Nation-building entails providing good education for all citizenry. The advent of inclusion in the Philippines encourages good nation-building. According to an official press release from the DepEd "there are 5.49 million children with special needs in the Philippines or 13 percent of the total children population. Of this number, an estimated 4.2million are persons with disabilities, while 1.27 million are gifted." Of this estimate, only about 2.9% (about 160,000) children with special educational needs (SEN) are enrolled in schools (Department of Education Philippines, 2005).

Having students with regular and special educational needs together in a class requires implementing a differentiated curriculum, practicing enriched teaching strategies, and using modified assessment. The teaching environment then is not solely in the hands of the general education teachers. The challenge to work with other teachers to recognize and appreciate each other's roles in the teaching environment becomes crucial (Friend & Bursuck, 2006; Smith, Polloway, Patton, & Dowdy, 2004).

Sebbs and Ainscow (1996) first defined an inclusive school as one that "works from the principle that all communities should learn together." They defined inclusion as "a process by which a school attempts to respond to all students as individuals by reconsidering its curricular organization and provision and through this process…as a process of responding to diversity would be more relevant and applicable for all schools…"

Inclusion is the approach where students with disabilities are served primarily in the general education classroom under the responsibility of the general classroom teacher. Whenever necessary and agreeable, students with disabilities may also receive some of their instruction in another setting, such as the resource room (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2007). Inclusion in schools is also viewed as an ongoing developmental process rather than as a static state (Wah, 2010).

Adult resource, however, is the most pertinent factor to consider. Teachers should have the knowledge and expertise to handle the different challenges of inclusive education (Wah, 2010). The advent of inclusion has called for teachers to redefine and re-establish their responsibilities and educational goals (Waligore, 2003). As Friend & Bursuck (2006) wrote, the perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding inclusive practices can be represented in a continuum–from those who strongly support this educational approach, to those who have concerns about the ability of children with disabilities to succeed in general education, and finally those who are ambivalent regarding the value of inclusive practice.

Armed with inclusion advocacy, the teacher in the general education classroom is faced with the need to differentiate curriculum, to collaborate with other teaching personnel, and to modify assessment. Thus, a redefinition of the roles and responsibilities of teachers and a look into their readiness to teach in inclusive classes is inevitable. Working in a school that has children with SEN is quite a feat.

At present, regular schools accept children with SEN. To be accepted, these children go through the same evaluative examination. They are also placed in a classroom with children with regular educational needs. They study the same scope and sequence and will usually go through the same assessment and grading requirements as the children with regular needs.

General education teachers need to teach children with various needs inside the general education classroom. Whether or not they are familiar with the condition of the child with special educational needs, the teacher will have to find a way for the child with SEN to learn along with other children. Whether or not these teachers have been trained, they are expected to teach children with SEN.

On the other hand, special education teachers are usually tasked to handle behavioral management issues in the classroom rather than be a resource for learning for the child with SEN. Special education teachers are familiar with behavior management techniques but often lack knowledge of the scope and sequence of the curriculum being studied.

It is important to evaluate if general and special education teachers are professionally ready to teach children with SEN in the general education classroom. Teacher preparation programs aim to adequately prepare pre-service teachers with the knowledge, skills, and disposition needed to be an in-service teacher. However, the reality of the college classroom is very different from that of a classroom of children (Melnick & Meister, 2008).

The Philippine government recognizes the important role of the teachers in nation-building. Thus, to "promote quality education through the proper supervision and regulation of the licensure examination and professionalization of the practice of the teaching profession," the Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994 was promulgated. Furthermore, the Act stipulates the creation of a Board for Professional Teachers, the guidelines for examination and registration, and

provisions for non-complianace with this law (Chan Robles Virtual Law Library).

Filipino educators are expected to uphold the code of ethics which was based on the Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994. The code of ethics stipulates its scope and limitations, the roles and responsibilities of the teachers toward the state, the community, the teaching profession and community, the higher authorities in the Philippines, the learners, and the parents. Furthermore, it has guidelines for school officials and for teachers engaging in businesses and disciplinary action in case of violation of any provision of the Code (Professional Regulatory Commission).

Aside from the code of ethics, The *National Competency-Based Teacher Standards* (NCBTS*)* was written as a guide for teachers in their commitment and their accountability to provide classroom instruction resulting in good student learning outcomes. The NCBTS has seven domains. The first domain, *Social Regard for Learning*, focuses on the principle that teachers serve as powerful and positive role models through their actions and behavior. The second domain, *Learning Environment*, looks into the significance of providing for a social, psychological, and physical environment where students will engage in different learning activities and work towards high standards of learning. The third domain, *Diversity of Learners*, has two strands: familiarity with learners' background knowledge and experiences and concern for the wholistic development of learner. *Curriculum*, the fourth domain, measures the teacher's mastery of the subject namely: the ability to clearly communicate learning goals for lessons that are appropriate for the learner; the capacity to make good use of allotted instructional time; and the skill to select teaching

methods, learning activities, and instructional materials aligned with the objectives of the lessons. The fifth domain, *Planning, Assessment, and Reporting*, focuses on developing, using, and integrating a variety of appropriate assessment strategies to monitor and evaluate learning, and provides feedback on learners' understanding of contents. It also emphasizes communicating promptly and clearly to parents, learners, and supervisors the students' progress. The sixth domain, *Community Linkages*, consists of the competency to establish learning environments that respond to the community where it belongs. The last domain, *Personal Growth & Professional Development*, cites three strands about taking pride in the teaching profession, building professional links to enrich teaching practice, and being able to reflect on the extent of the attainment of personal learning goals (National Competency-Based Teachers Standard, 2009).

This study will help determine how teachers perceive their readiness to teach in inclusive classes. It will also look into how some demographic factors–age, grade level taught (pre-school or grade school), type of teacher (general or special education teacher), training received–affect the teacher's professional readiness. The research sought to determine how teachers perceive their professional readiness for mainstreaming/inclusion.

Methods

Research Design

This study is a quantitative descriptive research. It aimed to gather data to describe the professional readiness of general and special education teachers presently working in the mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms.

Respondents

Respondents came from 10 schools in Metro Manila that practice mainstreaming and inclusion of children with special educational needs (SEN). Three of the schools are pre-schools level, five of them offer both pre-school and complete elementary programs, and two offer pre-school to high school programs. Forty-five general education and 13 special education teachers working in the 10 mainstreamed / inclusive schools were the respondents of this study. An interview was conducted with 10 of the 58 respondents--three supervisors who are also classroom teachers, two teachers who are both general and special education teachers, three general education teachers, and two special education teachers.

Research Instruments

The research instrument is an adapted National Competency-Based Teachers Standard (NCBTS) Self-Assessment Scale. The NCBTS is a unified theoretical framework that enumerates the different dimensions of effective teaching. Using the seven domains with their strands and performance indicators, teachers evaluated themselves in terms of their ability to help all types of students learn the different learning goals in the curriculum.

The NCBTS was meant as a framework to standardize effective teaching. With the change in the characteristics of the children inside the mainstreamed/inclusive classes, there is a need to adapt the performance indicators to include tasks related to children with special educational needs (SEN). Therefore, an adapted NCBTS was created and used. Performance indicators were taken from the competencies for special education practitioners as researched by Bustos (2008). The adapted NCBTS thus contained

additional performance indicators to include practices needed towards teaching children with SEN. The NCBTS has 69 performance indicators in its seven domains. The adapted NCBTS has additional 27 performance indicators to accommodate teaching children with SEN in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms. A scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest, was also added to the adapted NCBTS so that respondents will have a score rather than simply indicating whether they are practicing or not practicing the indicated task. A score of 1 meant the performance indicator was not done at all while a score of 5 meant the performance indicator was regularly practiced. Three experts–a professor involved in the training of early grade teachers at the University of the Philippines (UP) Diliman, a professor from the Special Education Department of UP Diliman, and a practicing special education teacher—validated the adapted NCBTS used for this research.

Data Analysis Procedure

Frequency counts and percentages of answers to the NCBTS self-assessment scale were computed for each domain. The summary of these responses was analyzed to see which domain the teachers ranked themselves highest and lowest.

The t-test for independent samples was also used to find if there was a significant difference in the answers between the two categories of the independent variable (e.g. between general and special education teachers). The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test was used when there were more than two categories of independent variables compared (e.g. preschool, gradeschool and high school teachers). The Pearson r was used to determine if there is a correlation

between the respondents' age and their scores in the adapted NCBTS.

Results and Discussion

The adapted NCBTS given to the teachers measured their self-perception of how professionally ready they are to teach in the mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms. Sixty-three percent or about 37 respondents assessed themselves as professionally ready to teach in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms.

Results of the respondents' ratings in each of the seven domains are presented below.

Domain 1: Social Regard for Learning

Out of the 58 respondents, more than 75% had a high raiting in the four indicators of Domain 1. This signifies that the respondents demonstrate value for learning. This also means they see themselves as positive role models for their students, which is a must especially in mainstreamed/ inclusive classrooms for better facilitation of learning and better management of the behavior of children with various needs. Wah (2010) mentioned that teachers in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms should have the knowledge in handling the different challenges of having a class of children with various needs. Children with SEN usually take time to follow an authority figure and once the teacher becomes the authority figure, they emulate whatever the teacher says and does. The respondents' ratings in Domain 1 signify that they are professionally ready in terms of the social regard for learning.

Domain 2: Learning Environment

More than 75% of the respondents gave themselves a high rating in Domain 2. This means that they practice these indicators 75% of their teaching time.

Respondents think that they are able to create an environment that is safe, fair, and conducive for learning which is important for the children, especially those with special educational needs. When children sense that their classrooms are safe environments, learning is unhindered and maximized. Teachers believe that they are able to set up classes that maintain consistent standard for learners' behavior which is a must in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms. When the children know what the standards are, they are able to act accordingly. Melnick & Meister (2008) mentioned in their study that as teachers gain experience in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms, they gain confidence in dealing with the children's different behaviors. Respondents believe that they are able to communicate higher learning expectations to their students. When teachers are able to use various learning activities and encourage the children to be involved, then they are able to help children of various needs learn the skill or the concept they are trying to communicate. The respondents' ratings in Domain 2 signify that they are professionally ready in terms of learning environment.

Domain 3: Diversity of Learners

This domain covers the teacher's familiarity with learners' background and experiences and the teacher's concern for the wholistic development of the learner. The respondents' ratings indicate that they know their learners well. At least 82% of the respondents said they perform these indicators 75% of their teaching time. Mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms are composed of children with various needs and having teachers who are able to familiarize themselves with the diverse needs of the students is essential. Children's needs, though unique, are quite similar in a regular classroom. However, when children

with SEN are included in these classrooms, the teachers need to be able to distinguish which needs of children with SEN are similar to their other classmates and which are specific to their exceptionality. The teachers then need to respond and prepare the environment according to the needs expressed. Giving themselves a high rating on being able to demonstrate concern for the wholistic development of the students means these respondents are ready to teach in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms.

Domain 4: Curriculum

The fourth domain measures the teacher's mastery of the subject and use of alloted instructional time. Of the 34 performance indicators, five were scored at three and below. This indicates that these practices are being done less than half of their teaching time. These indicators were specific to tasks for children with SEN. The ratings revealed that teachers in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms are not yet practicing tasks that help children with SEN learn. Since most of the respondents were general education teachers, their confidence to practice these tasks have yet to be developed. Taylor, Smiley, & Ramasamy (2008) found that though general education teachers agree that they teach children with mild disabilities, general education teachers prefer to teach children with regular needs. Perhaps the respondents also felt that even if they teach in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms, they prefer teaching children with regular needs. Inspite of the ratings in these five indicators, the respondents' ratings generally indicate that they are professionally ready to teach in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms.

Domain 5: Planning, Assessment & Reporting (PAR)

Most of the respondents said that they do these practices at least 75% of their

teaching time. Planning, assessing, and reporting tasks are important for teachers in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms. In a classroom of children with various needs, the teacher needs to plan well, assess the progress of each child, and report the child's progress to concerned personnel and parents. The respondents' high rating means that they are ready to be in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms.

Domain 6: Community Linkages

Half of the respondents did not see linkages between themselves as representative of their schools and the needs of the community around them. In Berliner's five levels of teaching development (Bartell, 2005), he mentioned how teachers progressed through living out what they know and how they respond to the environement around them. These respondents are in the advanced beginner level where the teacher has melded experience with verbal knowledge yet still has no sense of what is important to their environment. They might need mentoring on how to connect the classroom experience with the child's community.

Domain 7: Personal Growth & Professional Development (PGPD)

This domain stipulates how the teacher takes pride in his/her profession, how he/she networks with other professionals to enrich teaching practice, and how he/she reflects about his/her profession for improvement and attainment of personal goals. It is important for teachers to update themselves on behavior management of children with SEN in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms. Continuing education and dialogues with other professionals are good venues for development. Respondents' ratings in

Domain 7 signify that they are professionally ready in terms of personal growth and professional development.

Relationship of Age of Respondents with their Professional Readiness

Bartell (2005) cited Berliner's five levels of teaching development and how the years of teaching affect these. A lower rating on professional development could be expected of younger teachers while a higher rating could be expected from the older ones. The scores of the respondents and their ages were compared using the Pearson r Correlation Coefficient to find out if there is a significant relationship between the two variables. Table 1 shows the results.

Table 1
Correlation Table of Mean per Domain by Age

DOMAINS	MEAN	STD. DEV	Pearson R Correlation Coefficient	*P-value
Domain 1	4.59	0.493	0.282	0.015*
Domain 2	4.49	0.397	0.037	0.390
Domain 3	4.32	0.578	0.122	0.179
Domain 4	3.9	0.526	-0.036	0.394
Domain 5	3.92	0.742	0.024	0.429
Domain 6	3.36	1.05	0.070	0.305
Domain 7	4.28	0.393	0.224	0.048*

*p < 0.05

In Domain 1: *Social Regard for Learning* the correlation yielded a p-value of 0.015, indicating a significant but weak relationship, that is, the older the respondent is, the higher the rating in this domain. The longer the respondent is teaching, the better his/her appreciation for the vocation is. Behaviorally, this appreciation is manifested in his/her attitude towards being a teacher.

The Pearson correlation coefficient also showed a significant but weak relationship between the respondents' ages and their responses in Domain 7: *Personal Growth & Professional Development.* The older the respondent, the higher his/her rating in the practice of the performance indicators stipulated in this domain is. Experienced teachers are better able to manage their personal growth and development.

Differences in Mean Responses per Domain between the Variables Tested

The t-test was used to analyze the mean responses per domain between categories in the three sets of variables, i.e. level taught (pre-school or grade school), type of teacher (general education or special education), and whether respondent had training or not. Results and discussion are presented below.

Level Taught: Pre-school and Grade School. Significant differences were noted with level taught and Domain 6: *Community Linkages* and Domain 7: *Personal Growth & Professional Development.* The pre-school teachers rated themselves higher than the grade school teachers. Most of the pre-school teacher respondents came from schools espousing the were child-centered and recognized developmentally appropriate practices. Involving the community around the school for the children to better integrate their learning is also given time in the progressive schoool's curriculum.

Table 2
Table of Difference: Domain and Level Taught

Domain	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Significance
Domain 1	Pre-school	18.04	2.056	.369	.210
	Grade School	17.69	4.135	.383	
Domain 2	Pre-school	64.04	5.041	1.327	.106
	Grade School	60.04	13.657	1.392	
Domain 3	Pre-school	53.87	5.345	1.342	.125
	Grade School	50.12	12.424	1.401	
Domain 4	Pre-school	135.04	14.307	.589	.151
	Grade School	130.85	31.382	.614	
Domain 5	Pre-school	59.65	6.343	2.100	.051
	Grade School	52.73	14.622	2.192	
Domain 6	Pre-school	19.43	5.968	.305	.032*
	Grade School	18.73	9.535	.313	
Domain 7	Pre-school	50.83	4.119	1.214	.011*
	Grade School	46.23	17.716	1.284	

*$p < 0.05$

The t-test showed that there is a significant difference in the responses of the pre-school and grade school teachers with the former giving themselves a higher rating. Most of the pre-school teachers advocate the progressive philosophy thus classes are child-centered and personalized as much as possible. The self-contained set-up of classes help pre-school teachers practice these indicators more than the grade school teachers who hold classes for a specific subject only.

Type of Teacher: General Education and Special Education. Significant differences were noted with between type of teacher and Domain 1: *Social Regard for Learning,* Domain 2: *Learning Environment,* Domain 3: *Diversity of Learners*, Domain 4: *Curriculum,* Domain 6. *Community Linkages,* and Domain 7: *Personal Growth & Professional Development.* General education teachers ranked themselves higher in five of the 7 domains while special education teachers rated themselves more favorably in Domain 4. Most of the respondents are general education teachers directly handling the mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms. Therefore, the performance indicators in the adapted NCBTS were tasks usually expected of them. On the other hand, the special education respondents

work with specific children with SEN. Thus, they perform these tasks specific to teaching children with SEN more than the general education respondents. According to a study by Taylor, Smiley, & Ramasamy (2008), general education teachers prefer teaching children with regular needs while they expect special education teachers to work with children with SEN. Respondents in this study show the same preference when they signified that they do not practice performance indicators specifically focusing on children with SEN.

There is a significant difference in the rating of general education teachers and special education teachers in performance indicator 2.4.5 (*I apply behavior modification and management techniques on children with special needs*). The former gave themselves a higher rating than the latter. Implementing behavior modification and management techniques on children with SEN when necessary is part of the training of special education teachers which could be the reason why there is a difference in their classroom practices.

Most of the special education respondents are consultants, coordinators,

Table 3

Table of Difference: Domain and Type of Teacher

Domain	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Significance
Domain 1	General Education	18.48	2.019	1.959	.016*
	Special Education	16.62	5.316	1.239	
Domain 2	General Education	62.46	5.537	1.293	.010*
	Special Education	58.46	18.559	.767	
Domain 3	General Education	51.33	6.941	.385	.047*
	Special Education	50.15	16.298	.253	
Domain 4	General Education	130.00	15.573	-.231	.014*
	Special Education	131.77	43.652	-.144	
Domain 5	General Education	53.17	10.410	-.855	.242
	Special Education	56.54	18.401	-.631	
Domain 6	General Education	19.59	6.875	1.167	.007*
	Special Education	16.69	10.904	.908	
Domain 7	General Education	49.35	11.526	1.384	.035*
	Special Education	43.48	19.877	1.034	

*$p < 0.05$

or shadow teachers who manage individual children with SEN inside the mainstreamed/inclusive classes. Inside the classroom, it is the general education teacher who manages the children with SEN. Of the 45 general education teachers, only 25 respondents or 55% were untrained. Being untrained in managing children with SEN might account for their low rating in applying behavior modification on children with SEN. Classroom behavior management is an issue for the mainstreamed and inclusive classroom (Bayliss, Avramidis, & Burden, 2000, Tsang, 2004). Systematic and intensive training needs to be done to help these general education teachers address classroom management issues (Bayliss, Avramidis, & Burden, 2000, Eloff & Kgwete, 2007).

General education teachers rated themselves lower than special education teachers in the following performance indicators:

3.1.1 *I use information on the learning styles and needs of the learners to design and   select learning experiences.*

3.1.4 *I provide differentiated activities for different kinds of learners*

3.1.5 *I initiate other learning approaches for learners whose needs have not been met by usual approaches*

3.1.7 *I interact efficiently and effectively with children with special needs individually and collectively*

The special education teachers' rating showed that they do these practices more than 75% of their teaching time. Although there are children with SEN in the respondents' classrooms, it is still the special education teachers who were consulted on differentiated activities and teaching strategies to be done when the children with SEN have a difficult time learning a concept or skill.

In Domain 4 which pertained to curriculum, special education teachers rated themselves higher than general education teachers in: delivering accurate and updated knowledge in using methodologies, approaches, and strategies (4.1.1); developing effective oral and written language among children with SEN (4.1.12); providing and teaching vocational education and employable skills (4.1.14); developing an IEP for the child with SEN (4.2.4); and designing and providing continuing and exit programs for children with SEN (4.4.9). These performance indicators are the practices expected of special education teachers. However, as inclusive classrooms are embraced, the general education teachers might need to practice these indicators as well.

Significant differences were also noted between general education teachers and special education teachers in: involving parents in school activities to encourage learning (5.1.2); communicating the progress of the child to his/her parents and allied professionals involved in his/her case (5.1.3); recommending appropriate services for the child with SEN (5.2.6); monitoring, assessing and evaluating the progress of the child with SEN (5.2.7); collecting both numerical and narrative reports to document the progress of the child with SEN (5.3.3); and writing a progress and assessment report of the child with SEN (5.3.4), with the special education teachers rating themselves higher than the general education teachers. The pre-service training of the special education teachers exposed them to the different aspects of teaching children with SEN. General education teachers have taken courses that pertained to general knowledge of children with SEN but there is no in-depth course taught on

behavior management, modifying the curriculum, adapting the classroom setting, and assessing the children with SEN. In-service training might be able to address these needs.

General education and special education teachers showed a significant difference in the following performance indicators:

> 6.1.3 *I use the community as a laboratory for learning;*
>
> 6.1.6 *I advocate for children with special needs and special education programs within school, local government unit, and the community;* and
>
> 7.1.4. *I articulate and demonstrate my personal philosophy of teaching.*

Special education teachers rated themselves

articulate and demonstrate a philosophy of teaching involving children with SEN.

Teacher with Training and without Training. Respondents with training rated themselves higher than respondents without training in Domain 6: *Community Linkages* and Domain 7: *Personal Growth & Professional Development.* Trained respondents seem to know how to link the lessons of the classroom to the community and are more aware of professional development venues. The fact that they have had training and still seek to be trained speak of the respondents' effort to grow as a teacher. Training affects the teachers' performance in the mainstreamed/inclusive classroom because trained teachers have more confidence in teaching children with SEN as mentioned in studies by Bayliss, Avramidis, & Burden

Table 4

Table of Difference: Domain and Teachers With or Without Training

Domain	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-value	Significance
Domain 1	With Training	18.11	1.912	.095	.219
	Without Training	18.03	3.848	.099	
Domain 2	With Training	62.82	5.511	.950	.172
	Without Training	60.41	12.409	.995	
Domain 3	With Training	51.96	6.415	.776	.189
	Without Training	50.03	11.732	.805	
Domain 4	With Training	134.50	18.349	1.401	.404
	Without Training	125.75	28.212	1.440	
Domain 5	With Training	57.11	8.879	2.011	.082
	Without Training	50.78	14.419	2.073	
Domain 6	With Training	20.61	6.402	1.698	.048*
	Without Training	17.16	8.930	1.735	
Domain 7	With Training	51.64	4.885	1.982	.008*
	Without Training	44.78	17.727	2.100	

*$p < 0.05$

higher in those indicators.

Since special education teachers have been trained to deal with children with SEN, thus they are the ones able to

(2000) and Rose, Kaikkonen, & Koiv (2007).

Those who have had training rated themselves higher than those who have not been trained in indicator 2.1.2 *(I provide*

gender-fair opportunities for learning). Teachers who have been exposed to training might have learned about being sensitive to gender issues and making sure that they give equal opportunities for all genders involved.

In Domain 4, respondents who have training and those without training showed significant differences in six performance indicators. These indicators are: incorporating basic learning competencies in all subjects as needed by the child with SEN (4.1.10); teaching basic literacy skills (4.1.11); developing effective oral and written language among children with SEN (4.1.12); modifying curriculum and using strategies for children with SEN in the inclusive classrooms (4.4.6); providing lesson plans and activities base on the IEP of the child with SEN (4.4.7); and presenting lessons effectively using developmentally appropriate practices for the child with SEN (4.4.8). As mentioned in the preceding section, trainings for the continuing education of teachers to mentor them in the mainstreamed inclusive classes come sparsely. Apart from this reality, the thrust to provide in-service training pertinent to the needs of the teachers is lacking. Training gives teachers confidence in handling children with SEN (Bayliss, Avramidis, & Burden, 2000, Rose, Kaikkonen, & Koiv, 2007).

Conclusion

This study showed that the teachers' self-assessment were highest in four out of the seven domains: Domain 1: *Social Regard for Learning*; Domain 2: *Learning Environment*; Domain 3: *Diversity of Learners*; and Domain 7: *Personal Growth & Professional Development*. This is a good indication that the teachers value themselves as teachers, know the children they are teaching inside the classrooms, and are able to create learning environments for

maximum learning. Thus, these favorable ratings in four domains give us a good picture that inclusion will move forward where these teachers are practicing. Teachers who see themselves as able to teach children with various needs inside the classroom serve as an impetus to promote inclusion in schools. The domain with the lowest rating in their self-assessment was Domain 4: *Curriculum*. The adapted NCBTS contained performance indicators that are specific to teaching children with SEN in the classroom and these tasks are not usually expected of general education teachers teaching in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms.

This study also showed that the more experienced teachers have better appreciation of the teaching profession and have more conviction for professional development. Furthermore, the general education and special education teachers' differences stem from differences in their roles and responsibilities inside the mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms. Children with regular needs are catered to by the general education teacher; children with SEN, though included in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms are assigned to shadow teachers or special education consultants who modify content, instruction, and assessment.

The changing picture of the classroom demands a change in the present set-up of the classroom. The traditional view of the classroom as the turf of one teacher is slowly moving to a progressive view of collaborative relationships to optimize the learning environment in the classroom. The relationship of the general education and special education teachers is being sketched more clearly.The teachers' self-perceptions of their ability to teach in mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms are important. Teachers responded that they

are ready to face the challenge of teaching children with SEN in the regular classroom.

General education teachers are recommended to attend training that will help them learn more instructional strategies for a diverse classroom. Special education teachers are recommended to attend training which will familiarize them with the regular curriculum used in the general classrooms. This helps them in co-teaching in general education classrooms. Small private schools that offer mainstreamed/inclusive classrooms need to look into their personnel needs and the needs of the children with SEN. Continuing to accept children with SEN means acquiring the services of a special education personnel to focus on modifying curriculum, adapting classroom settings, and managing behanioral issues presented by children with SEN.

References

Bartell, C. A. (2005). *Cultivating High-Quality Teaching Through Induction and Mentoring.* California: Corwin Press.

Bayliss, P., Avramidis, E., & Burden, R. (2000). A Survey into Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Educaitonal Needs in the Ordinary School in one Local Education Authority. *Educational Psychology* , 191-211.

Bustos, M. T. (2008, October). Development of Progressince Competencies for Special Education Practitioners. Quezon City.

Chan Robles Virtual Law Library. (n.d.). Retrieved April 15, 2012, from www.chanrobles:

http://www.chanrobles.com/republicactno7836.htm

Department of Education Philippines. (n.d.). Retrieved July 2011, from http://www.deped.gov.ph.

Eloff, I., & Kgwete, L. (2007, August 15). *South African Teachers' Voice on Support of Inclusive Education.* Retrieved August 6, 2011, from HighBeam Research: http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-168163366.html

Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. D. (2006). *Including Students with Special Needs (A Practical Guide for Classroom Teachers.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Melnick, S. A., & Meister, D. G. (2008, March 1). *A Comparison of Beginning and Experienced Teachers' Concern.* Retrieved September 17, 2011, from HighBeam Research: http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-1438888271.html

National Competency-Based Teachers Standard. (2009). Retrieved July 2011, from Department of Education: http://www.unesco.or.id/reports/National_Competency_Based_Teachers_Standard.pdf

Professional Regulatory Commission. (n.d.). Retrieved April 15, 2012, from www.prc.gov.ph: http://www.prc.gov.ph/uploaded/documents/PROFESSIONAL%20TEACHERS-LAW1.PDF

Sebba J. and Ainscow, M. (1996) *International development in inclusive schooling:Mapping the issues.* Cambridge Journal of Education. Vol.26 (1)(p.5-18).

Taylor, R. L., Smiley, L. R., & Ramasamy, R. (December 2008, March 1). Effects of Educational Background and Experience on Teacher Veiws of Inclusion. *Educational Research Quarterly* .

Tsang, N. G. (2004). *Principals' and Regular Teachers' Perception of Inclusion.* UP Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

Van Laarhoven, T. R., Munk, D. D., Lynch, K., Bosma, J., & Rouse, J. (2007, November 1). *A Model for Preparing Special and General Education Preservice Teachers for Inclusive Education.* Retrieved September 17, 2011, from HighBeam Research: http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-171136041.html

Wah, L. L. (2010). Different Strategies for Embracing Inclusive Education: A Snapshot of Individual Cases from Three Countries. *International Journal of Special Education ,* 98-109.

Waligore, L. R. (2003). *Teachers' Attitudes Towards Inclusion: What Did They Say.* Retrieved 2011, from http://ref.lib.rowan.edu/rowan_theses/RU2002/0147TEACpdf