

Correlation between Educational Leadership Practices and the Implementation of Inclusive Education

Roderick M. Cadapan; Fe V. Candelaria, EdD

Mabini Colleges, Incorporated, Daet, Camarines Norte, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700562>

Received: 27 July 2026; Accepted: 01 August 2026; Published: 07 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the relationship between educational leadership practices and the implementation of inclusive education in Mabini Colleges, Inc. Specifically, it assessed educational leadership practices, the extent of inclusive education implementation, and the issues encountered by faculty members and academic staff, and proposed an intervention to strengthen both areas. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, involving all faculty members and academic staff as respondents. Data were collected using a validated researcher-made questionnaire and analyzed through descriptive statistics, weighted mean, and Spearman's rank-order correlation (ρ). The findings revealed that educational leadership practices were highly practiced in terms of vision and goal-setting, decision-making and problem-solving, communication and collaboration, and instructional support and supervision. Likewise, inclusive education was almost fully implemented in the areas of policies and practices, adaptive instructional delivery, and support services. A statistically significant positive relationship was found between educational leadership practices and the implementation of inclusive education, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. The absence of professional development programs on inclusive education and limited training on inclusive education practices emerged as the most frequently encountered concerns among faculty members and academic staff. Based on the findings, the Leadership and Inclusive Education (LEAD-IN) Enhancement Plan was proposed to strengthen educational leadership and inclusive education implementation. The study recommends sustained leadership development, continuous faculty professional development, strengthened stakeholder collaboration, and further studies in other higher education institutions.

Keywords: Educational leadership practices, inclusive education, instructional supervision, adaptive instructional delivery, support services, higher education

INTRODUCTION

Education is a fundamental human right and a key driver of social equity, economic development, and sustainable progress. Recognizing its importance, the United Nations, through Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4: Quality Education), emphasizes ensuring inclusive, equitable, and quality education for all, while Sustainable Development Goal 10 (SDG 10: Reduced Inequalities) advocates for equal opportunities and reduced disparities in education.

According to Ainscow (2020), inclusive education requires systemic reforms in school culture, policies, and instructional practices, supported by effective leadership that promotes collaboration and institutional change. Likewise, Hallinger (2011) emphasized that educational leadership plays a crucial role in shaping school vision, strengthening instructional practices, and fostering collaboration, all of which contribute to successful educational outcomes.

In the Philippines, the government's commitment to inclusive education is reflected in several national laws and policies. Republic Act No. 10533, or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, promotes an inclusive basic education system, while Republic Act No. 11650, or the Inclusive Education Act, institutionalizes inclusive education and support services for learners with disabilities through equitable access and appropriate accommodations. Likewise, Department of Education Order No. 21, s. 2019 establishes the Inclusive Education

Policy Framework for Basic Education, emphasizing equitable participation, learner-centered instruction, and the removal of barriers to learning.

Despite these policy initiatives, previous studies have identified persistent challenges related to teacher preparation and institutional readiness (Parucan, 2023). Additionally, inadequate resources, limited family engagement, and insufficient teacher training impede schools' ability to promote diversity (Beltran et al., 2025).

Furthermore, much of the existing literature has focused on basic education, leaving limited evidence on the relationship between educational leadership and the implementation of inclusive education in higher education institutions. This study aims to determine the relationship between educational leadership practices and the implementation of inclusive education, identify issues and concerns in these areas, and propose interventions to strengthen them.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative research method using a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between educational leadership practices and the implementation of inclusive education in Mabini Colleges, Inc. The descriptive component focused on determining the extent of educational leadership practices and the implementation of inclusive education and on identifying the issues and concerns in these areas. While the correlational component determined the relationship between two variables.

The respondents were all 167 faculty members and academic staff. The sample size was 167, which constitutes the entire population. Given that the study was limited to a single institution and the population was manageable, the study employed total enumeration.

However, only 153, or 92%, of faculty and academic staff participated. Total enumeration maximized representation, reduced sampling error, and ensured that leadership assessments across all departments were captured. A validated survey questionnaire was the primary research instrument used to collect data for the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Extent of Educational Leadership Practices. This section provides a detailed discussion of the extent of educational leadership practices, including vision and goal setting, decision-making and problem-solving, communication and collaboration, and instructional support and supervision.

Vision and Goal-Setting. This section presents and discusses the respondents' assessment of educational leadership practices, specifically focusing on vision and goal-setting. The indicator, school leaders ensure that institutional goals are understood by faculty and staff, got the highest weighted mean of 4.28, interpreted as very highly practiced. It means that aligning institutional goals with inclusive education principles and ensuring these goals are clearly understood by faculty and staff reflects a shared vision within the institution.

On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest weighted mean of 3.89, although still interpreted as highly practiced, obtained by the indicator, school leaders regularly review and evaluate institutional goals, implies that while leaders are effective in establishing and communicating goals, there is a need to strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems to ensure that institutional goals remain responsive to emerging educational needs.

The overall vision and goal-setting weighted mean of 4.15, interpreted as highly practiced, indicates that school leaders consistently demonstrate strong leadership in establishing and communicating the institutional vision and goals. These findings are supported by Ketikidou and Saiti (2022), who emphasized that school leadership plays an important role in promoting inclusive education by aligning institutional vision with equity and collaboration. Similarly, White et al. (2025) highlighted that effective leadership involves establishing clear goals and fostering shared understanding among stakeholders. These studies affirm that strong vision-setting practices contribute to the successful implementation of inclusive education.

Table 1: Extent of Educational Leadership Practices along Vision and Goal Setting

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
School leaders...	4.17	HP
1. clearly communicate a vision that promotes inclusive and equitable quality education.		
2. aligned the institutional goals with inclusive education principles and relevant global priorities.	4.21	VHP
3. encourages faculty and staff to participate in setting shared institutional goals that support student diversity.	4.23	VHP
4. regularly review and evaluate institutional goals to ensure alignment with inclusive education and global development targets.	3.89	HP
5. emphasize the college's mission and vision towards diversity, equal opportunities, and learner-centered values.	4.24	VHP
6. articulate long-term goals that guide academic planning.	4.07	HP
7. clearly reflect the institution's vision in academic programs and activities.	4.22	VHP
8. ensure that institutional goals are understood by faculty and staff.	4.28	VHP
9. anchor the vision and goals of the institution to serve as a basis for evaluating school performance.	4.17	HP
10. align leadership initiatives with the institution's stated goals.	4.07	HP
Overall Weighted Mean	4.15	HP

Rating Scale:

Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00 - Very Highly Practiced (VHP)

3.40 – 4.19 - Highly Practiced (HP)

2.60 – 3.39 - Moderately Practiced (MP)

1.80– 2.59 - Seldom Practiced (SP)

1.0 – 1.79 - Never Practiced (NP)

Decision-making and Problem-solving. This section presents and discusses data on the extent of educational leadership practices, particularly decision-making and problem-solving, as assessed by respondents. The highest weighted mean of 4.08 was obtained by the indicator, leaders consider the needs of diverse learners, implying that inclusivity and efficiency are prioritized in the decision-making process. The lowest weighted mean of 3.83 was obtained by the indicator, administrators respond promptly and appropriately to instructional challenges.

Although it is still considered as highly practiced, this suggests that responsiveness to immediate concerns requires further improvement.

Table 2: Extent of Educational Leadership Practices along Decision-Making and Problem-Solving

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Leaders use evidence or data in making academic and instructional decisions.	3.92	HP
2. Leaders consider the needs of diverse learners.	4.08	HP
3. Administrators support collaboration among faculty members to enhance inclusive teaching.	3.94	HP
4. Administrators respond promptly and appropriately to instructional challenges.	3.83	HP
5. Leaders implement problem-solving strategies to promote fairness and inclusion.	3.95	HP
6. Leaders analyze available data before making academic decisions.	3.99	HP
7. Leaders consider faculty input when resolving institutional problems.	3.84	HP
8. Administrators follow established procedures when making decisions.	3.92	HP
9. Leaders implement decisions effectively across departments.	4.07	HP
10. Leaders address academic concerns in a timely manner.	4.01	HP
Overall Weighted Mean	3.95	HP

Rating Scale:

Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Very Highly Practiced (VHP)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Highly Practiced (HP)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Moderately Practiced (MP)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Seldom Practiced (SP)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Never Practiced (NP)

The overall decision-making and problem-solving weighted mean of 3.95, interpreted as highly practiced, means that school leaders in the institution demonstrate competence in making informed, inclusive decisions. The findings were corroborated by White et al. (2025), who identified data-driven decision-making and responsive leadership as essential components of effective educational management. Moreover, Putri et al. (2020) found that effective problem-solving and collaborative leadership strategies are necessary in addressing institutional challenges.

Communication and Collaboration. This section presents data on respondents' assessments of the extent of educational leadership practices, in terms of communication and collaboration. The indicator with the highest weighted mean of 4.10, interpreted as highly practiced, administrators maintain positive and professional relationships with academic staff. This implies strong interpersonal leadership skills between administrators and academic staff.

Table 3: Extent of Educational Leadership Practices along Communication and Collaboration

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Leaders communicate information clearly and consistently to academic staff.	4.01	HP
2. The institution encourages open two-way communication between administrators and faculty.	3.88	HP
3. Collaboration among faculty members is supported to enhance inclusive teaching.	4.05	HP
4. Administrators maintain positive and professional relationships with academic staff.	4.10	HP
5. Regular meetings or dialogues are conducted to address academic issues and improve coordination.	4.02	HP
6. School leaders clearly explain decisions affecting faculty and staff.	3.84	HP
7. Communication between administrators and faculty is open and respectful.	4.02	HP
8. Collaborative activities are encouraged to improve academic performance.	4.06	HP
9. Administrators provide opportunities for dialogue among stakeholders.	3.73	HP
10. Faculty members feel comfortable expressing concerns to school leaders.	3.61	HP
Overall Weighted Mean	3.93	HP

Rating Scale:

Descriptive Interpretation:

- | | | |
|-------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 4.20 – 5.00 | - | Very Highly Practiced (VHP) |
| 3.40 – 4.19 | - | Highly Practiced (HP) |
| 2.60 – 3.39 | - | Moderately Practiced (MP) |
| 1.80 – 2.59 | - | Seldom Practiced (SP) |
| 1.00 – 1.79 | - | Never Practiced (NP) |

On the contrary, the lowest weighted mean of 3.61, interpreted as highly practiced, is recorded for the indicator, faculty members feel comfortable expressing concerns to school leaders. This suggests that although

communication channels are available within the institution, some faculty members do not always openly communicate their concerns to administrators. The overall weighted mean of communication and collaboration of 3.93, interpreted as highly practiced, suggests that school leaders maintain effective communication and foster collaboration among academic staff and faculty members. The findings were supported by Kilag et al. (2024), who emphasized that collaborative leadership and effective communication are critical in building inclusive school communities. Similarly, Elias and Mansouri (2023) highlighted that strong institutional communication and collaboration are necessary to promote inclusivity and address diversity in educational settings. These studies affirm that communication and collaboration are key drivers of inclusive practices.

Instructional Support and Supervision. This section presents respondents' assessments of the extent of educational leadership practices, particularly instructional support and supervision.

Table 4: Extent of Educational Leadership Practices along Instructional Support and Supervision

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Administrators provide instructional guidance to faculty when needed.	3.95	HP
2. Classroom supervision or monitoring is conducted to support instructional improvement.	3.75	HP
3. Leaders encourage faculty to use inclusive and innovative teaching strategies.	4.05	HP
4. Constructive feedback is provided to teachers to enhance their professional practice.	3.87	HP
5. The administration supports professional development related to instruction and inclusive education.	3.94	HP
6. Leaders provide assistance to improve classroom instruction.	3.92	HP
7. Classroom observations are conducted to support teaching effectiveness.	3.79	HP
8. Feedback from supervisors helps improve instructional practices.	3.88	HP
9. Administrators encourage the use of innovative teaching strategies.	4.07	HP
10. School leadership supports the continuous professional growth of faculty.	3.99	HP
Overall Weighted Mean	3.92	HP

Rating Scale:

Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00 - Very Highly Practiced (VHP)

3.40 – 4.19 - Highly Practiced (HP)

2.60 – 3.39 - Moderately Practiced (MP)

1.80 – 2.59 - Seldom Practiced (SP)

1.00 – 1.79 - Never Practiced (NP)

The highest weighted mean was observed for the indicator, leaders encourage faculty to use inclusive and innovative teaching strategies, at 4.07. This means that school leaders strongly promote the use of creative, modern instructional approaches in the teaching and learning process. Yet, the lowest weighted mean was observed for the indicator, classroom supervision or monitoring is conducted to support instructional improvement, at 3.75, interpreted as highly practiced. In the institution, instructional supervision and monitoring are generally evident through consultations, faculty meetings, and other supervisory activities conducted by deans and school administrators. Overall, instructional support and supervision obtained a weighted mean of 3.92, interpreted as highly practiced. This indicates that school leaders consistently demonstrate their role in supporting instructional improvement and faculty development within the institution. Overall, the findings imply that instructional support and supervision are integral components of leadership practices that contribute to achieving institutional goals. The findings were supported by White et al. (2025), who emphasized that instructional and pedagogical leadership are central to the success of inclusive education, particularly in enhancing teaching practices and professional development. Similarly, Marmol-Dado (2024) found that instructional leadership practices are significantly associated with the effective implementation of inclusive education. Moreover, Farzana et al. (2023) highlighted that innovative teaching strategies and teacher leadership are crucial for addressing diverse learner needs. However, the need to strengthen supervision and monitoring was corroborated by Neves et al. (2023) and Kocha and Senapathy (2022), who reported that gaps in implementation and leadership practices undermine the effectiveness of inclusive education.

Extent of Inclusive Education Implementation. This section focuses on the extent of implementation of inclusive education. It provides a detailed discussion of the extent of implementation of inclusive education, including policies and practices, adaptive instructional delivery, and support services.

Policies and Practices. This section discusses the findings on the extent of inclusive education implementation, focusing on policies and practices. The indicator, admission and retention policies do not discriminate against students with special needs, obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.20, interpreted as fully implemented. This indicates that the institution strongly upholds the principle of equity in providing access to education for all learners. On the other hand, faculty members are informed about institutional policies on inclusion, which had the lowest weighted mean of 3.79, also interpreted as almost fully implemented. This indicates that while policies exist, there are gaps in communication and dissemination among faculty members. The overall weighted mean for policies and practices was 3.94, interpreted as almost fully implemented. This indicates that the institution has generally established and implemented policies that support inclusive education. The findings were supported by Domingo (2020), who emphasized that policies, resources, and stakeholder awareness are critical factors in the successful implementation of inclusive education.

Table 5: Extent of Implementation of Inclusive Education along Policies and Practices

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Has clear policies supporting inclusive education.	3.84	AFI
2. Admission and retention policies do not discriminate against students with special needs.	4.20	FI
3. Inclusive education policies are well communicated to all faculty and staff.	3.89	AFI
4. There is a clear referral and support system for students with learning difficulties.	3.82	AFI

5. School policies ensure that necessary accommodations are provided for diverse learners.	3.92	AFI
6. Institutional policies support equal access to education for all learners.	4.06	AFI
7. Policies promote fairness and non-discrimination in academic settings.	4.11	AFI
8. Inclusive education policies are consistently implemented across departments.	3.87	AFI
9. Faculty members are informed about institutional policies on inclusion.	3.79	AFI
10. Policies are enforced to ensure inclusive educational practices.	3.87	AFI
Overall Weighted Mean	3.94	AFI

Rating Scale:

Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Fully Implemented (FI)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Almost Fully Implemented (AFI)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Moderately Implemented (MI)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Partially Implemented (PI)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Not Implemented (NI)

The study highlighted that equitable access policies, particularly non-discriminatory admission and retention practices, are essential in ensuring that learners with special needs are given equal educational opportunities. Similarly, Elias and Mansouri (2023) pointed out that the existence of inclusive policies alone is not sufficient unless they are effectively communicated and implemented within the institution. Moreover, Beltran et al. (2025) found that while schools attempt to implement inclusive education, challenges such as limited awareness, insufficient resources, and gaps in policy implementation persist. This further affirms the present findings that although policies are almost fully implemented, improvements are still needed to ensure consistency and full awareness among all stakeholders.

Adaptive Instructional Delivery. This section presents the analysis and interpretation of data concerning the extent of inclusive education implementation, particularly adaptive instructional delivery.

Table 6: Extent of Implementation of Inclusive Education along Adaptive Instructional Delivery

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Faculty members modify instructional methods to accommodate students with diverse learning needs.	4.12	AFI
2. Lessons are designed flexibly to allow students to learn at their own pace and style.	4.11	AFI

3. Assessment methods are adapted to measure the progress of students with different abilities.	4.08	AFI
4. Technology and varied instructional materials are used to support diverse learners.	4.16	AFI
5. Faculty members receive guidance or training on adaptive and inclusive instructional practices.	3.77	AFI
6. Teaching strategies are adjusted to address diverse learning needs.	4.01	AFI
7. Lessons are designed to accommodate different learning styles.	4.07	AFI
8. Instructional activities allow flexibility for learner differences.	4.13	AFI
9. Assessment methods are modified to suit varying student abilities.	3.99	AFI
10. Instructional approaches support the active participation of all learners.	4.04	AFI
Overall Weighted Mean	4.05	AFI

Rating Scale:

Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Fully Implemented (FI)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Almost Fully Implemented (AFI)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Moderately Implemented (MI)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Partially Implemented (PI)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Not Implemented (NI)

Among the indicators, technology and varied instructional materials are used to support diverse learners, obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.16, interpreted as almost fully implemented. This indicates that teachers effectively utilize digital tools and diverse instructional resources to enhance learning and accommodate different learner needs. The result suggests that technology plays a significant role in facilitating inclusive education by providing multiple ways for students to access and understand learning content. On the other hand, the indicator, faculty members receive guidance or training on adaptive and inclusive instructional practices, obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.77, interpreted as almost fully implemented. This indicates that while adaptive instructional strategies are being practiced, there are limitations in formal training and professional development for faculty members. The result suggests that teachers rely more on personal initiative than on structured institutional support when implementing inclusive practices. It also reflects the need to strengthen capacity-building programs that focus on adaptive instruction and inclusive teaching strategies. The overall weighted mean for adaptive instructional delivery is 4.05, which is interpreted as almost fully implemented. This indicates that faculty members generally employ adaptive teaching strategies to accommodate students' diverse learning needs. The result suggests that instructional practices within the institution are flexible and responsive, allowing learners to engage with lessons based on their individual abilities and learning styles. It also shows that inclusive education is evident in classroom practices through varied teaching approaches and modified assessment strategies. The findings were supported by Dela Fuente (2021), who emphasized that the use of

innovative teaching tools and varied instructional materials is essential in promoting inclusive education. The study stressed that adaptive and creative instructional approaches enhance student engagement and enable learners with diverse needs to access and understand lessons effectively. On the other hand, faculty training in adaptive and inclusive instructional practices was supported by Mirador and Lluz (2021), who reported that teachers often face challenges in implementing inclusive education due to insufficient preparation and limited training opportunities. Similarly, Beltran et al. (2025) identified a lack of training as one of the major barriers to the effective implementation of inclusive practices in schools. These studies affirm that while inclusive instructional strategies are being practiced, strengthening professional development remains essential to ensure their consistent and effective implementation.

Support services. This section presents the analysis and interpretation of data regarding the extent of inclusive education implementation, particularly support services. The highest weighted mean for the indicator, support services are available to address students' academic needs, which is 3.88, interpreted as almost fully implemented. This indicates that the institution prioritizes providing academic assistance to learners, particularly those with special needs. The result suggests that support systems are in place to help students cope with academic demands and improve their learning outcomes. While the lowest weighted mean of 3.65 was obtained by the indicator, the school coordinates with external specialists or agencies to support inclusion, which is interpreted as almost fully implemented.

This finding suggests that respondents generally perceived institutional efforts to support learners with diverse needs beyond the classroom. Within the institution, support is primarily provided through faculty members, the Guidance Office, and other internal student support services. While faculty members maintain communication with parents regarding students' academic progress and learning needs. At the same time, the relatively lower rating of this indicator indicates opportunities to further strengthen and formalize partnerships with SPED specialists, psychologists, physicians, therapists, and other external agencies to provide more comprehensive support for learners with diverse needs.

Table 7: Extent of Implementation of Inclusive Education along Support Services

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. The institution provides adequate support services for students with special needs (e.g., counseling, learning support).	3.82	AFI
2. Support services are accessible to both students and teachers.	3.84	AFI
3. The school coordinates with external specialists or agencies to support inclusion.	3.65	AFI
4. The administration monitors the effectiveness of the provided support services.	3.71	AFI
5. Parents and guardians are involved in planning support for their children.	3.72	AFI
6. Support services are available to address students' academic needs.	3.88	AFI
7. Students are informed about available support services.	3.79	AFI
8. Support personnel collaborate with teachers to assist learners.	3.83	AFI
9. Support services are monitored for effectiveness.	3.70	AFI

10. The institution provides timely assistance to students requiring support.	3.85	AFI
Overall Weighted Mean	3.78	AFI

Rating Scale:

Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Fully Implemented (FI)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Almost Fully Implemented (AFI)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Moderately Implemented (MI)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Partially Implemented (PI)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Not Implemented (NI)

It also demonstrates the need to strengthen linkages with external experts who can provide additional support for learners with diverse needs. The overall weighted mean for support services is 3.78, interpreted as almost fully implemented. This indicates that the institution generally provides support services that address the needs of diverse learners. The result suggests that mechanisms such as academic assistance, counseling, and coordination with support personnel are present and functioning within the institution. The findings were supported by Domingo (2020), who emphasized that support services, resources, and community involvement are essential components in the successful implementation of inclusive education. The study highlighted that providing academic support and assistance to learners significantly contributes to their inclusion and overall development. On the other hand, coordination with external specialists is corroborated by Kocha and Senapathy (2022), who found that a lack of coordination with external stakeholders and limited access to specialized support hinder the effective implementation of inclusive education. Similarly, Beltran et al. (2025) reported that gaps in stakeholder collaboration and support systems remain a challenge in schools implementing inclusive education. These studies affirm that while internal support services are present, strengthening external partnerships is necessary to achieve more effective and comprehensive inclusive education practices.

Correlation between Educational Leadership Practices and the Implementation of Inclusive Education.

This section presents the correlation between educational leadership practices and the implementation of inclusive education using Spearman's rank-order correlation (ρ). The findings reveal that all variables of educational leadership practices, namely, vision and goal setting, decision-making and problem-solving, communication and collaboration, and instructional support and supervision, have statistically significant relationships with all variables of inclusive education implementation, as evidenced by p-values of .000 ($p < .01$). This indicates strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis and confirms that educational leadership practices are significantly associated with the effective implementation of inclusive education. In terms of strength, the correlation coefficients range from moderate to very strong positive relationships. Instructional support and supervision demonstrate the highest correlations across all variables of inclusive education implementation, particularly with policies and practices ($\rho = .842$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), adaptive instructional delivery ($\rho = .724$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), and support services ($\rho = .715$, $p\text{-value} < .01$). Similarly, vision and goal setting also show very strong relationships, especially with policies and practices ($\rho = .822$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), adaptive instructional delivery ($\rho = .750$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), and support services ($\rho = .645$, $p\text{-value} < .01$). Moreover, decision-making and problem-solving also exhibit strong positive correlations across all indicators, particularly policies and practices ($\rho = .796$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), adaptive instructional delivery ($\rho = .706$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), and support services ($\rho = .713$, $p\text{-value} < .01$). Likewise, communication and collaboration also exhibit strong positive correlations, specifically policies and practices ($\rho = .791$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), adaptive instructional delivery ($\rho = .681$, $p\text{-value} < .01$), and support services ($\rho = .690$, $p\text{-value} < .01$). These results consistently suggest that the level of inclusive education implementation is associated with improvements in educational leadership practices. These findings were supported by Marmol-Dado (2024), who found that instructional leadership practices are significantly associated with inclusive education implementation. Similarly, White et al. (2025) emphasized that effective leadership, particularly in instructional and pedagogical aspects, is essential in promoting inclusive and

equitable learning environments. Furthermore, DeMatthews et al. (2021) highlighted that school leadership plays a central role in shaping inclusive school systems through comprehensive leadership approaches. In addition, Dela Fuente (2021) and Mirador and Lluz (2021) emphasized that adaptive instructional practices depend not only on leadership but also on teacher training and competence, which supports the present findings on adaptive instructional delivery. However, Kocha and Senapathy (2022) noted that limitations in resources and support systems can hinder the full implementation of inclusive education, which corroborates the present finding regarding the relatively lower influence of support services.

Table 8: Test for a Significant Relationship between the Educational Leadership Practices and the Implementation of Inclusive Education

Educational Leadership Practices	Inclusive Education Implementation					
	Policies and Practices		Adaptive Instructional Delivery		Support Services	
	ρ	p -value	ρ	p -value	ρ	p -value
Vision and Goal Setting	.822**	.000	.750**	.000	.645**	.000
Decision-Making and Problem-Solving	.796**	.000	.706**	.000	.713**	.000
Communication and Collaboration	.791**	.000	.681**	.000	.690**	.000
Instructional Support and Supervision	.842**	.000	.724**	.000	.715**	.000

**Correlation is significant @ 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Issues and Concerns Encountered by the Faculty Members and Academic Staff. This section presents the issues and concerns encountered by faculty members and academic staff regarding educational leadership practices and the implementation of inclusive education. Identifying these concerns is essential in understanding the challenges that may affect the effective delivery of educational services and the successful implementation of inclusive education initiatives.

Educational Leadership Practices. This section focuses on the issues and concerns encountered by faculty members and academic staff regarding educational leadership practices. Among the indicators, the absence of professional development programs about inclusive education obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.06. This indicates that a lack of training and professional development opportunities is the most frequently encountered issue among faculty members and academic staff. Conversely, the inconsistent implementation of leadership initiatives obtained the lowest weighted mean of 2.77, interpreted as sometimes encountered.

This indicates that inconsistency in leadership practices is less frequently experienced compared to other concerns. The overall weighted mean of 2.89 regarding issues and concerns in educational leadership practices faced by faculty and academic staff indicates that challenges related to educational leadership practices exist within the institution, but are not consistently experienced by all respondents. The findings were corroborated by Mirador and Lluz (2021), who reported that teachers often experience challenges in implementing inclusive education due to insufficient training and limited preparation, which aligns with the present finding, where lack of professional development was the most encountered issue. Similarly, Jardinez and Natividad (2024) identified inadequate professional development and limited resources as key barriers in implementing inclusive practices, emphasizing the need for continuous training and capacity-building among educators

Table 9: Issues and Concerns Encountered by the Faculty Members and Academic Staff, along with Educational Leadership

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Lack of clear vision and goals for inclusive education	2.84	SE
2. Inconsistent communication among administrators and teachers	2.97	SE
3. Limited support from leadership in addressing students' diverse needs	2.83	SE
4. Absence of professional development programs about inclusive education	3.06	SE
5. Inadequate monitoring and evaluation of inclusive education initiatives	2.97	SE
6. Limited involvement of faculty in institutional decision-making.	2.87	SE
7. Unclear communication of leadership decisions.	2.80	SE
8. Inconsistent implementation of leadership initiatives.	2.77	SE
9. Limited opportunities for leadership-related professional development.	2.85	SE
10. Delays in addressing academic and administrative concerns	2.95	SE
Overall Weighted Mean	2.89	SE

Rating Scale:

Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Always Encountered (AE)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Often Encountered (OE)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Sometimes Encountered (SE)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Rarely Encountered (RE)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Never Encountered (NE)

On the other hand, the relatively lower concern regarding inconsistent implementation of leadership initiatives was conformed by Neves et al. (2023), who noted that while leadership structures are generally established, challenges tend to arise more from implementation gaps rather than the absence of leadership systems. Furthermore, Kocha and Senapathy (2022) emphasized that leadership and management systems are often present but require strengthening to ensure effective and consistent implementation of inclusive education.

Inclusive Education Implementation. This section summarizes the issues and concerns encountered by respondents in implementing inclusive education. It highlights the challenges encountered in instructional practices, support services, training, and resource availability in addressing learners' diverse needs. The indicator

limited training on inclusive education practices obtained the highest weighted mean of 3.14, interpreted as sometimes encountered.

Table 10: Issues and Concerns Encountered by the Faculty Members and Academic Staff along Implementation of Inclusive Education

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Insufficient teaching materials and facilities for learners with special needs.	3.09	SE
2. Lack of collaboration between general and special education teachers.	3.05	SE
3. Inadequate support services for learners with disabilities	2.91	SE
4. Minimal parental or community involvement in inclusion programs.	2.92	SE
5. Insufficient training of teachers on inclusive education strategies and practices.	3.05	SE
6. Difficulty in adapting instruction for diverse learners.	2.73	SE
7. Limited availability of instructional materials for inclusive education.	3.01	SE
8. Inadequate coordination of support services for students with special needs.	2.97	SE
9. Limited training on inclusive education practices.	3.14	SE
10. Challenges in implementing inclusive policies consistently.	3.08	SE
Overall Weighted Mean	2.99	SE

Rating Scale:

Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Always Encountered (AE)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Often Encountered (OE)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Sometimes Encountered (SE)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Rarely Encountered (RE)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Never Encountered (NE)

This indicates that insufficient training is the most frequently encountered issue among faculty members in implementing inclusive education in the institution. In contrast, difficulty in adapting instruction for diverse learners obtained the lowest weighted mean of 2.73, interpreted as sometimes encountered. This indicates that challenges in adapting instruction are less frequently experienced compared to other concerns. The overall mean for issues and concerns in inclusive education implementation is 2.99, interpreted as sometimes encountered. This means that challenges related to inclusive education are present within the institution, but are not consistently experienced by all respondents. The findings were corroborated by Beltran et al. (2025), who

identified insufficient teacher training, limited resources, and a lack of collaboration as major challenges in implementing inclusive education. This aligns with the present findings where limited training was identified as the most encountered issue. Similarly, Domingo (2020) emphasized that training, resources, and stakeholder support are critical factors influencing the successful implementation of inclusive education, further supporting the need to strengthen professional development programs. On the other hand, the relatively lower concern regarding difficulty in adapting instruction is corroborated by Jardinez and Natividad (2024), who found that teachers are gradually developing adaptive strategies to address diverse learner needs despite existing challenges. Likewise, Dela Fuente (2021) highlighted that teachers employ creative and flexible instructional approaches in inclusive classrooms, indicating progress in adapting instruction for diverse learners.

Proposed Intervention to Strengthen Educational Leadership Practices and Inclusive Education Implementation in Mabini Colleges Inc. Based on the findings of the study, a proposed intervention entitled “Leadership and Inclusive Education (LEAD-IN) Enhancement Plan” (See Appendix M) was developed to strengthen educational leadership practices and enhance the implementation of inclusive education in the institution. The proposed intervention is a two-year leadership and inclusive education enhancement plan designed in response to the study's identified strengths, gaps, and concerns, particularly in instructional support and supervision, support services, professional development opportunities, and faculty preparedness to implement inclusive education.

The findings revealed that educational leadership practices were generally rated as highly practiced, while inclusive education implementation was assessed as almost fully implemented. Despite these positive results, instructional support and supervision obtained the lowest mean (3.92) among the educational leadership dimensions, while support services received the lowest mean (3.78) among the areas of inclusive education implementation. Furthermore, limited professional development opportunities (3.06) and insufficient training in inclusive education practices (3.14) emerged as the most frequently encountered issues and concerns among faculty members and academic staff. These findings indicate the need for a comprehensive intervention that will sustain existing strengths while addressing identified areas requiring improvement.

In response to these findings, the proposed two-year Educational Leadership and Inclusive Education Enhancement Plan focuses on strengthening leadership competencies, improving faculty capabilities, enhancing support systems, promoting stakeholder collaboration, and institutionalizing inclusive educational practices. The program is anchored in Republic Act No. 11650, otherwise known as the Inclusive Education Act, and is aligned with the institution's commitment to provide quality, equitable, learner-centered, and inclusive education.

The first component of the program focuses on Educational Leadership and Inclusive Education Foundations. This component aims to increase awareness of inclusive education policies and practices and strengthen educational leadership competencies among administrators, deans, faculty members, and academic staff. Key activities include policy orientation on Republic Act No. 11650 and on institutional inclusive education policies; seminar-workshops on instructional leadership, integrating inclusive education policies in course syllabi by incorporating an Inclusive Education Statement, reasonable accommodations, available support services, and referral procedures; inclusive supervision, communication, collaboration, and decision-making; mentoring and coaching sessions; classroom observations; and stakeholder consultations. These activities are intended to improve leadership effectiveness and strengthen the institution's instructional support mechanisms.

The second component focuses on Collaborative Leadership and Inclusive Teaching Competencies. This component seeks to improve adaptive instructional delivery, strengthen collaborative leadership, enhance classroom management strategies, and improve access to instructional resources and support services. Activities under this component include training workshops on differentiated instruction, adaptive assessment, and inclusive classroom management; establishment of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and mentoring groups; capacity-building sessions on learner-centered approaches; and the development of inclusive instructional materials and support systems. These activities are designed to improve teachers' competence and confidence in addressing learners' diverse needs while promoting collaboration among educational stakeholders.

The third component emphasizes Institutionalization, Monitoring, and Sustainability. This component focuses on developing institutional guidelines and support mechanisms for inclusive education and instructional

leadership, strengthening partnerships with parents, specialists, and community stakeholders, and establishing systematic monitoring and evaluation procedures. Through classroom observations, performance assessments, feedback conferences, and annual reviews of institutional practices, the institution can continuously assess the effectiveness of leadership practices and inclusive education initiatives. In addition, professional development plans and faculty enhancement programs will be sustained to ensure continuous improvement and long-term impact.

Through the implementation of the proposed Two-Year Educational Leadership and Inclusive Education Enhancement Plan, the institution is expected to strengthen educational leadership practices, improve instructional supervision and support systems, enhance faculty competence in inclusive education, establish sustainable professional development initiatives, and foster a more inclusive, responsive, and learner-centered educational environment. The proposed intervention serves as a strategic framework for addressing the study's identified concerns and promoting continuous institutional improvement in educational leadership and inclusive education implementation.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that educational leadership practices were highly practiced, while the implementation of inclusive education was almost fully implemented in Mabini Colleges, Inc., reflecting the institution's commitment to fostering an inclusive and learner-centered educational environment. Specifically, school leaders demonstrated competence in vision and goal-setting, decision-making and problem-solving, communication and collaboration, and instructional support and supervision, while inclusive education was evident through institutional policies and practices, adaptive instructional delivery, and support services. A statistically significant positive relationship was found between educational leadership practices and the implementation of inclusive education across all variables, indicating that effective educational leadership contributes to the successful implementation of inclusive education within the institution. Despite these positive findings, faculty members and academic staff identified concerns related to limited professional development programs and training on inclusive education practices, highlighting the need to strengthen faculty competencies and institutional support systems. To address these concerns and sustain inclusive educational practices, the proposed Leadership and Inclusive Education (LEAD-IN) Enhancement Plan was developed, focusing on leadership capacity-building, faculty development, policy integration, stakeholder collaboration, and continuous monitoring and evaluation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations focus on strengthening educational leadership practices, enhancing the implementation of inclusive education, and addressing the issues encountered by faculty members and academic staff. School administrators with the Academic Council are encouraged to implement leadership development programs that focus on vision-setting, decision-making, communication, instructional supervision, and data-driven leadership, while providing regular faculty training in adaptive instructional delivery, differentiated instruction, inclusive assessment, and other inclusive education practices. They may also strengthen instructional supervision through regular classroom observations, mentoring and coaching, Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, or Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), improve support services by collaborating with SPED specialists, guidance counselors, parents, and external agencies, and integrate inclusive education policies into freshmen orientation programs and course syllabi to promote institutional awareness and consistent implementation. Furthermore, school administrators may implement the proposed Leadership and Inclusive Education (LEAD-IN) Enhancement Plan as a sustainable professional development initiative, with continuous monitoring and evaluation to ensure its effectiveness and long-term sustainability. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to conduct similar studies in other higher education institutions using qualitative or mixed-method approaches and to examine additional variables related to educational leadership and inclusive education, including their long-term effects on teaching performance and learner outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher extends his heartfelt gratitude, first and foremost, to the Almighty God for His abundant grace, wisdom, strength, and guidance throughout the completion of this study. Sincere appreciation is extended to Mabini Colleges, Inc. for granting permission and providing support in conducting this research, and to the faculty members and academic staff of the institution for their valuable participation and cooperation as respondents. The researcher is deeply grateful to Sonia S. Carbonell, PhD, Dean of the Graduate School, for her encouragement and support throughout the research process, and to his adviser, Fe V. Candelaria, EdD, for her patient guidance, invaluable insights, constructive suggestions, and unwavering encouragement. Heartfelt thanks are likewise extended to the members of the Thesis Committee (Anicia S. Madarang, EdD, Annie M. Dado, EdD, Jennifer M. Rubio, PhD, and Jamila M. Macapundag, MAEd, MLL) for their scholarly comments, constructive criticisms, and valuable recommendations that greatly enhanced the quality of this study. The researcher also expresses his sincere appreciation to his colleagues and friends for their encouragement and support, and to his beloved family for their unconditional love, understanding, prayers, and constant inspiration throughout this journey. Finally, the researcher extends his deepest gratitude to everyone who, in one way or another, contributed to the successful completion of this study.

REFERENCES

1. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2020). Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education – All means all. UNESCO Publishing. <https://gem-report-2020.unesco.org>
2. Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
3. Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
4. Republic Act No. 10533. (2013). Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2013/05/15/republic-act-no-10533>
5. Republic Act No. 11650. (2022). An Act Instituting a Policy of Inclusion and Services for Learners with Disabilities in Support of Inclusive Education. *LawPhil*. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2022/ra_11650_2022.html
6. Department of Education Order No. 21. (2019). Inclusive education policy framework for basic education. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/DO_s2021_044.pdf
7. Puracan, R. B. (2025). School leadership contribution in the implementation of inclusive education. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(7), 1488–1505. <https://www.ijams-bbp.net/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/7-IJAMS-JULY-2025-1488-1505.pdf>
8. Beltran A., Agripa S., Bustarga A. J., Dela Cruz K., Marmol S., & Morallo S. J. (2025). Practices and Challenges in Implementing Inclusive Education in Philippine Elementary Schools. *Journal of Education Research* 6(1):8–22. <https://doi:10.37985/jer.v6i1.2251>
9. Ketikidou, G., & Saiti, A. (2022). The promotion of inclusive education through sustainable and systemic leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 28(3) 639654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2032368>
10. White, R., Lowery, C., & Johnson, J. (2025). Enhancing high-quality education through systemic school leadership: a systematic review. *Quality Education for All*, 2(1), 227–244. doi:10.1108/qea-09-2024-0096
11. Putri Z, Miarakhman N & Krisnawati R. (2020). Strategi kepemimpinan kepala sekolah dalam implementasi kebijakan pendidikan inklusif di smp negeri 2 yogyakarta. *Jurnal Khazanah Intelektual*, 4(3)—932–953. <http://jurnalkibalitbangdajbi.com/index.php/newkiki/article/view/74>
12. Kilag, O. K., Diano Jr., F., Bulilan, R., Allego, L., & Cañizares, M. C. (2024). Leadership Strategies for Building Inclusive School Communities: The Challenges of Managing Diversity in Schools. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (IMJRISE)*, 1(1), 92–100. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/view/10>

13. Elias A. & Mansouri F. (2023). Towards a critical transformative approach to inclusive intercultural education. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 18 (1)—4–21. <https://doi.10.1080/17447143.2023.2211568>
14. Marmol-Dado, A. & Carbonell S, S. (2024). Instructional leadership and implementation of inclusive education practices of school heads in the Division of Camarines Norte. *Journal of Educational and Management Studies*,14(2), 50–58. <https://dx.doi.org/10.54203/jems.2024.6>
15. Farzana F., Khairul F., & Jamilah A. (2023). Teachers' leadership in inclusive education in Johor Bahru, Malaysia. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 16(3), 900–903.<https://doi: 10.30574/ijrsra.2023.10.1.0847>
16. Neves, C., Almeida, A. P., & Ferreira, M. (2023). Headteachers and Inclusion: Setting the Tone for an Inclusive School. *Education Sciences*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13020129>
17. Kocha D. & Senapathy M. (2022). Practice and Challenges of the Implementation of Inclusive Education Strategy in Secondary Schools: The Case of Gofa Zone, Southern Ethiopia. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*,11(1). <https://doi:10.34293/education.v11i1.5177>
18. Domingo, Y. L. (2020). Factors affecting implementation of inclusive education in the Philippines (Doctoral dissertation, 서울대학교 대학원). <https://hdl.handle.net/10371/170980>
19. Beltran A, Agripa S, Bustarga A. J., Dela Cruz K, Marmol S., & Morallo S. J. (2025). Practices and Challenges in Implementing Inclusive Education in Philippine Elementary Schools. *Journal of Education Research* 6(1):8–22. <https://doi:10.37985/jer.v6i1.2251>
20. Dela Fuente, J. A. (2021). Implementing inclusive education in the Philippines: College teacher experiences with deaf students. *Issues in Educational Research*, 31(1), 94–110. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier31/dela-fuente.pdf>
21. Mirador M. & Lluz L. (2021). Through the Walls of Inclusion: The Higher Education Institution Perspective in the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 15(2), 28–34. <https://doi:10.9734/ajess/2021/v15i230377>
22. DeMatthews, D. E., Serafini, A., & Watson, T. N. (2021). Leading inclusive schools: Principal perceptions, practices, and challenges to meaningful change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(1), 3–48. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1287985>
23. Jardinez, M. J., & Natividad, L. R. (2024). The Advantages and Challenges of Inclusive Education: Striving for Equity in the Classroom. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 12(2), 57-65. <https://doi:10.34293/education.v12i2.7182>