to enhance instructional effectiveness (WM = 3.60), followed by adjusting lessons to meet learners’ individual goals (WM = 3.53), both of which are interpreted as “more competent.” Other indicators fall under the “competent” category, including implementing differentiated instruction in practice (WM = 3.48), aligning instructional content with learners’ developmental needs (WM = 3.48), employing strategies to address cognitive, emotional, and social challenges (WM = 3.43), using positive behavioral interventions (WM = 3.42), analyzing assessment data to inform teaching decisions (WM = 3.42), integrating assistive technologies into learning tasks (WM = 3.37), applying knowledge of learners’ disabilities to plan lessons (WM = 3.30), and utilizing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to guide instruction (WM = 3.16), which obtained the lowest mean. Overall, the results suggest that respondents demonstrate solid pedagogical competence in inclusive education, with stronger performance in collaboration and instructional adjustment compared to the use of structured planning tools such as IEPs.

The data in Table 17 indicate that respondents are generally more competent in managing the learning environment for learners with special needs, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 3.77 with a standard deviation of 0.88. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is ensuring safety and support for all students (WM = 3.93), followed by fostering a positive culture that values diversity (WM = 3.88). Other indicators also rated as “more competent” include promoting collaboration and respectful interactions among students (WM = 3.86), implementing seating arrangements that meet learners’ needs (WM = 3.86), encouraging student independence within the learning environment (WM = 3.81), using structured routines and clear instructions (WM = 3.80), and applying classroom management strategies to maintain order (WM = 3.80). Additional indicators include creating a physically accessible and inclusive classroom (WM = 3.66) and adapting classroom materials and layout (WM = 3.62), all



interpreted as “more competent.” However, providing accommodation for sensory processing difficulties obtained the lowest mean (WM = 3.49) and was interpreted as “competent,” indicating a relative area for improvement. Overall, the findings suggest that respondents demonstrate strong competence in establishing safe, structured, and inclusive learning environments, particularly in promoting safety, discipline, and positive classroom culture.

The data in Table 18 indicates that respondents are generally more competent in addressing the diversity of learners, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 3.61 with a standard deviation of 0.93. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is applying formative and alternative assessment methods (WM = 3.75), followed by recording and tracking learner performance accurately (WM = 3.73), and communicating assessment results effectively to stakeholders (WM = 3.67). Other indicators also rated as “more competent” include selecting instructional materials that meet diverse needs (WM = 3.65), aligning learning objectives with individual learner goals (WM = 3.60), providing constructive feedback (WM = 3.60), developing differentiated assessments (WM = 3.58), and reviewing and revising curriculum based on learner performance (WM = 3.55), as well as designing lesson plans with appropriate accommodations and modifications (WM = 3.54). However, incorporating multi-sensory approaches into lessons obtained the lowest mean (WM = 3.42) and was interpreted as “competent.” Overall, the results suggest that respondents demonstrate strong competency in managing learner diversity, particularly in assessment, monitoring, and instructional alignment, while slightly lower competency is observed in multi-sensory instructional approaches.

The data in Table 19 indicate that respondents are generally competent in curriculum modification for students with special needs, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 3.49 with a standard deviation of 0.98. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is collaborating with parents to support student learning (WM = 3.70), followed by applying new teaching strategies learned from professional development (WM = 3.60), and advocating for inclusive education practices in school and community (WM = 3.57), all interpreted as “more competent.” Other indicators also rated as “more competent” include seeking mentorship to improve teaching effectiveness (WM = 3.55), evaluating professional growth to enhance teaching quality (WM = 3.54), sharing experiences and best practices with colleagues (WM = 3.52), and participating in workshops and training to enhance skills (WM = 3.49, interpreted as competent but near the upper range). Meanwhile, engaging community resources for learner support (WM = 3.45), leading initiatives to support learners outside the classroom (WM = 3.38), and conducting action research to improve instructional methods (WM = 3.11) obtained the lowest means and were interpreted as “competent.” Overall, the results suggest that respondents demonstrate moderate to high competency in curriculum and planning, with stronger performance in collaboration, application of training, and advocacy, while showing relatively lower engagement in research-based and community-led initiatives.

The data in Table 20 indicate that respondents are generally more competent in assessment and reporting practices for learners with special needs, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 3.51 with a standard deviation of 0.93. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is maintaining accurate and confidential records of student performance and progress (WM = 3.74), followed by adhering to legal and ethical guidelines in reporting student progress and



assessment results (WM = 3.62), both interpreted as “more competent.” Other indicators also rated as “more competent” include providing clear and constructive feedback to support student growth (WM = 3.56), implementing formative assessments to monitor progress (WM = 3.51), and using alternative assessment methods such as portfolios and performance tasks (WM = 3.51). Meanwhile, several items fall under the “competent” category, including communicating assessment results to stakeholders (WM = 3.49), interpreting and utilizing assessment data (WM = 3.47), collaborating with stakeholders in assessment (WM = 3.45), utilizing varied assessment tools (WM = 3.43), and modifying assessments to accommodate diverse learners (WM = 3.36), which obtained the lowest mean. Overall, the results suggest that respondents demonstrate strong competence in ethical compliance, record-keeping, and feedback provision, while showing comparatively lower competence in assessment adaptation and collaborative evaluation practices.

The data in Table 21 indicate that respondents are generally competent in terms of community linkages and professional development, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 3.29 with a standard deviation of 0.91. Among the indicators, the highest-rated item is actively engaging with parents and guardians to support the learning and well-being of students with special needs (WM = 3.53), which is interpreted as “more competent.” This suggests strong involvement in home-school collaboration as a key support system for learners with special needs. Other indicators are all interpreted as “competent,” including applying new strategies learned from professional development (WM = 3.35), participating in professional development programs (WM = 3.32), collaborating with community organizations (WM = 3.31), and sharing best practices with colleagues (WM = 3.31). The lowest-rated indicators include engaging in research or action-based learning (WM = 3.17), building partnerships with local agencies (WM = 3.18), attending workshops and training sessions (WM = 3.23), and seeking mentorship from special education experts (WM = 3.24). Overall, the results suggest that respondents demonstrate adequate engagement in professional growth and community collaboration, with stronger performance in parent engagement compared to research-based and external partnership activities.

Table 22 presents the significant on the respondents’ competency as to their profile, on “Content Knowledge and Pedagogy”, since the computed P-values for gender (P=0.003), bachelor’s degree (P=0.000), teaching position (P=0.000), seminar and trainings attended (P=0.002) and years of experience in handling students with special educational needs (P=0.000) are less than 0.05 level of significance, thus rejection of null hypothesis, thus null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference on the respondents’ level of competency in dealing with special needs education learners as to “Content Knowledge and Pedagogy” when their profile is considered, except in age (P=0.178), civil status (P=0.240) and highest educational attainment (P=0.661). Following is “Learning Environment”, since the computed P-values for gender (P=0.014), bachelor’s degree (P=0.000), teaching position (P=0.007), seminar and trainings attended (P=0.002) and years of experience in handling students with special educational needs (P=0.000) are less than 0.05 level of significance, thus rejection of null hypothesis, thus null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference on the respondents’ level of competency in dealing with special needs education learners as to “Learning Environment” when their profile is considered, except in age (P=0.195), civil status (P=0.224) and highest educational attainment (P=0.283). Next is “Diversity of Students”, since



the computed P-values for gender ($P=0.005$), bachelor's degree ($P=0.001$), teaching position ($P=0.005$), seminar and trainings attended ($P=0.000$) and years of experience in handling students with special educational needs ($P=0.000$) are less than 0.05 level of significance, thus rejection of null hypothesis, thus null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference on the respondents' level of competency in dealing with special needs education learners as to "Diversity of Students" when their profile is considered, except in age ($P=0.114$), civil status ($P=0.360$) and highest educational attainment ($P=0.343$). Then on "Curriculum Modification", since the computed P-values for gender ($P=0.002$), bachelor's degree ($P=0.000$), teaching position ($P=0.000$), seminar and trainings attended ($P=0.000$) and years of experience in handling students with special educational needs ($P=0.000$) are less than 0.05 level of significance, thus rejection of null hypothesis, thus null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference on the respondents' level of competency in dealing with special needs education learners as to "Curriculum Modification" when their profile is considered, except in age ($P=0.188$), civil status ($P=0.099$) and highest educational attainment ($P=0.798$). On "Systematic Evaluation", since the computed P-values for gender ($P=0.002$), bachelor's degree ($P=0.000$), teaching position ($P=0.000$), seminar and trainings attended ($P=0.000$) and years of experience in handling students with special educational needs ($P=0.000$) are less than 0.05 level of significance, thus rejection of null hypothesis, thus null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference on the respondents' level of competency in dealing with special needs education learners as to "Systematic Evaluation" when their profile is considered, except in age ($P=0.165$), civil status ($P=0.372$) and highest educational attainment ($P=0.900$). Lastly, on "Community Linkages and Professional Development", since the computed P-values for gender ($P=0.002$), bachelor's degree ($P=0.000$), teaching position ($P=0.000$), seminar and trainings attended ($P=0.000$) and years of experience in handling students with special educational needs ($P=0.000$) are less than 0.05 level of significance, thus rejection of null hypothesis, thus null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there is a significant difference on the respondents' level of competency in dealing with special needs education learners as to "Community Linkages and Professional Development" when their profile is considered, except in age ($P=0.156$), civil status ($P=0.089$) and highest educational attainment ($P=0.606$). The data showed that respondents who did not want to disclose their gender, completed their BSED, held a master teacher I position, attended 16–20 seminars and trainings, and had 13–15 years of experience working with students with special needs rated their competency the highest in "Understanding Learners' Needs", "Learning Environment", "Diversity of Students", "Curriculum Modification", "Systematic Evaluation," and "Community Linkages and Professional Development".

Table 23 presents the test of relationship, based on the result the calculated Pearson r of 0.930 which acquired a qualitative description of very high positive relationship is significant, since its computed P -value of 0.000 is less than 0.05 level of significance, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between the respondents' knowledge and their level of competency in handling junior high school special needs education learners.

The data in Table 24 reveal a very high positive relationship between respondents' knowledge and their level of competency in handling Junior High School students with special needs, as indicated by a Pearson correlation coefficient of $r = 0.930$. This suggests that as



respondents' knowledge increases, their level of competency also significantly increases, and vice versa. The relationship is further supported by a p-value of 0.000, which is lower than the 0.05 level of significance, indicating that the relationship is statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship is rejected. Overall, the findings imply a strong and direct association between knowledge and competency in special needs education, highlighting that teachers with higher knowledge levels are more likely to demonstrate higher competence in instructional practices, classroom management, assessment, and collaboration when handling students with special needs.

The data in Table 25 indicate that respondents generally experience more serious challenges in handling students with special needs, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 3.63 and standard deviation of 0.88. Among the indicators, the significant challenge is responding to emotional and social challenges faced by special needs students (WM = 3.75), followed by addressing the diverse needs of students with varying disabilities (WM = 3.72). Other highly rated challenges include navigating communication barriers with non-verbal learners or those with language delays (WM = 3.68), implementing inclusive practices in classrooms with limited training or support (WM = 3.64), managing challenging behaviors (WM = 3.61), adapting teaching strategies (WM = 3.61), providing adequate time for individualized lesson planning (WM = 3.61), and accessing appropriate resources and materials (WM = 3.61). Additional concerns include balancing the needs of special education students with other students (WM = 3.60) and collaborating effectively with parents and specialists (WM = 3.52), which, while still interpreted as "significant challenge," obtained the lowest mean. Overall, the findings suggest that receiving teachers face consistently high levels of difficulty across instructional, behavioral, and resource-related dimensions, with emotional support needs and learner diversity emerging as the most pressing challenges.

The data in Table 26 indicate that respondents perceive the proposed solutions to address the challenges encountered by receiving teachers in handling students with special needs as agree and highly needed, as reflected in the overall weighted mean of 4.17 with a standard deviation of 0.89. Among the indicators, the most highly rated solutions are attending professional development sessions on special education practices and strategies (WM = 4.23) and adapting teaching methods to accommodate students with varying abilities and challenges (WM = 4.23), both interpreted as "agree." This is followed by providing individualized attention to meet learners' unique needs (WM = 4.21), collaborating with parents, specialists, and colleagues (WM = 4.19), creating an inclusive and supportive classroom environment (WM = 4.19), and fostering emotional and social growth through consistent encouragement and support (WM = 4.19). Other important solutions include utilizing assistive technologies and tools (WM = 4.17), advocating for sufficient resources and support (WM = 4.17), promoting understanding and acceptance of diversity (WM = 4.08), and developing and implementing Individualized Education Plans or IEPs (WM = 4.06), which obtained the lowest mean but remains within the "agree" category. Overall, the results suggest that respondents strongly recognize the need for comprehensive, collaborative, and professional development-oriented strategies to effectively address the challenges in inclusive education.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of the thematic analysis and interpretation of the gathered data, the following were discovered.

The respondents are generally within the productive working-age group, predominantly female, and mostly married. Most are BSED graduates with Master's units and hold Teacher III positions, although participation in professional development activities and exposure to special needs education training remain limited for many respondents.

Receiving teachers possess adequate knowledge of essential Special Needs Education concepts and practices. This indicates that they have developed a foundational understanding of inclusive education, learner diversity, instructional adaptation, classroom management, assistive technology, and collaboration necessary for supporting students with special needs.

Receiving teachers demonstrate the competencies required to implement inclusive education practices effectively. Their ability to create supportive learning environments, address learner diversity, and perform instructional and assessment responsibilities reflects their readiness to facilitate meaningful learning experiences for students with special needs.

Knowledge in handling students with special needs is influenced primarily by professional factors rather than personal characteristics. Specialized training, educational preparation, teaching position, and practical experience contribute significantly to teachers' knowledge development, emphasizing the importance of professional learning opportunities in inclusive education.

The competency of receiving teachers is shaped largely by their professional experiences, specialization, and participation in training programs. This suggests that competency in inclusive education is acquired and strengthened through continuous practice, professional development, and exposure to diverse teaching situations.

Knowledge and competency are closely interconnected dimensions of teacher effectiveness. A higher level of knowledge contributes to stronger professional competency, indicating that enhancing teachers' understanding of Special Needs Education is essential for improving their classroom practices and instructional performance.

Despite possessing adequate knowledge and competency, receiving teachers continue to face substantial challenges in implementing inclusive education. These challenges highlight the complexity of addressing diverse learner needs and underscore the necessity of providing teachers with sustained institutional support, resources, and specialized interventions.

Addressing the challenges encountered by receiving teachers requires a multifaceted approach that emphasizes continuous professional development, instructional adaptation, collaborative partnerships, individualized support, and the effective use of assistive technologies. Strengthening these areas can contribute to more successful inclusive education practices.

A structured and responsive professional development program can serve as an effective mechanism for enhancing teachers' capacity to address the demands of inclusive education. The proposed INCLUSIVE Training Program has the potential to strengthen teachers' knowledge, skills, and professional confidence while promoting more effective, equitable, and learner-centered educational experiences for students with special needs.

References

- Ainscow, M. (2005). Developing inclusive education systems: What are the levers for change? *Journal of Educational Change*, 6(2), 109–124.
- Ainscow, M. (2020). *Inclusive education: A review of research and practices in schools*. *Educational Review*, 72(2), 171-185.
- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107–136.
- Alharthi, S. (2021). *Teachers' perceptions of their preparedness to teach students with special needs in inclusive classrooms*. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(4), 44-57.
- Baars, B. J. (1988). *A cognitive theory of consciousness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Beninghof, A. M. (2020). *Collaborative teaching: A practical guide to co-teaching and supporting students with special needs*. *Journal of Special Education*, 44(2), 125-136.
- Bradley, R. A., Danielson, L., & Doolittle, J. (2020). *The impact of teacher preparation on the effectiveness of inclusive education*. *Journal of Special Education*, 54(1), 1-14.
- Caldwell, D. L. (2018). *The role of special education certification in enhancing teaching practices*. *Journal of Special Education*, 45(2), 103-117.
- CAST. (2019). *Universal design for learning guidelines version 2.2*. Center for Applied Special Technology. Retrieved from <http://www.cast.org>
- Cole, E. R. (2021). *Teachers' perceptions of their readiness to teach students with disabilities: Implications for teacher training programs*. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 44(1), 76-92.
- Cologon, K. (2020). *Challenges and opportunities in inclusive education for students with disabilities in secondary schools*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(3), 273-290.
- Cook, B. G., & Odom, S. L. (2020). *Collaboration for inclusive education: Developing and implementing individualized support plans*. *Educational Research Review*, 15(3), 301-319.
- De Boer, A. A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. E. M. G. (2019). *Attitudes of teachers towards inclusive education: A review of the literature*. *Educational Research Review*, 20, 7-19.
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199.
- Florian, L. (2019). *Inclusive teaching: The importance of teacher knowledge and training*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(5), 447-463.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2016). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (8th ed.). Pearson.

- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2021). *Interpersonal and collaborative skills for inclusion: Co-teaching in the inclusive classroom*. *Journal of Special Education*, 55(1), 45-58.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2021). *Interpersonal and collaborative skills for inclusion: Co-teaching in the inclusive classroom*. *Journal of Special Education*, 55(1), 45-58.
- Giangreco, M. F. (2021). *Inclusive education: The importance of a supportive school culture and collaborative practices*. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(2), 210-221.
- Hallahan, D. P., Kauffman, J. M., & Pullen, P. C. (2020). *Exceptional learners: An introduction to special education* (14th ed.). Pearson.
- Hasan, M. S., Sulaiman, T. S., & Azmi, M. N. (2020). *Stigmas and challenges in the education of students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(5), 544-558.
- Hehir, T., Grindal, T., & Ehlers, D. (2018). *Equity and inclusion: The role of school leadership in special education*. *Educational Leadership*, 75(4), 44-50.
- Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Eidelman, H., & Palmieri, S. (2020). *A summary of the evidence on inclusive education*. Institute for Community Inclusion.
- Horn, S., & Turner, A. (2020). *Building partnerships for student success: Collaboration between families, teachers, and community support organizations*. *International Journal of Special Education*, 35(4), 78-89.
- Hughes, C. E., & Johnson, A. M. (2020). *Creating a positive school culture for students with special needs: The role of school leadership and teachers*. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 31(4), 123-134.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (2004). Public Law 108-446.
- Jordan, A. (2020). *Empathy in the classroom: How teachers' attitudes toward students with disabilities affect inclusive education*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(3), 473-482.
- Kauffman, J. M., & Badar, J. (2019). *The benefits of special education certification on teaching students with disabilities*. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 70(3), 251-263.
- MacMillan, D., Shaw, K., & Williams, M. (2020). *Overcoming barriers to collaborative teaching in inclusive classrooms*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(7), 778-792.
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). *The key to classroom management*. *Educational Leadership*, 61(1), 6-13.
- Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2020). *Inclusive practices in the classroom: A guide to supporting students with disabilities*. *Journal of Special Education*, 53(2), 75-89.

- Matusov, E., & Davydenko, M. (2021). *Differentiated instruction and its impact on inclusive education in secondary schools*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(1), 22-39.
- McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. L. (2021). *Inclusive education: A systematic approach to teaching students with special needs*. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 36(2), 91-101.
- Minke, K. M., Anderson, A. L., & Kunsch, C. (2019). *The role of empathy in fostering positive teacher-student relationships in inclusive classrooms*. *Journal of Special Education*, 40(1), 34-42.
- Murawski, W. W., & Swanson, H. L. (2021). *Co-teaching and collaboration: A meta-analysis of the impact on student outcomes*. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 54(3), 145-157.
- Ocampo, J. (2022). *Challenges in special education training for mainstream teachers in Valenzuela City*. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 38(1), 121-135.
- Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & McDuffie, K. A. (2020). *Co-teaching and collaboration in inclusive classrooms: A review of the literature*. *Remedial and Special Education*, 41(2), 109-118.
- Sharma, U., & Sokal, L. (2020). *The impact of professional development on teachers' ability to support students with special needs*. *International Journal of Special Education*, 35(1), 1-10.
- Sharma, U., Forlin, C., & Loreman, T. (2021). *Impact of teacher attitudes towards inclusion on teaching and learning: A global perspective*. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23(4), 291-305.
- Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., & Sugai, G. (2021). *Positive behavioral interventions and supports: Strategies for managing behaviors of students with disabilities*. *Journal of Special Education*, 55(3), 245-257.
- Smith, A. L., & Tyler, C. D. (2021). *Enhancing teacher knowledge through professional development programs in special education*. *Journal of Special Education Teacher Preparation*, 32(4), 315-327.
- Sugai, G., & Horner, R. H. (2009). Responsiveness-to-intervention and school-wide positive behavior supports: Integration of multi-tiered system approaches. *Exceptionality*, 17(4), 223-237.
- Tait, A. (2020). *Continuous professional development for inclusive education: A review of programs and outcomes*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 93, 103-112.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2020). *Differentiated instruction: A guide to meeting diverse needs*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(3), 501-513.



- Turnbull, R., Turnbull, A., Wehmeyer, M. L., & Shogren, K. A. (2017). *Exceptional lives: Special education in today's schools* (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Turner, R., & Dunsmuir, S. (2020). *The effects of professional development on teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education*. *Journal of Educational Research*, 113(1), 75-86.
- Upton, T., & Hayward, A. (2021). *Resource allocation and special education in schools: A review of barriers and solutions*. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 62(2), 195-208.
- Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., & Hickman, P. (2019). *Improving academic outcomes for students with disabilities: The role of co-teaching models*. *Journal of Special Education*, 53(1), 12-24.