



IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BACHELOR OF SPECIAL NEEDS EDUCATION CURRICULUM: CHALLENGES AND RESPONSIVE COPING APPROACHES

Lodyvina G. Angeles, Christopher G. Francisco, Evelyn L. Adriano,
Jonalyn A. Caguining, Jeremiah A. Mallare, Janeth A. Petilo, Valerie V. Valdez
College of Education, Nueva Ecija University of Science & Technology, Cabanatuan City, Philippines

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra28559>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra28559

ABSTRACT

This study examined the challenges encountered by students in the implementation of the Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNEd) curriculum and the coping strategies they employed in addressing these challenges. Specifically, the study described the respondents' demographic profile in terms of age, sex, and general weighted average (GWA); determined the level of challenges encountered across six curriculum dimensions, namely curriculum content, instructional strategies, learning resources/materials, assessment process, College of Education (COED) facilities, and linkages; assessed the coping strategies practiced by students; examined the relationship between respondents' profile variables and their perceived challenges and coping strategies; and proposed an action plan to improve the implementation of the BSNEd curriculum.

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. A total of 115 BSNEd students from the College of Education, Sumacab Campus, during the Academic Year 2024–2025 participated in the study through stratified random sampling. Data were gathered using a validated researcher-made questionnaire with excellent reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .954$ for challenges and $.961$ for coping strategies). Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, and weighted mean, were used to analyze the data, while Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation and Spearman's Rank Correlation were employed to determine the relationships among variables.

The findings revealed that the respondents were predominantly female, mostly 20 years old, and generally demonstrated high academic performance. Overall, the implementation of the BSNEd curriculum was perceived as slightly challenging, with COED facilities identified as the most challenging dimension due to inadequate specialized classrooms, therapy and sensory rooms, and insufficient instructional facilities. Learning resources and materials also emerged as areas requiring improvement. In contrast, students generally practiced positive coping strategies, particularly in curriculum content, instructional strategies, assessment processes, and linkages, although coping related to learning resources and facilities was only sometimes practiced. Correlation analysis indicated that age and GWA were not significantly related to either challenges or coping strategies. However, sex was significantly associated with challenges in learning resources, while year level was significantly related to challenges in assessment processes and COED facilities, as well as negatively associated with coping strategies in linkages.

Based on the findings, the study proposed an action plan focused on strengthening curriculum content, enhancing experiential learning opportunities, promoting innovative and inclusive instructional practices, improving learning resources and facilities, and expanding institutional linkages to enhance the quality of BSNEd curriculum implementation.

KEYWORDS: Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNEd), Curriculum Implementation, Challenges, Coping Strategies, Special Needs Education, Descriptive-Correlational Research, Curriculum Content, Instructional Strategies, Learning Resources, Assessment Process, COED Facilities, Linkages.

INTRODUCTION

The Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNEd) is a comprehensive undergraduate program that equips future educators with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to support learners with diverse needs. It prepares graduates to teach and manage students in inclusive and specialized educational environments, offering training in both the basic education curriculum and alternative programs tailored to individual requirements. At the elementary level, BSNEd students are

trained across multiple subject areas, while at the secondary level, they focus on specialized instruction and individualized support in inclusive classrooms or special education centers. Graduates who successfully complete the program and pass the Licensure Examination for Teachers are expected to become competent professionals in both regular and special education settings.

Despite its promise, the BSNEd program presents unique challenges for its pioneering students. As the first batch of enrollees, they navigate unfamiliar academic and practical



demands while adjusting to expectations from faculty, peers, and the broader community. Many students enter the program with limited prior exposure to learners with special needs, making the acquisition of specialized competencies such as sign language, the development of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), and the application of differentiated teaching strategies particularly demanding. Opportunities for hands-on experience may also be limited due to constraints such as parental consent for observations and interviews, further complicating their preparation. These conditions create a steep learning curve and often result in feelings of stress, uncertainty, and overwhelm among students.

Although existing studies examine the implementation of special education programs in various regions, there is limited research that directly addresses the lived challenges and coping strategies of BSNEd students, particularly those belonging to the pioneering batch. This gap highlights the need to document their experiences and identify both barriers and supports that influence their academic and personal growth.

In response, this study aims to describe the challenges encountered by BSNEd students in the College of Education, Sumacab Campus, and to examine the coping strategies they employ in navigating the program. Specifically, it will analyze challenges and coping mechanisms in relation to assessment processes, curriculum content, instructional strategies, learning resources, facilities, and linkages. The study further seeks to determine whether students' demographic profiles are significantly related to their experiences and to propose an action plan that may enhance program implementation and student support.

Statement of the Problem

This study explored the challenges and coping strategies encountered in implementing the Bachelor of Special Needs Education curriculum at the College of Education, Sumacab Campus.

Specifically it sought to answer the following questions:

1. How may the profile of the respondents be described in terms of:
 - 1.1 BSNEd students
 - 1.1.1 Age;
 - 1.1.2 sex; and
 - 1.1.3 GWA?
2. How may the challenges in the implementation of BSNEd curriculum be described in terms of:
 - 2.1 assessment process;
 - 2.2 curriculum content;
 - 2.3 instructional strategies;
 - 2.4 learning resources/materials;
 - 2.5 COED facilities; and
 - 2.6 linkages?
3. How may the coping approaches in the implementation of BSNEd curriculum be described in terms of:
 - 3.1 assessment process;
 - 3.2 curriculum content;
 - 3.3 instructional strategies;
 - 3.4 learning resources/materials;
 - 3.5 COED facilities; and
 - 3.6 linkages?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the students and their Challenges and Coping strategies in the implementation of Bachelor of Special Needs Education Curriculum?
5. What action plan may be proposed based on the result of the study?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research approach, specifically a descriptive–correlational design. Quantitative research involves the systematic collection and analysis of numerical data to identify patterns, test relationships, and generalize findings to larger populations. According to Bhandari (2022), it can be used to identify trends, formulate hypotheses, and examine causal and correlational relationships. Similarly, Copeland (2022) explains that descriptive–correlational research is appropriate for examining the relationship between variables without manipulating them.

A descriptive–correlational design was deemed suitable for this study because it allowed the researchers to describe and analyze the relationship between the demographic profile of BSNEd students and their reported challenges and coping strategies in the implementation of the BSNEd curriculum. No variables were manipulated; rather, the focus was on observing and measuring existing conditions.

Participants

The participants of this study were 115 students enrolled in the Bachelor of Special Needs Education program at the Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST)–College of Education, Sumacab Campus during the academic year 2024–2025. This group was selected to provide a comprehensive perspective on the challenges and coping strategies in relation to the implementation of the BSNEd curriculum.

Sample and Sampling Procedure

The sample was selected using stratified random sampling to ensure that students from different year levels were proportionately represented. Stratified sampling is a probability sampling technique that divides a population into subgroups, or strata, to ensure representation across key categories (Parsons, 2017). In this study, the strata were based on year level.

Table 1
Distribution of Respondents According to Year Level

Year/ Level	Students Respondents
	Population
First Year	35
Second Year	36
Third Year	44
Total	115



Research Instrument

Data were collected using a structured survey questionnaire designed to gather information on the respondents' demographic profile, challenges encountered, and coping strategies employed in the BSNEd curriculum. The instrument consisted of three parts:

- **Part I:** Demographic profile of the respondents (age, sex, and GWA).
- **Part II:** Challenges encountered in curriculum implementation, including assessment processes, curriculum content, instructional strategies, learning resources and materials, College of Education facilities, and linkages.
- **Part III:** Coping strategies used by students in relation to the same six domains of curriculum implementation.

The questionnaire used close-ended questions measured on a 4-point Likert scale to capture frequency and degree of challenges or coping strategies.

Validation and Reliability of the Instrument

The questionnaire underwent a multi-stage validation process to ensure clarity, relevance, and appropriateness. Initial drafts were reviewed by the research adviser and faculty experts in education, who provided feedback on wording and content alignment with the study objectives. Further validation was conducted by experts in Special Needs Education, who assessed the questionnaire's applicability to the BSNEd context.

Subsequently, the revised instrument was reviewed by the subject adviser for additional technical guidance. It was also evaluated by a panel of validators.

Pilot testing was conducted with BSNEd students not included in the final study to assess clarity, answerability, and appropriateness. Feedback from the pilot informed the final revisions. Reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha revealed excellent internal consistency: .954 for the "Challenges" scale and .961 for the "Coping Strategies" scale. These results exceeded the .70 benchmark for acceptable reliability (Field, 2015), confirming the instrument's consistency in measuring the intended constructs.

Data Gathering Procedure

Formal permission to conduct the study was secured from the College of Education. After approval, the validated questionnaires were distributed to the respondents, who were assured of confidentiality and voluntary participation. Completed questionnaires were retrieved, checked for completeness, and organized for analysis.

Data Analysis Technique

Data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics.

- To address **Problem 1** (respondents' profile), frequency counts and percentages were computed.
- To address **Problem 2** (challenges in implementation), mean scores with corresponding verbal descriptions were used. The Likert scale interpretation is shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Verbal Description and Interpretation on the Challenges in the Implementation of BSNEd Curriculum

Mean Interval	Verbal Description	Verbal Interpretation
3.26 - 4.00	Highly Challenging	This indicates that the task is perceived as very difficult, requiring significant effort, skill, or resources to accomplish.
2.51 - 3.25	Moderately Challenging	This suggests that the task presents a moderate level of difficulty, demanding a fair amount of effort or skill but is generally manageable.
1.16 - 2.50	Sometimes Challenging	This implies that the task is occasionally difficult, with some aspects posing challenges while others are straightforward.
1.00 - 1.75	Not Challenging	This indicates that the task is perceived as easy, requiring minimal effort or skill to complete.

To address Problem 3 (coping strategies), mean scores with verbal descriptions were also computed. The Likert scale interpretation is shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Verbal Description and Interpretation on the Coping Strategies in the Implementation of BSNEd Curriculum

Scale	Verbal Description	Verbal Interpretation
3.26 - 4.00	Always Practiced	This indicates that the individual consistently and regularly employs the strategy in question.
2.51 - 3.25	Sometimes Practiced	This suggests that the individual occasionally uses the strategy, but it is not a consistent part of their routine.
1.16 - 2.50	Rarely Practiced	This implies that the individual infrequently uses the strategy
1.00 - 1.75	Never Practiced	This indicates that the individual does not use the strategy at all.

To address **Problem 4** (relationship between profile and challenges/coping strategies), inferential statistics were used.

Spearman's rho correlation was applied for ordinal data to assess the strength and direction of associations between ranked



variables (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2015). Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was applied for interval/ratio data that met assumptions of linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity (Field, 2015). Correlation coefficients were interpreted within the range of -1.00 to $+1.00$, with values closer to ± 1.00 indicating stronger relationships.

Results

This section presents the findings of the study in accordance with the research objectives. The results are organized into the respondents' profiles, including age, sex, and first-semester general weighted average (GWA).

Profile of the Respondents

1.1 Age

Table 4
Distribution of Respondents According to Age

Age	F	%
19	33	28.70
20	42	36.52
21	40	34.78
Total	115	100.00

The age distribution showed that the majority of respondents were 20 years old (36.52%), followed by 21 years old (34.78%), and 19 years old (28.70%). This indicated that respondents were concentrated within a narrow age range typical of undergraduate college students.

1.2 Sex

Table 5
Distribution of Respondents According to Sex

Sex	F	%
Male	21	18.26
Female	94	81.74
Total	115	100.00

The sample was composed predominantly of female respondents (81.74%), while males accounted for 18.26%.

1.3 General Weighted Average (First Semester)

Table 6
Distribution of Respondents According to General Weighted Average

GWA	F	%
1.00 – 1.25	47	40.87
2.25 – 2.00	45	39.13
2.50 – 2.75	23	20.00
Total	115	100.00

The majority of respondents achieved a GWA between 1.00 and 2.25. Specifically, 40.87% had a GWA of 1.00–1.25, 39.13% had 2.00–2.25, while 20.00% recorded 2.50–2.75. This indicated that most respondents performed at a high academic level during their first semester.

1. Discussion

The results indicated that the respondents were mostly within the traditional undergraduate age range of 19 to 21 years. This finding is consistent with Wingo, Ivankova, and Moss (2017), who reported that most college students in higher education fall between 18 and 24 years, with an average of 20–21 years. The similarity suggests that the age distribution of the respondents aligned with typical patterns observed in higher education populations.

The study also revealed a substantial gender imbalance, with female students (81.74%) significantly outnumbering male students (18.26%). This reflects the national trend reported by the Commission on Higher Education (2016), where female enrollees have consistently outnumbered males in Philippine higher education institutions. While this imbalance did not directly affect the study's focus, it implies that the experiences and perspectives analyzed may reflect predominantly female views, potentially limiting the applicability of findings to more gender-balanced populations.

In terms of academic performance, the distribution of GWAs showed that the majority of respondents achieved strong academic results within the 1.00–2.25 range. This pattern aligns with findings from Isabela State University (2025), where students similarly clustered around mid to high academic performance. Such consistency across studies strengthens the credibility of the current findings, suggesting that students in education programs often demonstrate above-average academic achievement.

Overall, these results contribute to understanding the demographic and academic characteristics of Bachelor of Special Needs Education students. However, the predominance of female respondents and the relatively small sample size represent limitations that should be considered in interpreting the findings. Future studies may expand the scope to include larger, more diverse samples to enhance generalizability.

This section further presents the findings on challenges encountered in the implementation of the Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNEd) curriculum and the coping strategies employed by the respondents. Data are organized thematically based on curriculum content, instructional strategies, learning resources, assessment, facilities, and linkages.



2.1 Challenges Encountered

Table 7
Challenges in the Implementation of the BSNEC Curriculum: Curriculum Content

2.1 Curriculum Content	Mean	Verbal Description
1. The topics covered are not well-organized and do not follow a clear sequence.	2.18	Slightly Challenging
2. There is limited discussion on different types of disabilities and their specific educational needs.	2.39	Slightly Challenging
3. There are not enough subjects that develop specialized teaching strategies for learners with disabilities.	2.28	Slightly Challenging
4. There is insufficient exposure to various teaching approaches used in special education.	2.41	Slightly Challenging
5. There are limited prescribed subjects that focus on communication tools like sign language and Braille.	2.46	Slightly Challenging
6. The lessons do not align with the latest trends and developments in special education.	2.12	Slightly Challenging
7. The students have limited time in observation/field study programs, and fieldwork provides hands-on learning experiences.	2.51	Moderately Challenging
Overall Mean	2.34	Slightly Challenging

Students rated the BSNEC curriculum content as *slightly challenging* ($M = 2.34$). The most pressing issue was the limited time for observation and field study ($M = 2.51$, *moderately challenging*), while other concerns included limited exposure to teaching approaches, insufficient subjects on communication tools such as sign language and Braille, minimal discussion of disabilities, and poorly organized topics.

exposure, content coverage, and alignment with current SPED trends. These findings support Villanueva (2018), who emphasized the importance of well-sequenced curricula, and Espeño et al. (2024), who identified persistent challenges in SPED implementation nationwide. Likewise, Mangongon (2023) highlighted the need for stronger training and support systems. Enhancing fieldwork opportunities, expanding specialized subjects, and updating content are essential to better prepare future special education teachers.

2. Discussion

The results suggest that the BSNEC curriculum is generally manageable but requires improvement in practical

2.2. Instructional Strategies

Table 8
Challenges in the Implementation of the BSNEC Curriculum: Instructional Strategies

2.2 Instructional Strategies	Mean	Verbal Description
1. Inadequate use of differentiated instruction to cater to diverse learning needs.	2.46	Slightly Challenging
2. Limited incorporation of technology-enhanced learning strategies.	2.48	Slightly Challenging
3. Insufficient emphasis on active learning and student engagement.	2.38	Slightly Challenging
4. Overreliance on traditional teaching methods, hindering innovation.	2.34	Slightly Challenging
5. Ineffective assessment and feedback mechanisms to gauge student progress.	2.33	Slightly Challenging
6. Lack of culturally responsive teaching practices, neglecting students' diverse backgrounds.	2.23	Slightly Challenging
7. Inadequate integration of real-world applications and problem-based learning.	2.29	Slightly Challenging
Overall Mean	2.36	Slightly Challenging

Students rated instructional strategies in the BSNEC curriculum as slightly challenging ($M = 2.36$). The main concerns were limited use of technology-enhanced learning ($M = 2.48$) and inadequate differentiated instruction ($M = 2.46$). Other issues

included insufficient active learning, overreliance on traditional teaching, weak assessment and feedback, minimal integration of real-world applications, and lack of culturally responsive practices.



3. Discussion

The findings indicate that while instructional strategies are manageable, improvements are needed to foster innovation and inclusivity. The limited use of technology and differentiated instruction reflects Hall's (2015) and Lisdiana et al.'s (2019) assertion that these methods are crucial in inclusive classrooms.

Likewise, Boyle and Kennedy (2019) noted that technology enhances engagement but is underutilized due to insufficient training and resources. Strengthening technology integration, diversifying methods, and embedding active, culturally responsive, and real-world approaches are necessary to improve the BSNEC curriculum.

2.3 Challenges in Implementing BSNEC Learning Resources/Materials for Students

Table 9

Challenges in Implementing BSNEC Learning Resources/Materials for Students

2.3 Learning Resources/Materials	Mean	Verbal Description
1. There are not enough textbooks and reference books related to special education.	2.52	Moderately Challenging
2. The available digital learning materials, such as e-books and online modules are limited.	2.63	Moderately Challenging
3. Some learning materials, such as printed hand-outs and manuals, are out-dated and lack updated information.	2.31	Slightly Challenging
4. Assistive learning tools, such as Braille books and tactile graphics, are not readily available.	2.58	Moderately Challenging
5. There are insufficient multimedia resources, such as educational videos and interactive software, for learning special education concepts.	2.43	Slightly Challenging
6. The availability of sign language learning materials, such as illustrated guides and video tutorials is limited.	2.42	Slightly Challenging
7. There are not enough manipulative and hands-on materials, such as pegs, educational toys and adapted teaching aids, to support practical learning.	2.60	Moderately Challenging
Overall Mean	2.50	Slightly Challenging

Learning resources were considered slightly to moderately challenging ($M = 2.50$). The most pressing concerns were limited digital learning materials ($M = 2.63$), a shortage of manipulative/hands-on materials ($M = 2.60$), and insufficient

textbooks ($M = 2.52$). Outdated printed handouts ($M = 2.31$) and lack of sign language materials ($M = 2.42$) were identified as slightly challenging.

2.4 Challenges in Implementing BSNEC Assessment Process for Students

Table 10

Assessment Process

2.4 Assessment Process	Mean	Verbal Description
1. The BSNEC curriculum does not include the regular assessment such as assignment, class participation, exams, quizzes to effectively monitor the students' progress.	1.94	Slightly Challenging
2. The BSNEC curriculum assessment tools are not suitable for BSNEC students' diverse learning styles and needs.	2.04	Slightly Challenging
3. The curriculum is not in alignment with the Assessment tools given to BSNEC curriculum.	1.98	Slightly Challenging
4. The BSNEC curriculum assessment process does not accurately identify the students' individual learning needs.	2.04	Slightly Challenging
5. The BSNEC curriculum assessment results are not systematically used to guide instructional planning.	2.08	Slightly Challenging
6. The BSNEC curriculum fails to implement the necessary interventions based on the results of assessments.	2.07	Slightly Challenging
7. The BSNEC curriculum does not regularly reassess students' needs and progress	2.08	Slightly Challenging
Overall Mean	2.03	Slightly Challenging



The assessment process was perceived as slightly challenging ($M = 2.03$). The lowest rating was on the lack of regular assessments ($M = 1.94$), while issues such as non-systematic use of assessment

results ($M = 2.08$) and lack of reassessment ($M = 2.08$) were also noted.

2.5 Challenges in Implementing BSNEC COED Facilities for Students

Table 11
COED Facilities

2.5 COED Facilities	Mean	Verbal Description
1. The BSNEC curriculum inadequate facilities hinder the effective delivery of special education services for BSNEC students.	2.66	Moderately Challenging
2. The BSNEC curriculum lack of well-equipped classrooms limits effective special education instruction.	2.76	Moderately Challenging
3. The BSNEC curriculum's absence of specialized rooms (e.g., therapy or sensory rooms) restricts skill practice for BSNEC students.	2.87	Moderately Challenging
4. The BSNEC curriculum insufficient outdoor spaces reduce opportunities for therapeutic activities in the BSNEC curriculum.	2.77	Moderately Challenging
5. The BSNEC curriculum has no designated spaces for individualized support that affect students' specific learning needs.	2.58	Moderately Challenging
6. The BSNEC curriculum limited resources for hands-on learning hinder meaningful curriculum engagement.	2.64	Moderately Challenging
7. There is a shortage of cleaning supplies and materials in the COED classrooms.	2.59	Moderately Challenging
Overall Mean	2.70	Moderately Challenging

COED facilities were rated as moderately challenging ($M = 2.70$). The most difficult issue was the absence of specialized rooms ($M = 2.87$), followed by limited outdoor spaces ($M = 2.77$).

2.6 Challenges in Implementing BSNEC Linkages for Students

Table 12
Linkages

2.6 Linkages	Mean	Verbal Description
1. The BSNEC curriculum has limited collaboration with partner institutions.	2.31	Slightly Challenging
2. The BSNEC curriculum experiences difficulty in securing industry partnerships for academic activities.	2.37	Slightly Challenging
3. The BSNEC curriculum struggles to maintain consistent with linkage partners.	2.41	Slightly Challenging
4. The BSNEC curriculum encounters delays in the implementation of planned linkage programs.	2.46	Slightly Challenging
5. The BSNEC curriculum faces a lack of faculty and student involvement in linkage activities.	2.42	Slightly Challenging
6. The BSNEC curriculum has limited opportunities for students to participate in off-campus learning experiences.	2.60	Moderately Challenging
7. The BSNEC curriculum lacks sufficient funding to support linkage initiatives.	2.56	Moderately Challenging
Overall Mean	2.45	Slightly Challenging

Linkages were found slightly challenging overall ($M = 2.45$). However, off-campus learning opportunities ($M = 2.60$) and

insufficient funding ($M = 2.56$) posed moderately challenging barriers.



2.7 Summary of Challenges

Table 13
Summary of Challenges in the Implementation of BSNEC Curriculum

Factors	Mean	Verbal Description
Curriculum Content	2.34	Slightly Challenging
Instructional Strategies	2.36	Slightly Challenging
Learning Resources/Materials	2.50	Slightly Challenging
Assessment Process	2.03	Slightly Challenging
COED Facilities	2.70	Moderately Challenging
Linkages	2.45	Slightly Challenging
General Mean	2.40	Slightly Challenging

Overall, implementation of the BSNEC curriculum was perceived as slightly challenging ($M = 2.40$). Facilities ($M = 2.70$) were the

most difficult factor, while assessment processes ($M = 2.03$) posed the least challenge.

III. Coping in the Implementation of the BSNEC Curriculum for students

3.1 Coping Strategies in Implementing BSNEC Curriculum Content for Students

Table 14
Curriculum Content

3.1 Curriculum content	Mean	Verbal Description
1. Reviewing lessons in advance helps in understanding topics that are not well-organized or clearly sequenced.	3.15	Sometimes Practiced
2. Seeking guidance from teachers helps in understanding different types of disabilities and their educational needs.	3.36	Always Practiced
3. Attending workshops and training programs enhances knowledge of specialized teaching strategies for learners with disabilities.	3.50	Always Practiced
4. Observing and practicing different teaching approaches in class discussions and group activities strengthens practical knowledge.	3.43	Always Practiced
5. Using online resources and additional learning materials helps in improving skills in sign language and Braille.	3.43	Always Practiced
6. Staying updated with new research and developments in special education helps in understanding modern teaching strategies.	3.36	Always Practiced
7. Participating in internships, volunteer programs, and fieldwork provides hands-on learning experiences.	3.38	Always Practiced
Overall Mean	3.37	Always Practiced

Coping strategies were frequently applied, with an overall rating of always practiced ($M = 3.37$). Attending workshops ($M = 3.50$) was the most common, while reviewing lessons in advance ($M = 3.15$) was the least.

4. Discussion

The findings revealed that the implementation of the BSNEC curriculum is hindered by multiple challenges, particularly in the areas of **learning resources and facilities**. Limited textbooks, outdated handouts, and insufficient assistive tools align with Farley et al. (2020), who argued that inadequate resources directly affect the quality of education for learners with disabilities. Similarly, Dikumar (2018) emphasized the lack of teacher access to appropriate technologies, further limiting learning opportunities.

The **assessment process**, although only slightly challenging, raised concerns about misalignment between tools and student needs. These results resonate with Brookhart (2017) and Black and Wiliam (2018), who highlighted the importance of

formative assessments in improving learning outcomes. The absence of systematic and consistent assessments reduces opportunities for feedback and intervention.

Facilities emerged as the most critical issue, with the lack of specialized rooms and outdoor spaces receiving the highest ratings. This supports the findings of the World Health Organization (2015) and Parker et al. (2016), who stressed that accessible and well-equipped environments are crucial for the engagement and success of students with disabilities.

On the other hand, **linkages** were rated as slightly challenging, yet funding issues and limited off-campus opportunities stood out as moderately challenging barriers. Watson and Johnston (2016) and Fletcher et al. (2017) highlighted that strong partnerships enrich learning by providing real-world experiences, which remain underdeveloped in the BSNEC program.

Despite these challenges, students and faculty reported employing effective **coping strategies**, such as attending workshops, seeking guidance, and using additional resources.



These strategies align with the findings of Zagona et al. (2017) and López et al. (2020), who emphasized that self-directed learning, professional development, and peer collaboration strengthen curriculum delivery.

In summary, while most areas were only slightly challenging, **facilities and resources remain pressing concerns**

that require institutional prioritization. The consistent practice of coping strategies reflects resilience among students and faculty, but sustainable improvements will depend on systemic changes in resource allocation, facility upgrades, and assessment alignment.

3.2 Coping Strategies in Implementing BSNE Instructional Strategies for Students

Table 15

Instruction Strategies

3.2 Instructional strategies	Mean	Verbal Description
1. Effective implementation of student-centered learning approaches.	3.32	Always Practiced
2. Strategic integration of technology-enhanced learning strategies.	3.30	Always Practiced
3. Emphasis on active learning and collaborative student engagement.	3.34	Always Practiced
4. Use of formative and summative assessments to improve instruction.	3.33	Always Practiced
5. Incorporation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles to support students.	3.35	Always Practiced
6. Implementation of culturally responsive teaching practices.	3.28	Always Practiced
7. Regular use of feedback and reflection to improve teaching and learning process.	3.32	Always Practiced
Overall Mean	3.32	Always Practiced

All instructional strategies were consistently applied, with an overall mean of 3.32. UDL (3.35), collaborative learning (3.34), and assessments (3.33) ranked highest, while culturally responsive practices (3.28) ranked lowest but still “Always Practiced.”

5. Discussion.

These findings on instructional strategies show strong alignment with inclusive and modern pedagogies. They support Al-Azawei et al. (2016) on the value of UDL and Tiruneh et al. (2019) on technology-enhanced learning, confirming BSNE’s commitment to effective practices

3.3 Coping Strategies in Implementing BSNE Learning Resources/Materials for Students

Table 16

Learning Resources/Materials

3.3 Learning Resources/Materials	Mean	Verbal Description
1. Borrowing textbooks and reference books from the library or classmates helps in accessing important learning materials.	3.09	Sometimes Practiced
2. Utilizing online resources, such as e-books and educational websites, supplements the lack of digital learning materials.	3.22	Sometimes Practiced
3. Seeking guidance from teachers and peers helps in understanding outdated or printed hand-outs and manuals.	3.30	Always Practiced
4. Using alternative assistive learning tools, such as mobile apps for Braille and screen readers, helps compensate for the lack of tactile resources.	3.24	Sometimes Practiced
5. Watching online educational videos and using interactive software enhances understanding when multimedia resources are limited.	3.22	Sometimes Practiced
6. Practicing sign language with peers and using available video tutorials helps improve proficiency despite limited learning materials.	3.33	Always Practiced
7. Creating or adapting hands-on materials, such as pegs, educational toys and teaching aids, helps reinforce learning when resources are insufficient.	3.24	Sometimes Practiced
Overall Mean	3.23	Sometimes Practiced



Resource strategies were applied inconsistently ($M = 3.23$). Guidance from peers/teachers (3.30) and sign language practice (3.33) were “Always Practiced,” while borrowing books (3.09) and creating hands-on materials (3.24) were only “Sometimes Practiced.”

5. Discussion.

As to learning resources, the reliance on peer support and occasional use of digital/assistive tools reflect resource limitations. He et al. (2021) and Jones et al. (2018) emphasized the importance of digital and adapted materials, underscoring the need for stronger institutional resource support.

3.4 Coping Strategies in Implementing BSNE Assessment Process for Students

Table 17

Assessment Process

3.4 Assessment process	Mean	Verbal Description
1. The BSNE curriculum always includes the regular assessment to determine if the curriculum is effective for the students' progress.	3.24	Sometimes Practiced
2. The BSNE curriculum assures that the assessment tools are suitable for the students' learning styles and needs.	3.31	Always Practiced
3. The BSNE students' assessment record are being documented, handled confidentially, and protected to maintain the student's confidentiality and privacy.	3.33	Always Practiced
4. The BSNE curriculum assessment approach (diagnostic tests, self-assessments, observations, parent/peer input) accurately identifies the students' individual learning needs.	3.23	Sometimes Practiced
5. The BSNE curriculum initiates discussions with teachers, administrators, and curriculum developers to emphasize the importance of systematically analysing assessment data.	3.27	Always Practiced
6. The BSNE curriculum involves the creation of a system in identifying students who need additional support	3.25	Sometimes Practiced
7. The BSNE curriculum advocates for regular assessment to track student progress and provide interventions as needed.	3.32	Always Practiced
Overall Mean	3.28	Always Practiced

Assessment practices averaged 3.28 (“Always Practiced”). Confidentiality (3.33) and suitability of tools (3.31) were consistently applied, while diagnostic assessments (3.23) and systems for student support (3.25) were less consistent.

6. Discussion

Findings on assessment process highlight strong ethical practices but uneven diagnostic use. This supports Panadero (2017) and Brookhart (2013), who stressed formative and varied assessments for student monitoring. More consistent diagnostic approaches are needed in BSNE.

3.5 Coping Strategies in Implementing BSNE COED Facilities for Students

Table 18

COED Facilities

3.5 COED Facilities	Mean	Verbal Description
1. The BSNE curriculum improves facilities through funding, grants, and resource allocation.	2.97	Sometimes Practiced
2. The BSNE curriculum upgrades classrooms with specialized equipment and assistive technology.	2.84	Sometimes Practiced
3. The BSNE curriculum establishes specialized rooms for practice (therapy, sensory) through the needs of students.	2.81	Sometimes Practiced
4. The BSNE curriculum maximizes outdoor spaces for therapeutic and recreational activities.	2.85	Sometimes Practiced
5. The BSNE curriculum designates areas for individualized student support within learning spaces.	2.97	Sometimes Practiced
6. The BSNE curriculum secures resources for hands-on learning through grants and community support.	3.08	Sometimes Practiced
7. Reporting broken or out-dated equipment to faculty or COED staff for repairs.	3.03	Sometimes Practiced
Overall Mean	2.93	Sometimes Practiced



Facility-related coping strategies were only “Sometimes Practiced” ($M = 2.93$). Efforts to secure resources (3.08) and report equipment issues (3.03) were noted, but specialized rooms (2.81) and upgrades (2.84) were least practiced.

7. Discussion.

As to facilities, findings suggest resource constraints. UNESCO (2017) and Mitchell et al. (2019) stressed adapting spaces and investing in assistive technologies, pointing to the need for more systematic facility improvements in BSNE.

3.6 Coping Strategies in Implementing BSNE Linkages for Students

Table 19
Linkages

3.6 Linkages	Mean	Verbal Description
1. The BSNE curriculum strengthens collaboration by reaching out to potential partner institutions.	3.32	Always Practiced
2. The BSNE curriculum organizes event for the stakeholders and industry visits to encourage partnerships.	3.29	Always Practiced
3. The BSNE curriculum establishes clearer communication channels with linkage partners.	3.30	Always Practiced
4. The BSNE curriculum improves the planning process to prevent delays in linkage programs.	3.23	Sometimes Practiced
5. The BSNE curriculum encourages student participation in linkage-related activities.	3.25	Sometimes Practiced
6. The BSNE curriculum provides more opportunities for students to engage in external learning experiences.	3.30	Always Practiced
7. The BSNE curriculum explores funding options, such as grants and sponsorships, to support linkage initiatives.	3.26	Always Practiced
Overall Mean	3.28	Always Practiced

Results

Linkages were generally “Always Practiced” ($M = 3.28$). Collaboration (3.32), communication (3.30), and external learning opportunities (3.30) were strong, while planning (3.23) and student participation (3.25) were less consistent.

8. Discussion.

Results show effective partnerships but weaker planning and engagement. This aligns with Lamport et al. (2018) on the role of collaborations and Guskey (2016) on the need for clear planning to sustain linkages.

3.7 Summary of Coping Strategies

Table 20
Summary of Coping Strategies in the Implementation of Bachelor of Special Needs

Factors	Mean	Verbal Description
Curriculum Content	3.37	Always Practiced
Instructional Strategies	3.32	Always Practiced
Learning Resources/Materials	3.23	Sometimes Practiced
Assessment Process	3.28	Always Practiced
COED Facilities	2.93	Sometimes Practiced
Linkages	3.28	Always Practiced
General Mean	3.24	Sometimes Practiced

The overall mean of 3.24 indicated that coping strategies were “Sometimes Practiced.” Curriculum content ($M = 3.37$) and instructional strategies ($M = 3.32$) were consistently applied,

while learning resources ($M = 3.23$) and COED facilities ($M = 2.93$) were less consistently utilized.



4.1 Relationship between Profile of the Students and their Challenges

Table 21

Profile of the Students and their Challenges

Profile		Curriculum Content	Instructional Strategies	Learning Resources/ Materials	Assessment Process	COED facilities	Linkages
Age	<i>r – value</i>	.138	.147	.069	.180	.160	.035
	<i>p – value</i>	.141	.118	.465	.054	.088	.713
Sex	<i>r – value</i>	-.119	-.064	-.230*	-.055	-.127	-.120
	<i>p – value</i>	.205	.499	.013	.563	.176	.202
Year	<i>r – value</i>	.134	.117	.096	.280**	.192*	.037
	<i>p – value</i>	.154	.213	.307	.002	.039	.693
GWA	<i>r – value</i>	.032	.061	-.115	.111	-.095	-.037
	<i>p – value</i>	.738	.520	.223	.238	.310	.692

Table 21 shows the correlation between student profile variables and curriculum challenges.

- **Age** was not significantly correlated with any challenge (all $p > .05$).
- **Sex** was significantly related to learning resources ($r = -.230$, $p = .013$).
- **Year level** was significantly associated with assessment process ($r = .280$, $p = .002$) and COED facilities ($r = .192$, $p = .039$).
- **GWA** had no significant relationship with any challenge (all $p > .05$).
-

9. Discussion

The results suggest that while coping strategies for curriculum content and instructional practices are consistently applied, resource provision and facilities remain areas of concern. This supports Kebbi and Al-Hroub (2018), who emphasized that special education teachers demonstrate strong coping in pedagogy but struggle with limited institutional support.

Student profile factors showed mixed relationships. Sex was significantly associated with challenges in learning resources, consistent with Reyes and Delos Santos (2021), who reported greater resource access difficulties among female students. Year level correlated with increased challenges in assessments and facilities, confirming Cruz and Gabriel (2018) and Albay and Buenviaje (2019), who noted higher awareness of institutional issues among upper-year students.

For coping strategies, year level was negatively related to linkages, suggesting that advanced students rely less on collaborative support, aligning with De Guzman (2019). Age, sex, and GWA showed no significant associations, consistent with De Leon (2020) and Santos and Reyes (2021), who reported that demographic and academic performance factors are not strong predictors of coping strategies.

Overall, the findings highlight that while BSNEd students employ effective strategies in instruction and content, systemic issues such as learning resources and facilities require targeted interventions.

4.2 Relationship between the Profile of the Students and their Coping Strategies

Table 22

Profile of the Students and their Coping Strategies

Profile		Curriculum Content	Instructional Strategies	Learning Resources/ Materials	Assessment Process	COED facilities	Linkages
Age	<i>r – value</i>	.133	.045	-.130	-.148	-.100	-.118
	<i>p – value</i>	.156	.635	.166	.114	.287	.208
Sex	<i>r – value</i>	-.098	-.142	-.039	-.108	.080	.039
	<i>p – value</i>	.298	.130	.677	.253	.398	.678
Year	<i>r – value</i>	.122	-.006	-.177	-.161	-.177	-.219*
	<i>p – value</i>	.194	.946	.059	.086	.058	.019
GWA	<i>r – value</i>	-.015	.023	.007	.045	.014	.031
	<i>p – value</i>	.871	.808	.938	.635	.881	.745

Table 22 presents the correlation results.

- **Age, sex, and GWA** were not significantly related to coping strategies (all $p > .05$).
- **Year level** had a significant negative correlation with linkages ($r = -.219$, $p = .019$), indicating decreased reliance on linkages as students advanced.



10. Discussion

The findings revealed that most student profile variables—age, sex, and GWA—did not significantly influence coping strategies in the implementation of the BSNEd curriculum. This aligns with De Leon (2020), who reported that age does not affect coping mechanisms in academic contexts, and with Villanueva and San Juan (2022), who found no significant differences in coping strategies based on sex. Likewise, the non-significant correlations between GWA and coping strategies are consistent

with Santos and Reyes (2021), who noted that academic performance is not a predictor of coping behavior.

However, year level was significantly associated with linkages, showing that students in higher levels relied less on external or institutional support. This supports De Guzman (2019), who suggested that advancing students often shift toward greater independence, reducing reliance on institutional and peer linkages as academic demands increase.

Table 23
Action Plan for Improving the Implementation of the BSNEd Curriculum

Objectives	Strategies	Materials/Resources	Expected Outcomes	Timeframe	Persons Involved	Verifiable Indicators
Improve Curriculum Content	Review and update content; integrate diverse learning needs; align with national standards	Updated curriculum guides, textbooks, online resources	Enhanced student mastery and curriculum relevance	1 year	Curriculum Committee, Faculty, Subject Matter Experts	Revised curriculum guides; positive student and faculty feedback
Enhance Instructional Strategies	Conduct training on active learning, differentiated instruction, and technology integration	Training modules, ICT tools, professional development workshops	Increased student engagement and improved teaching practices	Ongoing	Faculty, Instructional Designers, Tech Support	Higher student participation; improved teaching evaluations
Strengthen Learning Resources	Secure funding; adapt materials for accessibility; develop digital resources	Funding proposals, adapted/digital learning materials	Adequate and accessible resources for all learners	2 years	Department Head, Librarians, Faculty	Student surveys indicating improved resource access
Improve Assessment Practices	Develop varied, inclusive assessments; provide regular feedback	Rubrics, digital platforms, feedback tools	More accurate and comprehensive evaluation of student learning	Ongoing	Faculty, Assessment Specialists	Improved assessment records; student understanding of criteria
Upgrade COED Facilities	Renovate classrooms; acquire specialized equipment; improve accessibility	Architectural plans, funding support, assistive devices	Safer, more inclusive, and functional learning environment	2–3 years	Department Head, Facilities Management, Architects	Facility audit reports; positive student/faculty feedback
Strengthen Linkages	Expand partnerships; increase fieldwork opportunities; organize collaborative events	Partnership agreements, event plans, field placement documents	Greater student exposure to real-world practice and collaboration	Ongoing	Department Head, Faculty, Community Partners	Number of active partnerships; student participation in fieldwork



The proposed action plan directly responds to the study's findings. Strengths identified in the BSNEd curriculum, such as curriculum content, instructional strategies, and established linkages, are sustained through strategies that encourage collaboration, professional growth, and active student engagement. At the same time, the plan addresses areas that were only "Sometimes Practiced" particularly the adequacy of resources and facilities by recommending resource development, funding initiatives, and infrastructure upgrades.

In addition, the plan highlights inclusive and varied assessment practices to ensure that student performance is accurately measured and continuously improved. Strengthening partnerships and expanding linkages remain central to providing students with meaningful real-world experiences, consistent with the program's vision of preparing competent and practice-ready graduates.

Overall, the action plan provides a practical and responsive roadmap for enhancing the implementation of the BSNEd curriculum. Its success depends on the collaborative efforts of administrators, faculty, students, and partner institutions. Through this joint commitment, the BSNEd program can evolve into a more inclusive, well-resourced, and practice-oriented curriculum that effectively responds to the needs of learners with special needs.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the challenges encountered by Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNEd) students in the implementation of the BSNEd curriculum, the coping strategies they employed, and the relationship between students' profile variables and both the challenges encountered and coping strategies used.

The findings revealed that the respondents were predominantly female, mostly 20 years old, and generally demonstrated good academic performance. Overall, the implementation of the BSNEd curriculum was perceived as slightly challenging, indicating that while the curriculum generally meets students' educational needs, several areas require improvement. Among the six curriculum dimensions, COED facilities emerged as the most challenging aspect, particularly the lack of specialized classrooms, therapy and sensory rooms, and other facilities essential for effective special education training. Learning resources and instructional materials also posed concerns due to limited digital resources, insufficient assistive technologies, and inadequate hands-on instructional materials.

Despite these challenges, the respondents demonstrated positive coping behaviors. Overall, coping strategies were sometimes practiced, with students consistently applying strategies related to curriculum content, instructional practices, assessment, and linkages. However, coping strategies associated with learning resources and facilities were implemented less consistently, reflecting the limitations of institutional resources that are beyond students' direct control.

The correlation analysis further showed that age and academic performance (GWA) were not significantly associated with either the challenges encountered or the coping strategies

employed. However, sex was significantly related to challenges in learning resources, while year level was significantly associated with challenges in assessment processes and COED facilities. Moreover, year level showed a significant negative relationship with linkages, suggesting that as students progress in the program, they become less dependent on institutional partnerships and external support.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Strengthen curriculum organization and content by improving the sequencing of courses and expanding discussions on diverse disabilities and their specific educational needs to provide students with a more comprehensive understanding of inclusive education.
2. Enhance experiential learning opportunities by extending the duration of observation and fieldwork programs, allowing students to gain more meaningful hands-on experiences in special education settings.
3. Promote innovative and inclusive teaching practices by integrating technology-enhanced learning strategies, encouraging innovative instructional approaches, and effectively implementing differentiated instruction to address the diverse learning needs of students.
4. Improve the availability and accessibility of learning resources by addressing the shortage of updated instructional materials, expanding access to digital learning resources, and increasing the provision of assistive learning tools that support effective teaching and learning.
5. Encourage future research by replicating this study in other colleges and universities offering the Bachelor of Special Needs Education (BSNEd) program to compare findings across different educational contexts and strengthen the generalizability of the results.

REFERENCES

1. Agbon, A., & Mina, C. (2019). *Inclusive education for children with disabilities in the Philippines urged*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://www.pids.gov.ph/details/inclusive-education-for-children-with-disabilities-in-ph-urged>
2. Al-Azawei, A., Parslow, P., & Lundqvist, K. (2016). *Universal design for learning (UDL): A content analysis of peer-reviewed journal papers from 2012 to 2015*. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 19(2), 195-205. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1104867.pdf>
3. Al-Azawei, A., Serenelli, F., & Lundqvist, K. (2016). *Universal design for learning: A content analysis of peer-reviewed journal papers from 2012 to 2015*. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 16(3), 39-56. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i3.19295>
4. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). *Classroom assessment and pedagogy*. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 25(6), 551-575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807>



5. Boyle, J. R., & Kennedy, M. J. (2019). Innovations in classroom technology for students with disabilities. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 55(1), 28–36.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451219837716>
6. Brookhart, S. M. (2013). *Advancing formative assessment in every classroom: A guide for instructional leaders* (2nd ed.). ASCD. <https://www.ascd.org/books/advancing-formative-assessment-in-every-classroom-a-guide-for-instructional-leaders-2nd-edition?chapter=references-advancing-formative-assessment-in-every-classroom-a-guide-for-instructional-leaders-2nd-edition>
7. Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to use grading to improve learning*. ASCD. <https://www.ascd.org/books/how-to-use-grading-to-improve-learning>
8. Brookhart, S. M., & Lazarus, S. S. (2017). *Formative assessment for students with disabilities*. Council of Chief State School Officers. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED620542.pdf>
9. Campado, R. J., Toquero, C. M. D., & Ulanday, D. M. (2023). Integration of assistive technology in teaching learners with special educational needs and disabilities in the Philippines. *International Journal of Professional Development, Learners and Learning*, 5(1), 42–56.
<https://doi.org/10.54684/ijpdll.13062>
10. Dikumar, M. (2018). Learning delivery readiness of special education teachers in secondary schools in Camarines Norte, Philippines. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 2(6), 1–4.
<https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/learning-delivery-readiness-of-special-education-teachers-in-secondary-schools-in-camarines-norte-philippines/>
11. Espeño, S. R., Babiano, E. H., Bucoy, M. L. R., Busime, E. L., & De Borja, J. M. A. (2024). Issues and challenges of implementing special education (SPED) curriculum in the Philippines: A systematic literature review. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.60132/jip.v2i4.390>
12. Farley, J., Huscroft-D'Angelo, J., Trout, A. L., & Hurley, K. D. (2020). A review of web-based special education resources provided to parents by state departments of education. *The Journal of Special Education*, 54(3), 180–190.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466920903114>
13. Field, A. (2015). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
14. Fletcher, A., & Artiles, A. (2017). Collaborative linkages in special education: Strategies for success. *Educational Practices Review*, 22(2), 55–67.
15. Gomez, D., Pascual, L., & Regidor, R. (2023). Teachers' experiences teaching children with special needs: A qualitative inquiry. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 12(2), 45–59.
16. Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2015). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.
<https://www.cengage.com/c/statistics-for-the-behavioral-sciences-10e-gravetter/9781305504912>
17. Guskey, T. R. (2016). Gauge impact with five levels of data. *The Journal of Staff Development*, 37(3), 16–22.
<https://tguskey.com/wp-content/uploads/Professional-Learning-1-Gauge-Impact-with-Five-Levels-of-Data.pdf>
18. Hall, T. (2015). *Differentiated instruction: Effective classroom practices*. National Center on Accessible Educational Materials. <https://aem.cast.org/navigating/differentiated-instruction.html>
19. He, W., Zhu, C., & Deneen, C. (2021). Problem-based learning in online environments: A systematic review. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning*, 13(1), 46–65. <http://www.kmel-journal.org/ojs/index.php/online-publication/article/view/476>
20. He, W., Zhu, X., & Deneen, C. (2021). The effectiveness of technology-supported personalised learning in low- and middle-income countries. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(1), 42–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13116>
21. Jones, K. E., Moore, D. R., & Alderton, A. (2018). Application of assistive technology in inclusive classrooms. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 18(4), 282–292.
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31814471/>
22. Kebbi, M., & Al-Hroub, A. (2018). Stress and coping strategies used by special education and general classroom teachers. *International Journal of Special Education*, 33(1), 34–52.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1184086.pdf>
23. Kusmaryono, I., Wijayanti, D., & Maharani, H. R. (2022). Number of response options, reliability, validity, and potential bias in the use of the Likert scale education and social science research: A literature review. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 8(4), 625–637.
<https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.8.4.625>
24. Lamport, M. A., Graves, L., & Ward, S. (2018). Building community partnerships for special education. *Journal of Special Education Apprenticeship*, 7(1).
<https://jspea.org/index.php/jspea/article/view/55>
25. Lamport, M. A., McCormick, J. R., & Golden, L. (2018). Enhancing community engagement by schools and programs of public health in the United States. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, 24(3), 282–290.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346842964>
26. Lisdiana, A., Hufad, A., Tarsidi, D., & Aprilia, I. D. (2019). Differentiated instruction: An alternative learning approach for all learners in inclusive setting. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Educational Sciences (ICES 2018)* (pp. 19–21). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ices-18.2019.5>
27. López, V. A., Orona, M. C., & Vásquez, M. C. (2020). Special education teachers' professional development through digital storytelling. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 38(1), 137–151. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358271592>
28. Mangongon, F. A. A. (2023). Challenges encountered by special educators: Inputs for the improvement of the individualized education program. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 2(1).
<https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v2i1.25>
29. Mitchell, D., & Sutherland, D. (2019). Application of assistive technology in inclusive classrooms. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 34(2), 57–69.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0162643418809789>
30. Møhlolt, T. (2019). Aging and the social construction of age: A review. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 3(1), 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaging.2019.02.001>
31. Moran, M. (2024, April 18). *The various forms of ANOVA. Statistics Solutions*. <https://www.statisticssolutions.com/the-various-forms-of-anova/>
32. Ntumi, S. (2021). Reporting and interpreting one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using a data-driven example: A



- practical guide for social science researchers. *Journal of Research in Educational Sciences*, 12(14), 38.
<https://doi.org/10.14505/jres.v12.14.04>
33. Palestina, M. R., Pangan, M. A., & Ancho, I. V. (2020). Curriculum implementation facilitating and hindering factors: The Philippines context. *International Journal of Education*, 13(2).
<https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/ije/article/view/25340>
 34. Panadero, E. (2017). A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 422. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422>
 35. Panadero, E. (2018). Fusing self-regulated learning and formative assessment: A relationship and its implications for educational practice. *Educational Research Review*, 21, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.11.004>
 36. Parker, R., Smith, L., & Johnson, M. (2016). Impact of specialized facilities on special education outcomes. *International Journal of Special Education*, 31(2), 112–120.
 37. Putrawangsa, S., Febrian, F., & Hasanah, U. (2021). Developing students' understanding of percentage: The role of spatial representation. *Mathematics Teaching Research Journal*, 13(4). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1332344.pdf>
 38. Quizana, C. F., & Espiritu, M. B. (2023). Challenges encountered and coping strategies used by teachers in implementing SPED inclusive education program in public elementary schools of third congressional district, Division of Quezon. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.802579>
 39. Scale. (n.d.). Scaling and measurement. INFLIBNET.
<https://ebooks.inflibnet.ac.in/socp3/chapter/scaling-and-measurement/>
 40. Sex. (n.d.). Sex and gender. Council of Europe – Gender Matters. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/gender-matters/sex-and-gender>
 41. Taylor, S. (2023). Weighted mean. Corporate Finance Institute.
<https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/data-science/weighted-mean/>
 42. Tiruneh, D., Han, K., & Eom, S. (2019). A student-centered approach using modern technologies in distance education. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 67(5), 1081–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-019-09668-8>
 43. Tufan, E. (2016). The sociology of age: An analytical approach to social aging. *Journal of Aging and Society*, 12(3), 18–26.
<https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/2645775>
 44. UNESCO. (2017). A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248254>
 45. UNESCO. (2017). Inclusive education: All means all.
<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000261971>
 46. Villanueva, M. G. (2018). Adaptive curriculum designs for special needs education. *Philippine Journal of Special Education*, 2(1), 45–59.
 47. Watson, D., & Johnston, L. (2016). Building effective linkages in inclusive education. *Journal of Inclusive Practices*, 4(2), 112–125.
 48. Watson, L., & Johnston, R. (2016). Building effective educational partnerships in special education. *Journal of Inclusive Education*, 22(4), 345–359.
 49. Wingo, N. P., Ivankova, N. V., & Moss, J. A. (2017). Faculty perceptions about teaching online: Exploring the literature using the technology acceptance model as an organizing framework. *Online Learning*, 21(1), 15–35.
<https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i1.761>
 50. World Health Organization. (2015). The physical school environment: An essential component of a health-promoting school. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9241590645>
 51. World Health Organization. (2015). World report on disability: Inclusive education chapter.
<https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/world-report-on-disability>
 52. Zagona, A. L., Kurth, J. A., & MacFarland, S. Z. (2017). Perceived barriers and facilitators to inclusive education in the United States. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 37(1).
<https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v37i1.5067>
 53. Zagona, A. L., Monda-Amaya, L. E., & Lignugaris/Kraft, B. (2017). Teachers' views of their preparation for inclusive education and collaboration. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 40(3), 210–228.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406417692969>