Towards Inclusive Physical Education: Assessing the Readiness of PE Teachers in the Philippines

Maria Alexandra Benitez[1], Mark Kevin Deloso[2], Richmond Hinaniban[3], Ingrid Mae Tantog[4], & Marchee T. Picardal[5]
Cebu Normal University, Osmeña Boulevard, Cebu City, Philippines
main.23000005@cnu.edu.ph[1]; main.18001785@cnu.edu.ph[2]; main.24001762@cnu.edu.ph[3]; main.13001572@cnu.edu.ph[4];picardalm@cnu.edu.ph [5]

Article Information

History:
Received 05OCT2024
Final Revision 15DEC2024
Accepted 21DEC2024

Keywords:
Inclusive education
Physical education
Professional development
Self-efficacy
Training needs

Abstract: This study assessed the preparedness of Physical Education (PE) teachers in the Philippines for inclusive education, focusing on training, experience, attitudes, and professional development needs. A descriptive-comparative design was used to analyze data from 35 PE teachers across public and private schools. Results showed high preparedness in attitudes and self-efficacy (M = 3.95, SD = 0.31) but moderate levels in training and experience (M = 3.19, SD = 0.32), highlighting the need for further capacity-building. Professional development needs ranked highest (M = 4.39, SD = 0.03), emphasizing a strong demand for continuous learning. Younger teachers scored highest in training needs, while experienced teachers relied on confidence and strategies. No significant differences in preparedness were found based on sex (p = 0.165), years of experience (p = 0.335), or grade levels taught (p = 0.115). Public elementary school teachers showed the highest preparedness, whereas public high school teachers faced more challenges due to curriculum constraints. These findings highlight the need for targeted training and institutional support to strengthen inclusive PE practices. The study contributes to achieving Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 by promoting inclusive education.

1. Introduction

The global call for inclusive education underscores the imperative of ensuring equal access to quality learning for all, including learners with disabilities (Polat, 2019). While significant strides have been made in integrating learners with diverse needs into mainstream education, numerous challenges persist, necessitating continued efforts to advance inclusive education. One crucial yet often overlooked aspect of holistic education is Physical Education (PE). Recognized as an essential element of comprehensive development, PE offers unique opportunities to foster inclusivity by providing an environment where all learners, regardless of ability, can actively participate and benefit from the physical, social, and affective dimensions of physical activity (UNESCO, 2023).

The Philippines has established a strong legal framework supporting inclusive education through various policies and legislations, including Republic Act No. 9442, which amends Republic Act No. 7277 or the Magna Carta for Disabled Persons (Llego, 2022), the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (RA No. 10533) (Gatchalian & Senate of the Philippines, 2023), and the recently enacted RA No. 11650, which institutionalizes inclusive education services for learners with disabilities (Department of Education [DepEd], 2021).

Additionally, the country's commitment to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) reinforces the obligation to ensure accessible and inclusive education for all learners (Nieva, 2023). However, the successful implementation of inclusive PE largely hinges on the readiness and preparedness of PE teachers to adapt their teaching methods, curricula, and assessment approaches to accommodate diverse learning needs (Byrd & Alexander, 2021).

Research suggests that PE teachers' confidence and attitudes toward inclusive practices can be enhanced through adequate training and support systems (Aldabas, 2020; Ruppar et al., 2019). Ensuring that teachers are equipped with the necessary tools, strategies, and knowledge is crucial in creating an inclusive and engaging learning environment (Gonzaga et al., 2023; Javier, 2022). Various international studies highlight the significant impact of teacher attitudes and self-efficacy in fostering inclusion in PE settings (Tarantino et al., 2022; Morley et al., 2020; Byrd & Alexander, 2021; Antala et al., 2022; Alhumaid et al., 2021). These studies emphasize the importance of professional development initiatives that focus on specialized training and adapted physical education (APE) methodologies.

While global literature offers valuable insights into inclusive PE practices, there remains a gap in research specific to the Philippine context. Studies by Alcosero et al. (2023), Masongsong et al. (2023), and Arcuino et al. (2022) have highlighted the scarcity of resources and training for teachers in inclusive educational settings within the country. However, the specific challenges, strategies, and professional development needs of Filipino PE teachers in both public and private schools remain underexplored.

This study aims to address these gaps by conducting a descriptive comparative analysis of the preparedness of PE teachers in the Philippines to deliver inclusive education. It will explore various dimensions of teacher preparedness, including their training and experience, attitudes and self-efficacy, challenges encountered, and strategies employed to overcome these challenges. Additionally, the study will analyze the influence of demographic factors such as age, sex, years of experience, school type, and grade levels taught on teacher preparedness.

Using a purely descriptive comparative research design, this study will analyze quantitative data to compare the preparedness levels across different demographic variables. The findings are expected to contribute to national and global mandates for inclusive education aligned with Sustainable Development

Goal (SDG) 4, which advocates for inclusive and equitable quality education for all (Kamenopoulou, 2019). Furthermore, this research will serve as a valuable resource for policymakers, educators, and stakeholders in designing targeted training programs and policies to enhance inclusive education practices in the Philippines. Ultimately, the study aspires to support PE teachers in fostering inclusive learning environments that cater to the diverse needs of all learners.

2. Objectives

This study assessed the preparedness of Physical Education (PE) teachers in delivering inclusive education in the Philippines by examining their training and experience, attitudes and self-efficacy, challenges, and professional development needs across different demographic factors.

It specifically sought to:

a. describe the demographic profile of PE teachers in terms of age, sex, years of experience in teaching PE and inclusive PE, school type, and grade levels taught;
b. determine the level of preparedness of PE teachers in teaching inclusive education based on training and experience, attitudes and self-efficacy, challenges and strategies, and professional development;
c. identify the significant differences in PE teachers' preparedness across various demographic categories by analyzing their preparedness scores using statistical tests.

Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the preparedness levels of PE teachers based on their demographic characteristics (age, sex, years of teaching experience, school type, and grade levels taught).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

his study utilized a quantitative research approach employing a descriptive-comparative research design to assess the preparedness of Physical Education (PE) teachers in delivering inclusive education in the Philippines. The descriptive aspect of the study aimed to provide a comprehensive profile of PE teachers by analyzing their demographic characteristics, levels of preparedness, and the challenges they encounter. Meanwhile, the comparative component examined potential differences in preparedness levels across various demographic categories such as age, sex, years of teaching experience, school type, and grade levels taught.

3.2. Research Instrument

The study was conducted through a survey using the "Preparedness of Physical Education Teachers for Inclusive Education" questionnaire, a 50-item researcher-made instrument derived from studies by Bharti (2016), Ruppar et al. (2016), Maher et al. (2017), Townsend (2017), Lidor and Hutzler (2019), Donnelly (2020), Braksiek (2021), Antala et al. (2022), Tarantino et al. (2022), Celestino et al. (2023), and Kuntjoro et al. (2022). These studies examined critical aspects of teacher preparedness, including pre-service training, perceptions of inclusion, strategies for supporting students with severe disabilities, and factors influencing teachers' confidence

Table 1

Preparedness of Physical Education Teachers for Inclusive Education Questionnaire Reliability Statistics

Groups	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of items
Training and Experience	.967	.964	14
Attitude and Self-Efficacy	.920	.926	12
Challenges and Strategies	.921	.935	13
Professional Development Needs	.942	.961	11

and competence in inclusive settings. The questionnaire aimed to comprehensively assess PE teachers' preparedness in Philippine institutions and identify areas for professional development.

The survey gathered demographic data and included 50 items categorized into four sections: (I) Training and Experience, (II) Attitudes and Self-Efficacy, (III) Challenges and Strategies, and (IV) Professional Development Needs. Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree), with an estimated completion time of 5-10 minutes. According to Joshi et al. (2015), quantifying qualitative traits is crucial, and previous research has shown that Likert scale surveys achieve a reliability of 90% and an accuracy of 89% (Louangrath, 2018).

To ensure content validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by a Physical Education teacher and two Special Education teachers. A pilot study involving 20 faculty members from public and private schools in Misamis Occidental was conducted to further validate the instrument. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to determine internal consistency, with a value of 0.70 or higher deemed acceptable. The reliability test results for each section are presented in Table 1.

The results indicate that all four sections of the questionnaire have excellent internal consistency, with Cronbach's Alpha values ranging from 0.920 to 0.967, exceeding the acceptable threshold of 0.70. This suggests that the questionnaire items are highly reliable for assessing PE teachers' preparedness for inclusive education. The high values for each category imply that the survey instrument effectively measures its intended constructs and can be considered a valid tool for further data collection and analysis.

3.3 Research Sample

The research respondents were selected through purposive sampling, which involved identifying Physical Education (PE) teachers who met specific criteria essential to the study. The selection criteria required teachers to have at least two years of teaching experience and to have taught classes that included Learners with Exceptional Needs (LSENs). To ensure ethical compliance, clearance was obtained from the Ethics Review Committee (ERC) of Cebu Normal University (CNU) before data collection.

Potential respondents were initially identified through school administrators, who were contacted via email to introduce the study, outline the data collection

procedures, and address ethical considerations. Teachers were then invited to participate via email and social media platforms, with recruitment efforts further supported through referrals from colleagues, online advertisements, and personal networks. This multi-faceted approach ensured a diverse representation of respondents from both public and private schools in Cebu City.

Upon agreeing to participate, teachers provided informed consent, and their anonymity was maintained throughout the process. The survey, delivered via Google Forms, was designed to assess their preparedness for inclusive education and underwent expert validation and pilot testing to ensure reliability and consistency. Ultimately, 35 qualified teachers were included in the study, ensuring that the data collected was relevant and representative of the study's objectives.

3.4 Data Gathering Procedure

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Ethics Review Committee (ERC) of Cebu Normal University (CNU) before data collection. Public and private schools in Cebu City were contacted via email to inform school heads about the study's objectives and ethical considerations. Purposive sampling was used to select PE teachers with at least two years of teaching experience and experience teaching Learners with Exceptional Needs (LSENs).

The survey was distributed via Google Forms to the selected respondents after obtaining their informed consent. Recruitment efforts included direct invitations, social media promotions, and referrals through professional and personal networks. A total of 35 teachers participated. Respondents were given three weeks to complete and submit the survey, with reminder emails sent after one week. Anonymity and confidentiality were ensured throughout the process, and participants who chose to withdraw had their data excluded.

The collected responses were analyzed using statistical tools to assess teachers' preparedness for inclusive education.

3.5 Data Analysis

The quantitative data collected from the survey were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics. Descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage were used to describe the demographic profile of respondents in terms of age, sex, years of experience in teaching PE and inclusive PE, school type, and grade levels taught.

The preparedness level of PE teachers in teaching inclusive education was determined using mean and weighted mean with standard deviation, which provided insights into their training and experience, attitudes and self-efficacy, challenges and strategies, and professional development needs.

To analyze significant differences in PE teachers' preparedness across demographic categories, the study employed the Kruskal-Wallis H test, a nonparametric statistical method. This test, also referred to as the "one-way ANOVA on ranks," was used to compare differences between two or more independent groups for ordinal and continuous data.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

This study prioritized ethical research practices, adhering to the guidelines of Cebu Normal University (CNU) Ethics Review Committee (ERC). Participation was voluntary, with respondents free to withdraw at any time. Anonymity and confidentiality were

ensured by not collecting identifiable information, with data securely stored and disposed of following the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (RA 10173). No conflicts of interest were declared. Participants provided informed consent after being fully informed of the study's objectives, methods, and potential risks. Minimal risks were anticipated, with measures in place to prevent distress during data collection. Participants were fairly compensated for any incurred expenses, and a raffle system was implemented to show appreciation for their time and participation.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Demographic Characteristics

The demographic profile of the 35 Physical Education (PE) teachers in the study, as presented in Table 2, provides critical insights into their preparedness for inclusive education. The majority of respondents are male (60.00%), with a significant portion falling within the age range of 26–30 years (42.86%), followed by 20–25 years old (22.86%) and 31–35 years old (20.00%). This relatively young demographic suggests that most teachers are likely in the early stages of their careers, which could have implications for their exposure to inclusive education strategies and professional development opportunities (Morley et al., 2020).

Nearly half (45.71%) of respondents have 2–3 years of experience teaching PE, while 51.43% have the same experience in inclusive PE, indicating limited exposure to addressing the diverse needs of Learners with Exceptional Needs (LSENs). This supports findings that less experienced teachers may lack confidence in delivering inclusive PE (Tarantino et al., 2022). Only 5.71% have over 10 years of experience, underscoring the need for targeted professional development to improve readiness (Byrd & Alexander, 2021).

The majority of respondents come from private (28.57%) and public high schools (25.71%), suggesting that inclusive PE is more established at the high school level. However, the presence of elementary teachers (14.29% public, 5.71% private) indicates ongoing efforts to implement inclusive practices across various educational levels. Respondents from integrated schools further highlight the emphasis on inclusive education in different settings (Antala et al., 2022).

Most respondents teach high school students (54.29%), followed by elementary school teachers (28.57%). This suggests that high school teachers may face greater challenges in adapting teaching strategies for LSENs, as older students often require more tailored support compared to younger learners (Alhumaid et al., 2021).

The findings highlight the need for structured and continuous professional development programs to build teachers' confidence and competence in inclusive PE settings. Given the high proportion of teachers with limited experience, professional development efforts should focus on providing hands-on training, inclusive teaching strategies, and resources tailored to different school settings and student needs (Braksiek, 2021).

The diverse teaching experiences across public and private institutions highlight the need for standardized inclusive education policies to ensure equitable learning opportunities. While demographic data show progress in inclusive PE, challenges persist, especially for early-career and high school teachers. Targeted training and support are essential to fostering a more inclusive PE environment in the Philippines.

Table 2

Respondents' Demographics

Groups	Description	f (n=35)	(%)
Sex	**Man**	**21**	**60.00**
	Woman	13	37.14
	I prefer not to answer	1	2.86
Age	20 – 25 years old	8	22.86
	26 – 30 years old	**15**	**42.86**
	31 – 35 years old	7	20.00
	36 – 40 years old	3	8.57
	41 – 45 years old	1	2.86
	46 – 50 years old	1	2.86
Years of Experience Teaching Physical Education (PE)	**2 – 3 years**	**16**	**45.71**
	4 – 5 years	2	5.71
	6 – 7 years	5	14.29
	8 – 9 years	5	14.29
	10 – 15 years	4	11.43
	More than 15 years	2	5.71
	I prefer not to answer	1	2.86
Years of Experience Teaching Inclusive Physical Education (PE)	**2 – 3 years**	**18**	**51.43**
	4 – 5 years	4	11.43
	6 – 7 years	3	8.57
	8 – 9 years	2	5.71
	10 – 15 years	1	2.86
	More than 15 years	2	5.71
	I prefer not to answer	5	14.29
School Type	Public Elementary School	5	14.29
	Private Elementary School	2	5.71
	Public High School	9	25.71
	Private High School	**10**	**28.57**
	Public Integrated School	1	2.86
	Private Integrated School	6	17.14
	I prefer not to answer	2	5.71
Grade Level(s) Taught	Elementary School	10	28.57
	High School	**19**	**54.29**
	Both Elementary and High School	3	8.57
	I prefer not to answer	3	8.57

4.2 Teachers' Preparedness in Teaching Inclusive Education

Table 3 reveals that PE teachers exhibit varying levels of preparedness for inclusive education across key areas. Their **training and experience** received a moderate preparedness rating (M = 3.19, SD = 0.32), indicating a need for further capacity-building efforts to enhance their practical skills (Sharma et al., 2021). Despite this, teachers show high preparedness in terms of attitudes and self-efficacy (M = 3.95, SD = 0.31), suggesting a positive mindset and confidence in handling inclusive classrooms (Jones et al., 2020).

Table 3

PE Teachers' Preparedness in Teaching Inclusive Education

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Training and Experience	3.19	0.32	Moderate Preparedness
Attitudes and Self-Efficacy	3.95	0.31	High Preparedness
Challenges and Strategies	4.19	0.13	High Preparedness
Professional Development Needs	4.39	0.03	Very High Preparedness

Legend: 4.21 - 5.00 (Very High Preparedness; 3.41 - 4.20 (High Preparedness; 2.61 - 3.40 (Moderate Preparedness); 1.81 - 2.60 (Low Preparedness); 1.00 - 1.80 (Very Low Preparedness)

Teachers also demonstrated high preparedness in managing challenges and strategies (M = 4.19, SD = 0.13), indicating familiarity with techniques to support learners with diverse needs (Smith & Brown, 2019). However, their professional development needs scored the highest (M = 4.39, SD = 0.03), reflecting a strong desire for ongoing learning and skill enhancement to meet inclusive education demands (Garcia & Lopez, 2022).

These findings suggest that while teachers have a strong foundation in attitudes and strategies, targeted training and professional development initiatives are essential to further strengthen their preparedness for inclusive PE (Davis et al., 2021).

4.3 Analysis of Teachers' Preparedness on Inclusive Education across Demographics

Table 4 shows that younger PE teachers, particularly those aged 20–25 years, scored highest in training and experience (20.13) and professional development needs (19.69), indicating their focus on skill development in inclusive education (Smith et al., 2021). Similarly, the 26–30 age group demonstrated high scores across all areas, reflecting their confidence and readiness to implement inclusive practices despite their early career stage (Jones & Brown, 2020).

Table 4

Analysis of Teachers' Preparedness by Age Group

Age Group	Preparedness Score (Mean Rank)			
	Training and Experience	Attitudes and Self-Efficacy	Challenges and Strategies	Professional Development Needs
20 – 25 years old	20.13	19.50	19.50	19.69
26 – 30 years old	19.80	19.77	19.77	19.80
31 – 35 years old	17.43	17.71	17.71	17.79
36 – 40 years old	6.33	6.17	6.17	6.17
41 – 45 years old	18.00	20.00	20.00	17.50
46 – 50 years old	13.00	15.00	15.00	15.00
H statistic	5.046	5.019	5.019	5.037
p-value	0.410	0.414	0.414	0.411

If the p-value is < 0.05, reject the null hypothesis (Ho), significant
If the p-value is > 0.05, accept the null hypothesis (Ho), not significant

Table 5

Analysis of Teachers' Preparedness by Sex

Sex Group	Preparedness Score (Mean Rank)			
	Training and Experience	Attitudes and Self-Efficacy	Challenges and Strategies	Professional Development Needs
Man	19.52	19.55	19.55	19.55
Woman	16.85	16.81	16.81	16.81
I prefer not to answer	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
H statistic	3.443	3.602	3.602	3.570
p-value	0.179	0.165	0.165	0.168

If the p-value is < 0.05, reject the null hypothesis (Ho), significant
If the p-value is > 0.05, accept the null hypothesis (Ho), not significant

Teachers in the 31–35 years age group reported slightly lower scores in all areas, which may imply a need for additional support and targeted training to enhance their effectiveness in inclusive settings (Garcia & Lopez, 2022). Notably, the 36–40 years age group had the lowest scores across all indicators, particularly in training and experience (6.33), which highlights potential challenges in adapting to inclusive teaching methods and the need for specialized interventions (Davis et al., 2021).

On the other hand, Teachers aged 41–45 years showed strong attitudes and self-efficacy (20.00) and high preparedness in challenges and strategies (20.00), reflecting their confidence and experience in inclusive PE. However, their professional development needs (17.50) highlight the ongoing need for learning to stay updated (Almeida & Clark, 2020).

These findings suggest that younger teachers are more inclined towards professional development, while experienced teachers rely on their confidence and strategies. The results emphasize the need for differentiated training programs tailored to the unique needs of each age group to ensure comprehensive preparedness for inclusive PE instruction.

Table 5 presents the analysis of PE teachers' preparedness based on sex across four key indicators: training and experience, attitudes and self-efficacy, challenges and strategies, and professional development needs. The results indicate that male teachers have higher preparedness scores across all indicators, with mean ranks ranging from 19.52 to 19.55, compared to female teachers whose scores range from 16.81 to 16.85. This suggests that male teachers may perceive themselves as better prepared for inclusive education, which could be attributed to differences in experience, confidence levels, or access to professional development opportunities (Smith & Brown, 2021).

The small sample size may have influenced these results. The Kruskal-Wallis test found no significant differences across sex groups (p-values: 0.165–0.179), confirming that gender does not significantly affect preparedness for inclusive PE. This supports research This

supports research indicating that experience and training play a more critical role than gender (Garcia & Lopez, 2022). While male teachers report slightly higher preparedness, the lack of statistical significance highlights the need to focus on enhancing inclusive education training equally for all teachers, regardless of sex, to ensure equitable preparedness.

Table 6 shows PE teachers' preparedness based on years of experience across key areas. Teachers with 10–15 years of experience scored the highest in all categories, indicating greater confidence and preparedness due to their extensive experience (Smith & Brown, 2021). In contrast, those with 6–7 years of experience had the lowest scores, suggesting a need for further training and support to enhance their skills (Garcia & Lopez, 2022). Teachers with 2–3 years of experience showed high professional development needs (20.78), reflecting their recognition of the need for continuous learning (Davis et al., 2021).

The Kruskal-Wallis test results (p-values: 0.335–0.359) indicate no statistically significant differences in preparedness based on years of experience, suggesting that training and institutional support play a more critical role in readiness than experience alone (Almeida & Clark, 2020). The findings emphasize the importance of continuous professional development to equip teachers with the necessary competencies for inclusive education.

Table 7 shows that PE teachers with 4–5 years of experience achieved the highest preparedness scores across all areas, reflecting their confidence and readiness. This is likely due to their recent exposure to training and practical experience, which have equipped them with effective strategies for inclusive education (Garcia & Lopez, 2022). In contrast, teachers with 6–9 years of experience scored lower, indicating challenges in adapting to inclusive teaching over time, possibly due to limited access to ongoing professional development (Smith & Brown, 2021).

Table 6

Analysis of Teachers' Preparedness by Years in Teaching Physical Education

Years in Teaching Physical Education	Preparedness Score			
	Training and Experience	Attitudes and Self-Efficacy	Challenges and Strategies	Professional Development Needs
2 – 3 years	21.19	20.63	20.63	20.78
4 – 5 years	20.00	21.50	21.50	21.50
6 – 7 years	10.20	9.80	9.80	9.80
8 – 9 years	15.00	15.30	15.30	15.30
10 – 15 years	21.50	22.00	22.00	22.00
More than 15 years	15.50	17.50	17.50	16.25
I prefer not to answer	8.00	8.50	8.50	8.50
H statistic	6.607	6.667	6.667	6.849
p-value	0.359	0.353	0.353	0.335

If the p-value is < 0.05, reject the null hypothesis (Ho), significant
If the p-value is > 0.05, accept the null hypothesis (Ho), not significant

Table 7

Analysis of Teachers' Preparedness by Years in Teaching Inclusive Physical Education

Years in Teaching Inclusive Physical Education	Preparedness Score			
	Training and Experience	Attitudes and Self-Efficacy	Challenges and Strategies	Professional Development Needs
2 – 3 years	21.83	21.56	21.56	21.69
4 – 5 years	24.00	25.25	25.25	25.25
6 – 7 years	5.67	5.67	5.67	5.67
8 – 9 years	6.50	6.25	6.25	6.25
10 – 15 years	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
More than 15 years	15.50	17.50	17.50	16.25
I prefer not to answer	15.80	15.10	15.10	15.10
H statistic	14.110	15.120	15.120	15.337
p-value	0.028	0.019	0.019	0.018

If the p-value is < 0.05, reject the null hypothesis (Ho), significant
If the p-value is > 0.05, accept the null hypothesis (Ho), not significant

These findings highlight the need for continuous training to ensure teachers remain equipped with evolving best practices in inclusive physical education.

Teachers with 10–15 years of experience had the lowest scores across all areas, reflecting significant gaps in training and self-efficacy that may stem from outdated practices or limited exposure to evolving inclusive education strategies (Davis et al., 2021). In contrast, teachers with more than 15 years of experience showed moderate scores, highlighting their reliance on experience but also a need for continuous learning to stay updated with current inclusive teaching methodologies (Almeida & Clark, 2020).

These findings suggest that continuous professional development tailored to different experience levels is crucial for enhancing preparedness and ensuring effective implementation of inclusive PE practices.

Table 8 shows that PE teachers from public elementary schools had the highest preparedness scores (27.20–27.60), reflecting strong training and institutional support for inclusive education (Garcia & Lopez, 2022). Similarly, teachers from private integrated schools scored high (25.17–25.83), indicating access to resources and professional development. These findings highlight the importance of structured programs in enhancing teacher preparedness across school types.

Conversely, Public high school teachers had the lowest preparedness scores (12.11–12.39), reflecting gaps in training and experience. High school educators face challenges adapting inclusive strategies due to curriculum constraints and large classes (Smith & Brown, 2021). Private high school and public integrated school teachers showed moderate preparedness, indicating a need for further professional development (Davis et al., 2021). Targeted training and stronger institutional support are needed for consistent inclusive PE practices.

Table 8

Analysis of Teachers' Preparedness by School Type

School Type	Preparedness Score			
	Training and Experience	Attitudes and Self-Efficacy	Challenges and Strategies	Professional Development Needs
Public Elementary School	27.60	27.20	27.20	27.30
Private Elementary School	17.50	17.00	17.00	17.25
Public High School	12.11	12.33	12.33	12.39
Private High School	15.90	15.40	15.40	15.30
Public Integrated School	17.00	16.50	16.50	16.00
Private Integrated School	25.17	25.83	25.83	25.83
I prefer not to answer	10.50	11.75	11.75	11.75
H statistic	12.017	12.387	12.387	12.467
p-value	0.062	0.054	0.054	0.052

If the p-value is < 0.05, reject the null hypothesis (Ho), significant
If the p-value is > 0.05, accept the null hypothesis (Ho), not significant

Table 9

Analysis of Teachers' Preparedness by Grade Levels Taught

Grade Level(s) Taught	Preparedness Score			
	Training and Experience	Attitudes and Self-Efficacy	Challenges and Strategies	Professional Development Needs
Elementary School	23.90	23.80	23.80	23.90
High School	16.32	16.03	16.03	15.97
Both Elementary and High School	9.67	11.67	11.67	11.67
I prefer not to answer	17.33	17.50	17.50	17.50
H statistics	5.932	5.351	5.351	5.501
p-value	0.115	0.148	0.148	0.139

If the p-value is < 0.05, reject the null hypothesis (Ho), significant
If the p-value is > 0.05, accept the null hypothesis (Ho), not significant

Table 9 shows that PE teachers handling elementary school students had the highest preparedness scores across all indicators (23.80–23.90), indicating stronger training and self-efficacy, likely due to greater emphasis on foundational skills and structured support in early education settings (Garcia & Lopez, 2022). In contrast, teachers handling both elementary and high school levels reported the lowest preparedness scores (9.67–11.67), suggesting challenges in managing diverse learner needs and adapting teaching strategies across different age groups (Smith & Brown, 2021).

High school teachers scored lower (15.97–16.32), possibly reflecting the complexities of addressing inclusive education at higher levels where curriculum demands and student diversity increase. The Kruskal-Wallis test results

show no statistically significant differences in preparedness based on grade level taught (p-values: 0.115–0.148), suggesting that grade level alone does not significantly impact preparedness. These findings emphasize the need for tailored training programs to address specific challenges faced by teachers at different educational levels.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The study underscores the need for enhanced training and professional development to strengthen the preparedness of PE teachers in delivering inclusive education in the Philippines. While teachers generally demonstrate positive attitudes and self-efficacy, their readiness in terms of practical training and experience remains moderate. The findings suggest that professional development opportunities play a more significant role in improving preparedness than demographic factors such as sex, years of experience, or grade levels taught.

Structured support systems in public elementary and private integrated schools contribute to higher preparedness levels, whereas high school teachers, particularly in public institutions, encounter greater challenges in implementing inclusive practices. These variations highlight the necessity for targeted training programs that cater to the specific needs of teachers across different educational settings.

Moving forward, continuous professional development, policy enhancements, and increased institutional support are crucial in ensuring that all PE teachers are equipped to provide inclusive education effectively. Addressing these areas will contribute to a more inclusive and equitable educational environment for all learners.

6. Bibliography

Aldabas, R. (2020). Teachers' readiness for inclusive education: Perspectives and challenges. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24*(6), 123-137. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1694506

Alcosero, J., Masongsong, R., & Arcuino, M. (2023). Inclusive education challenges in the Philippines. *Educational Review Journal, 55*(4), 456-478. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2023.1412458

Alhumaid, K., Noor, H., & Al-Malki, M. (2021). Teachers' self-efficacy in implementing inclusive practices in physical education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 25*(7), 789-805. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1751324

Almeida, A., & Clark, K. (2020). Professional development needs of physical education teachers for inclusive classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research, 113*(2), 189-204. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2019.1709405

Antala, B., Smith, P., & Jones, D. (2022). Factors influencing inclusive physical education. *European Journal of Physical Education, 39*(3), 78-95. https://doi.org/10.1080/19407099.2021.2024569

Arcuino, M., Masongsong, R., & Alcosero, J. (2022). Professional development needs of Filipino PE teachers. *Philippine Educational Research Journal, 10*(3), 234-250.

Bharti, K. (2016). Teacher preparation for inclusive education: Examining best practices. *Journal of Educational Change, 17*(4), 421-437.

Braksiek, J. (2021). Inclusive physical education: Strategies for teachers. *International Journal of Adapted Physical Activity, 16*(1), 23-38. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2021.1999876

Byrd, M., & Alexander, J. (2021). Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive physical education. *Journal of Physical Education and Sports Management, 12*(2), 34-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X20944938

Celestino, P., Santos, L., & Reyes, C. (2023). The effectiveness of adapted physical education programs. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 18*(4), 123-137.

Department of Education (DepEd). (2021). Implementing guidelines on inclusive education services for learners with disabilities. Retrieved from www.deped.gov.ph

Donnelly, M. (2020). Examining teacher perspectives on inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24*(9), 1017-1031.

Gatchalian, S., & Senate of the Philippines. (2023). Republic Act No. 10533: The Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Retrieved from www.senate.gov.ph

Garcia, P., & Lopez, D. (2022). Strategies for inclusive physical education in Philippine schools. *Asian Journal of PE and Recreation, 14*(1), 110-128. https://doi.org/10.1080/13548678.2022.1349874

Gonzaga, P., Rivera, L., & Santos, K. (2023). Supporting PE teachers in inclusive classrooms. *Asian Journal of PE and Recreation, 14*(2), 210-229. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2023.1406589

Javier, M. (2022). Inclusive education challenges in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education, 9*(2), 200-215.

Joshi, R., Gupta, S., & Sharma, P. (2015). Measuring teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education. *International Journal of Research in Education, 45*(1), 67-84.

Kamenopoulou, L. (2019). Inclusive education and SDG 4. *Educational Inclusion Quarterly, 8*(1), 20-35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-019-09478-w

Kuntjoro, B., Syahrial, S., & Rahman, A. (2022). Professional training for inclusive PE teachers. *International Journal of Physical Education and Sport, 19*(3), 45-61.

Lidor, R., & Hutzler, Y. (2019). The effectiveness of adapted physical education. *Journal of Adapted Physical Activity, 34*(5), 78-96.

Llego, M. A. (2022). Republic Act No. 9442: An Act amending Republic Act No. 7277, Magna Carta for Disabled Persons. Retrieved from www.gov.ph

Louangrath, P. (2018). Reliability of Likert scale surveys in educational research. *Educational Measurement Journal, 13*(2), 112-128.

Maher, C., McKay, L., & Sharma, R. (2017). Addressing barriers to inclusive PE. *Educational Practice and Theory Journal, 9*(1), 89-104.

Morley, D., O'Connor, S., & Pearson, R. (2020). The role of teachers in inclusive education. *Global Journal of PE Research, 21*(5), 56-78.

Nieva, R. A. (2023). The Philippines' commitment to the UNCRPD and inclusive education. *Asian Disability Studies Journal, 11*(3), 123-145.

Polat, F. (2019). Implementing inclusive education globally. In *Inclusion and Education Reform* (pp. 48-62). Routledge.

Ruppar, A. L., Roberts, C. A., & Olson, A. J. (2019). Perceptions of preparedness to teach students with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 42*(2), 149-162.

Sharma, R., Patil, S., & Joshi, P. (2021). Capacity building for inclusive physical education. *Educational Review Journal, 50*(3), 341-360.

Smith, P., & Brown, L. (2021). Teachers' perceptions of inclusive PE challenges. *Journal of Education and Practice, 15*(4), 78-94.

Tarantino, A., Lopez, J., & Cruz, B. (2022). Inclusive practices in physical education. *Journal of Sports Science and PE, 35*(4), 89-110.

Townsend, J. (2017). Teachers' attitudes towards inclusion: A critical review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 21*(8), 1001-1021.

UNESCO. (2023). Quality physical education policies and practices. Retrieved from unesdoc.unesco.org