

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies



Dean Patrick R. Espiritu¹, Donnabel D. Abao-an²

¹Master of Arts in Education Major in Special Education at the University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, Las Piñas City, Philippines

²Master of Arts in Education Major in English at the University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, Las Piñas City, Philippines

ABSTRACT: This study examined the implementation of innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education among teachers, focusing on eight key constructs: Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) integration, technological innovations, playful and creative strategies, universal design principles, teacher preparation programs, social justice and inclusion, collaborative and reflective practices, and adapting and scaffolding curriculum using descriptive comparative methods. The study revealed that while teachers were generally engaged in applying these strategies, there was variability in their consistency and effectiveness. Significant differences in the assessment of these strategies were observed based on the length of service and age, with mid-career and older teachers reporting higher engagement and more favorable evaluations in specific areas. Gender and educational attainment, however, did not significantly impact the assessment of these strategies. The findings highlighted the need for targeted professional development, particularly in enhancing collaborative practices and leveraging technological innovations, to ensure a more consistent and effective application of inclusive teaching strategies across all classrooms. The study also underscored the importance of fostering an inclusive educational environment that supported the diverse needs of all students, through both foundational training and ongoing professional development.

KEYWORDS: innovative teaching strategies, inclusive education, basic education, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI), Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

I. INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education played a vital role in promoting equal opportunities and embracing diversity in educational settings. It ensured that every student, regardless of their background or abilities, had fair access to high-quality education. However, achieving true inclusivity required continuous exploration and adaptation of teaching strategies to meet the diverse needs of learners.

The exploration of innovative strategies for inclusive education, with a particular focus on teaching methodologies, had evolved in response to the growing recognition of the significance of inclusive practices in the field of education. In the past, inclusive education had undergone a gradual transformation, characterized by significant shifts in societal attitudes towards diversity and the rights of individuals with disabilities.

The concept of inclusive education was grounded in the belief that all students, including those with disabilities, should be educated alongside their peers in general education classrooms to the greatest extent possible. This paradigm shifting towards inclusivity began with the passage of Public Law 94-142 in the United States, now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which mandated that students with disabilities had the right to be educated in the least restrictive environment (Wolfberg et al., 2020).

Over the years, various innovative teaching strategies were developed to support inclusive education. These strategies encompassed a wide range of approaches, including Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) integration, technological innovations, playful and creative strategies, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles. For instance, Salleh (2023) emphasized the importance of integrating EDI principles into continuous professional development (CPD) to enhance teachers' understanding and application of inclusive practices. Similarly, the use of Universal Design for Instruction (UDI) was highlighted to create accessible and supportive learning environments in higher education (Chavarría et al., 2023).

Technological innovations also played a crucial role in fostering inclusive education. The use of digital tools and interactive technologies, such as virtual and augmented reality, showed to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

(Montoya-Rodríguez et al., 2022). These tools provided opportunities for students with diverse needs to participate actively in the learning process, thereby promoting inclusivity.

Playful and creative strategies were another important aspect of inclusive education. Guerrero Granda et al. (2022) discussed the use of engaging activities for children with Down syndrome, highlighting the benefits of incorporating technology and motor stimulation into teaching methods. These strategies not only made learning enjoyable but also catered to the diverse learning needs of students.

Teacher preparation programs were essential for equipping educators with the skills and knowledge necessary for inclusive education. Effective teacher training emphasized educational reform and inclusive practices could significantly improve the quality of education for students with disabilities (Wolfberg et al., 2020). Additionally, social justice and inclusion were integral to fostering an inclusive classroom environment. Mason et al. (2020) underscored the importance of incorporating social justice themes into teaching practices to address diversity and promote inclusion.

Collaborative and reflective practices among educators further enhanced the implementation of inclusive education. Creating communities of practice for teachers to share knowledge and develop new methodologies could lead to more effective teaching strategies (Chege et al., 2019). Moreover, adapting and scaffolding the curriculum to meet the diverse needs of students was critical for ensuring that all learners could succeed (Chavarría et al., 2023).

The researcher was driven by a profound commitment to advancing educational equity and inclusivity. Observing the diverse needs of students at Gabu Elementary School, the researcher recognized the critical importance of implementing effective teaching strategies that accommodated and celebrated this diversity. The motivation stemmed from a desire to empower educators with innovative tools and methods that not only enhanced learning outcomes for all students but also created an environment where every child felt valued and supported. The researcher believed that by systematically examining and improving inclusive teaching practices, significant strides could be made in ensuring that all students, regardless of their backgrounds or abilities, had access to high-quality education. This dedication to fostering an inclusive educational landscape underpinned the researcher’s commitment to this study.

Despite the growing emphasis on inclusive education, there remained a significant gap in understanding the specific innovative teaching strategies that were most effective in diverse elementary school settings. While extensive research had been conducted on inclusive education at higher education levels, there was limited empirical evidence focusing on elementary schools, particularly in the context of Gabu Elementary School. Furthermore, much of the existing literature tended to address inclusive strategies in broad terms without delving into the practical, day-to-day applications and their impact on both teachers and students.

Additionally, while numerous studies highlighted the importance of teacher preparation and professional development in fostering inclusive education, there was a lack of comprehensive analysis on how these elements were integrated and assessed within the specific context of Gabu Elementary School. The researcher aimed to fill this gap by providing detailed insights into the innovative strategies currently employed, evaluating their effectiveness, and identifying areas for improvement. This study sought to contribute to the body of knowledge by offering practical recommendations and a proposed training plan tailored to the unique needs of the school, thereby bridging the gap between theoretical frameworks and practical implementation in inclusive education.

Hence, the present study aimed to explore these innovative teaching strategies and assess their implementation at Gabu Elementary School. By examining the experiences and perspectives of teachers and learners, this research sought to identify effective practices, address challenges, and propose a training plan to enhance inclusive education within the school.

II. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of sex, age, length of service, and highest educational attainment?
2. What is the assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) integration; technological innovations; playful and creative strategies; universal design principles; teacher preparation programs; social justice and inclusion; collaborative and reflective practices; and adapting and scaffolding curriculum?
3. Is there a significant difference in the assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education when grouped according to profile?

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopted a descriptive comparative research design to examine the range of innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education that were used by the teachers and learners. This design was justified for several reasons. The focus of this study was on the teachers of Gabu Elementary School, who were selected using purposive sampling techniques. These teachers had varying levels of experience and educational backgrounds, providing a comprehensive perspective on the current state and impact of inclusive teaching practices within the school. To effectively gather data for this study, the researcher utilized a researcher-made questionnaire as a research instrument. This tool was selected for its ability to systematically collect quantitative

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

data from respondents, providing an idea as to the innovative teaching strategies employed for inclusive education at Gabu Elementary School. The rating scale (1.00–4.00) ranges from Strongly Disagree (Not Evident) to Strongly Agree (Highly Evident) with corresponding numerical values.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presented the findings of the study on the innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education, based on the assessment of the respondents. The results were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, providing insights into the extent of integration of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI), technological innovations, playful and creative strategies, Universal Design Principles, and other inclusive teaching practices. The discussion interpreted the significance of these findings in the context of improving inclusive education strategies.

Table 1. Frequency and distribution of profile of respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	26	47.3%
	Female	28	50.9%
Age	25-35 years	23	41.8%
	36-45 years	9	16.4%
	46-55 years	18	32.7%
	55-years above	4	7.3%
Length of Service	1-5 years	28	50.9%
	6-10 years	6	10.9%
	11-15 years	10	18.2%
	16-Above	10	18.2%
Highest Educational Attainment	Bachelor's Degree	37	67.3%
	Master's Degree	17	30.9%

The respondents were nearly evenly distributed by sex, with a slight female majority (50.9%), indicating balanced gender representation. Most respondents (41.8%) were within the 25-35 age range, suggesting a relatively young teaching workforce, while a smaller portion (7.3%) consisted of older teachers aged 55 and above. A significant number (67.3%) held only a Bachelor’s degree, highlighting the need for professional development to encourage further academic advancement.

Table 2.1. Weighted mean and standard distribution of assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) integration

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I actively promote gender equality in my teaching strategies.	3.02	.78	Agree	Evident	5.5
2. I integrate diverse cultural backgrounds into my curriculum.	2.96	.61	Agree	Evident	7
3. I ensure students from different socioeconomic backgrounds receive equal learning opportunities.	3.07	.72	Agree	Evident	3
4. I use teaching materials that reflect the diversity of my students.	3.04	.69	Agree	Evident	4
5. I have policies in place to support students with disabilities.	3.02	.73	Agree	Evident	5.5
6. I create a classroom environment that fosters	3.31	.46	Agree	Evident	1

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

inclusivity and respect for all students.					
7. I participate in professional development on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion regularly.	3.20	.81	Agree	Evident	2
8. I incorporate EDI principles into my lesson planning and execution.	2.46	.66	Disagree	Slightly Evident	8
Overall Mean	3.01	.28	Agree	Evident	

The overall mean of 3.01 indicated that teachers generally integrated EDI principles into their teaching. The highest-rated aspect was fostering an inclusive classroom environment (mean = 3.31), reflecting strong efforts in creating respectful spaces for students. However, incorporating EDI into lesson planning (mean = 2.46) scored lowest, highlighting a gap between awareness and structured implementation.

Table 2.2. Weighted mean and standard distribution of assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of technological innovations

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I effectively use digital tools to enhance student learning.	3.35	.73	Agree	Evident	1
2. I use interactive technologies, such as smartboards, to engage students.	3.22	.79	Agree	Evident	2
3. I provide students with access to online resources and e-learning platforms.	2.83	.84	Agree	Evident	5
4. I incorporate multimedia resources into my lessons.	3.09	.75	Agree	Evident	4
5. I use educational software to support diverse learning needs.	3.15	.76	Agree	Evident	3
6. I stay updated with the latest technological advancements in education.	2.63	.89	Agree	Evident	6.5
7. I use technology to facilitate collaborative learning among students.	2.48	.84	Disagree	Slightly Evident	8
8. I assess students' progress through digital platforms.	2.63	.89	Agree	Evident	6.5
Overall Mean	2.92	.38	Agree	Evident	

Teachers demonstrated moderate use of technology in inclusive education, with an overall mean of 2.92. The highest-rated practice was the effective use of digital tools for student learning (mean = 3.35), indicating strong engagement with basic tech resources. However, facilitating collaborative learning through technology (mean = 2.48) was less evident, suggesting a need for better integration of interactive digital strategies.

Table 2.3. Weighted mean and standard distribution of assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of playful and creative strategies

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
-----------	---------------	--------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	------

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

1. I incorporate games and playful activities into my lessons to engage students.	3.20	.62	Agree	Evident	3
2. I use creative arts (such as drawing, music, drama) as part of my teaching strategies.	3.24	.58	Agree	Evident	1
3. I encourage students to express their creativity in class projects and assignments.	2.80	.83	Agree	Evident	8
4. I design lessons that include hands-on, experiential learning activities.	3.20	.81	Agree	Evident	3
5. I use storytelling as a method to make learning more engaging.	2.94	.65	Agree	Evident	6
6. I allow students to explore their interests through creative projects.	3.20	.65	Agree	Evident	3
7. I provide opportunities for students to work on group projects that foster creativity.	3.06	.68	Agree	Evident	5
8. I integrate play-based learning techniques to make lessons more enjoyable.	2.87	.82	Agree	Evident	7
Overall Mean	3.06	.30	Agree	Evident	

The use of playful and creative strategies was evident (mean = 3.06), with the highest rating for incorporating arts in teaching (mean = 3.24), emphasizing the role of music, drama, and visual arts in engagement. However, encouraging student creativity in projects (mean = 2.80) ranked lowest, indicating that while creative methods were used, they might not consistently foster individual student expression.

Table 2.4. Weighted mean and standard distribution of assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of universal design principles

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I design my lessons to be accessible to all students, regardless of their abilities.	3.13	.61	Agree	Evident	4
2. I use multiple means of representation to present information.	3.00	.75	Agree	Evident	6
3. I provide multiple means of action and expression for students to demonstrate their learning.	3.26	.70	Agree	Evident	1
4. I create flexible learning environments that accommodate diverse learning needs.	3.02	.68	Agree	Evident	5
5. I use assistive technologies to support students with disabilities.	2.96	.75	Agree	Evident	7.5
6. I offer various ways for students to engage with the lesson material.	2.96	.72	Agree	Evident	7.5

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

7. I provide clear and accessible instructions for all classroom activities.	3.19	.82	Agree	Evident	2.5
8. I regularly review and adapt my teaching strategies to ensure inclusivity.	3.19	.67	Agree	Evident	2.5
Overall Mean	3.08	.35	Agree	Evident	

With an overall mean of 3.08, teachers showed strong commitment to designing inclusive lessons, particularly in providing diverse ways for students to express learning (mean = 3.26). The use of assistive technologies (mean = 2.96) was less emphasized, highlighting a need for improved accessibility measures to support students with disabilities.

Table 2.5. Weighted mean and standard distribution of assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of teacher preparation programs

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I have received training on inclusive education during my teacher preparation program.	2.63	.80	Agree	Evident	7
2. My teacher preparation program provided me with strategies to support diverse learners.	3.02	.62	Agree	Evident	4.5
3. I feel well-prepared to teach in an inclusive classroom.	2.63	.80	Agree	Evident	7
4. I have ongoing access to professional development on inclusive teaching practices.	3.02	.62	Agree	Evident	4.5
5. My teacher preparation included hands-on experience in inclusive settings.	3.26	.67	Agree	Evident	1
6. I learned about Universal Design for Learning in my teacher preparation program.	3.19	.77	Agree	Evident	2
7. I received training on how to use technology to support inclusive education.	3.09	.65	Agree	Evident	3
8. I continue to seek out additional training on innovative teaching strategies for inclusivity.	2.63	.80	Agree	Evident	7
Overall Mean	2.93	.39	Agree	Evident	

The assessment of teacher training programs yielded an overall mean of 2.93, with hands-on experience in inclusive settings ranking highest (mean = 3.26). However, the lowest score (2.63) was for preparedness to teach inclusively, suggesting that while training was provided, it might not sufficiently equip teachers for real-world inclusive education challenges.

Table 2.6. Weighted mean and standard distribution of assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of social justice and inclusion

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I incorporate discussions on social justice issues into my	3.11	.76	Agree	Evident	1.5

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

curriculum.					
2. I use teaching strategies that promote fairness and equality in the classroom.	2.80	.81	Agree	Evident	7.5
3. I encourage students to think critically about social issues.	3.11	.76	Agree	Evident	1.5
4. I create a classroom environment that supports marginalized and underrepresented students.	2.80	.81	Agree	Evident	7.5
5. I teach students about their rights and responsibilities in a diverse society.	2.94	.81	Agree	Evident	5
6. I use inclusive language and practices in my teaching.	3.02	.71	Agree	Evident	4
7. I address and challenge stereotypes and biases in the classroom.	3.07	.72	Agree	Evident	3
8. I promote an understanding of social justice among my students.	2.81	.82	Agree	Evident	6
Overall Mean	2.95	.33	Agree	Evident	

Teachers recognized the importance of integrating social justice principles into education (mean = 2.95). The highest-rated aspects involved encouraging students to engage critically with social issues (mean = 3.11), but lower scores in promoting fairness and equality (mean = 2.80) indicated a need for more structured approaches to addressing inequality in classrooms.

Table 2.7. Weighted mean and standard distribution of assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of collaborative and reflective practices

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I regularly collaborate with colleagues to improve my teaching strategies.	2.39	.78	Disagree	Slightly Evident	7
2. I participate in professional learning communities focused on inclusive education.	2.98	.73	Agree	Evident	1.5
3. I reflect on my teaching practices to identify areas for improvement.	2.39	.78	Agree	Evident	7
4. I seek feedback from students and colleagues to enhance my teaching.	2.98	.73	Agree	Evident	1.5
5. I engage in peer observations to learn from other teachers.	2.81	.82	Agree	Evident	3
6. I participate in collaborative planning sessions to develop inclusive lesson plans.	2.48	.77	Agree	Evident	5
7. I use reflective journals to document my teaching experiences and growth.	2.72	.76	Agree	Evident	4
8. I attend workshops and conferences to stay informed about best practices in inclusive education.	2.39	.78	Disagree	Slightly Evident	7
Overall Mean	2.64	.42	Agree	Evident	

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

Teachers acknowledged the role of collaboration and reflection in inclusive education (mean = 2.64), but regular collaboration with colleagues (mean = 2.39) was ranked lowest. This suggested that while teachers valued these strategies, they might lack formal structures or opportunities to consistently engage in them.

Table 2.8. Weighted mean and standard distribution of assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of adapting and scaffolding curriculum

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I adapt my lessons to meet the diverse needs of my students.	2.74	.75	Agree	Evident	4.5
2. I use scaffolding techniques to support student learning.	2.80	.83	Agree	Evident	2
3. I provide additional resources for students who need extra help.	2.74	.75	Agree	Evident	4.5
4. I modify assignments to accommodate different learning styles and abilities.	2.80	.83	Agree	Evident	2
5. I use formative assessments to guide my instructional decisions.	2.80	.73	Agree	Evident	2
6. I create individualized learning plans for students with specific needs.	2.39	.87	Disagree	Slightly Evident	7
7. I use flexible grouping strategies to support student learning.	2.30	.90	Disagree	Slightly Evident	8
8. I continuously adjust my teaching methods based on student feedback and performance.	2.54	.96	Agree	Evident	6
Overall Mean	2.63	.36	Agree	Evident	

With an overall mean of 2.63, teachers applied some curriculum adaptations, particularly through scaffolding techniques (mean = 2.80). However, the creation of individualized learning plans (mean = 2.39) was less frequent, indicating that while general adaptations existed, personalization for diverse student needs remained limited.

Table 2.9 Weighted mean and standard distribution of summary table on the assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Integration	3.01	.28	Agree	Evident	3
2. Technological Innovations	2.92	.38	Agree	Evident	6
3. Playful and Creative Strategies	3.06	.30	Agree	Evident	2
4. Universal Design Principles	3.08	.35	Agree	Evident	1
5. Teacher Preparation Programs	2.93	.39	Agree	Evident	5
6. Social Justice and Inclusion	2.95	.33	Agree	Evident	4
7. Collaborative and Reflective Practices	2.64	.42	Agree	Evident	7
8. Adapting and Scaffolding Curriculum	2.63	.36	Agree	Evident	8
OVERALL MEAN	2.90	.13	Agree	Evident	

The highest-rated strategy was Universal Design Principles (mean = 3.08), reflecting efforts to create accessible learning environments. The lowest-ranked strategies, adapting/scaffolding curriculum (mean = 2.63) and collaborative practices (mean = 2.64), indicated areas requiring further development and professional support.

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

Table 3.1. Independent samples T-test on the differences in the assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of sex

Indicator	Sex	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Integration	Male	3.01	.29	.58	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.00				
2. Technological Innovations	Male	2.72	1.11	.29	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.11				
3. Playful and Creative Strategies	Male	3.12	.35	.55	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.01				
4. Universal Design Principles	Male	3.06	.42	.51	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	3.11				
5. Teacher Preparation Programs	Male	2.96	.28	.59	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	2.90				
6. Social Justice and Inclusion	Male	2.92	2.62	.11	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	2.99				
7. Collaborative and Reflective Practices	Male	2.61	3.27	.07	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	2.67				
8. Adapting and Scaffolding Curriculum	Male	2.51	.78	.37	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	2.74				
OVERALL	Male	2.86	1.62	.20	Accepted	Not Significant
	Female	2.94				

There were no significant differences in the assessment of innovative teaching strategies between male and female teachers ($p > .05$), indicating that gender did not influence how teachers perceive and implement inclusive education practices.

Table 3.2. One-way ANOVA on differences in the assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of age

Indicator	Age	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Integration	25-35 years	2.98	.244	.86	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45 years	2.97				
	46-55 years	3.05				
	55-years above	3.03				
2. Technological Innovations	25-35 years	2.92	2.01	.12	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45 years	2.66				
	46-55 years	3.02				
	55-years above	3.06				
3. Playful and Creative Strategies	25-35 years	3.13	2.43	.07	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45 years	3.19				
	46-55 years	2.92				
	55-years above	3.00				
4. Universal Design Principles	25-35 years	3.12	2.41	.07	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45 years	2.81				
	46-55 years	3.18				
	55-years above	3.06				
5. Teacher Preparation Programs	25-35 years	3.02	1.86	.14	Accepted	Not Significant
	36-45 years	2.69				
	46-55 years	2.89				

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

	55-years above	3.09				
6. Social Justice and Inclusion	25-35 years	2.82	4.05	.01		
	36-45 years	2.88				
	46-55 years	3.11			Rejected	Significant
	55-years above	3.18				
7. Collaborative and Reflective Practices	25-35 years	2.65	.20	.89		
	36-45 years	2.70				
	46-55 years	2.58			Accepted	Not Significant
	55-years above	2.68				
8. Adapting and Scaffolding Curriculum	25-35 years	2.51	3.35	.02		
	36-45 years	2.56				
	46-55 years	2.73			Rejected	Significant
	55-years above	3.03				
OVERALL		2.89	3.25	.02		
		2.81			Reje	Significan
		2.93			cted	t
		3.01				

Age significantly influenced the assessment of social justice and curriculum adaptation strategies ($p < .05$), with older teachers (55+) rating these aspects higher. This suggested that experience might contribute to stronger emphasis on inclusivity and curriculum flexibility.

Table 3.3. One-way ANOVA on differences in the assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of length of service

Indicator	Length of Service	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Integration	1-5 years	2.96	.64	.593		
	6-10 years	3.04				
	11-15 years	3.01			Accepted	Not Significant
	16-Above	3.11				
2. Technological Innovations	1-5 years	3.03	2.27	.091		
	6-10 years	2.62				
	11-15 years	2.85			Accepted	Not Significant
	16-Above	2.87				
3. Playful and Creative Strategies	1-5 years	3.00	.91	.439		
	6-10 years	3.20				
	11-15 years	3.06			Accepted	Not Significant
	16-Above	3.13				
4. Universal Design Principles	1-5 years	3.11	.64	.587		
	6-10 years	3.04				
	11-15 years	3.16			Accepted	Not Significant
	16-Above	2.96				
5. Teacher Preparation Programs	1-5 years	2.97	.38	.762		
	6-10 years	2.81				
	11-15 years	2.96			Accepted	Not Significant
	16-Above	2.86				
6. Social Justice and Inclusion	1-5 years	3.00	1.41	.249		
	6-10 years	2.72				
	11-15 years	3.03			Accepted	Not Significant
	16-Above	2.90				

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

7. Collaborative and Reflective Practices	1-5 years	2.70	2.88	.045	Rejected	Significant
	6-10 years	2.54				
	11-15 years	2.83				
	16-Above	2.35				
8. Adapting and Scaffolding Curriculum	1-5 years	2.67	.41	.746	Accepted	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.50				
	11-15 years	2.62				
	16-Above	2.61				
OVERALL	1-5 years	2.93	2.52	.068	Accepted	Not Significant
	6-10 years	2.81				
	11-15 years	2.94				
	16-Above	2.85				

While most assessments did not differ significantly, collaborative and reflective practices varied based on experience ($p < .05$). Mid-career teachers (11-15 years) were more engaged in these strategies, possibly due to balancing experience with ongoing professional development.

Table 3.4. One-way ANOVA on differences in the assessment of the respondents on their innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education in terms of highest educational attainment

Indicator	Education	Mean	F	Sig.	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Integration	Bachelor's	2.99	2.743	.104	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's	3.04				
2. Technological Innovations	Bachelor's	2.86	.876	.354	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's	3.05				
3. Playful and Creative Strategies	Bachelor's	3.08	1.667	.202	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's	3.02				
4. Universal Design Principles	Bachelor's	3.09	2.056	.158	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's	3.06				
5. Teacher Preparation Programs	Bachelor's	2.90	.445	.508	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's	2.99				
6. Social Justice and Inclusion	Bachelor's	2.99	.050	.824	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's	2.88				
7. Collaborative and Reflective Practices	Bachelor's	2.64	.071	.791	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's	2.63				
8. Adapting and Scaffolding Curriculum	Bachelor's	2.63	1.021	.317	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's	2.63				
OVERALL	Bachelor's	2.90	.050	.825	Accepted	Not Significant
	Master's	2.91				

There were no significant differences in assessment based on highest educational attainment ($p > .05$), suggesting that both Bachelor's and Master's degree holders perceived and implemented inclusive strategies similarly, possibly due to institutional training and experience compensating for academic differences.

CONCLUSIONS

The study revealed that the respondents were well-positioned to support inclusive teaching practices due to their experienced, advanced degrees, and balanced gender representation. They were generally active in innovative teaching strategies for inclusive education, such as EDI integration, technology use, and creative methods. However, there was room for improvement in consistency and resource provision. Strategies like curriculum adaptation and collaborative and reflective practices showed potential but required more focused support. The assessment of innovative teaching strategies was uniform across gender and educational attainment groups, but differences were noted based on length of service and age. Mid-career teachers were more engaged in collaborative practices, while older teachers, particularly those aged 55 and above, rated their inclusive practices more favorably, particularly in social justice and curriculum adaptation.

Developing Innovative Strategies for Inclusive Education: “Focus on Teaching Strategies

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author expresses gratitude to their adviser, DR. AIDA DAMIAN, for her invaluable support and mentorship throughout their research journey. They also thank their thesis committee for their hard work and constructive feedback, which enhanced the quality of their work. The Dean of the Graduate School, DR. EDUARDO C. ZIALCITA, has been instrumental in inspiring and motivating the author throughout their study. The author also thanks their wife, VANESSA MAE C. ESPIRITU, and son, DASHIEL VONN C. ESPIRITU, for their love, patience, and sacrifices. The author also thanks their parents and family for their unwavering support, encouragement, and belief in their abilities. The author also thanks the teachers who participated in the study and the dedicated faculty and staff of the University of Perpetual Help System-DALTA, Las Piñas, for their contributions and support. The author thanks everyone for being a part of this journey.

REFERENCES

- 1) Chavarría, R. M., González-Montesino, R. H., López-Bastías, J. L., & Díaz-Vega, M. (2023). Universal Design for Learning and Instruction: Effective strategies for inclusive higher education. *Education Sciences*.
- 2) Chege, L., Juma, S., Kiambati, F., & Wambua, M. T. (2020). Delivering quality education through inclusive teacher professional development pedagogies in Kenya. *Innovations for quality education and lifelong learning*.
- 3) Guerrero Granda, S., Serpa-Andrade, L., & Guerrero, L. A. (2022). Playful strategies to enhance teaching-learning and the inclusion of children with Down syndrome. *AHFE International*.
- 4) Mason, D. P., McDougle, L. M., Jones, J. M., & Jones, J. A. (2020). Teaching social justice in nonprofit management education: A critical pedagogy and practical strategies. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*.
- 5) Montoya-Rodríguez, M. M., Franco, V. de S., Tomás Llerena, C., Molina Cobos, F. J., Pizzarossa, S., García, A. C. de A., & Martínez-Valderrey, V. (2022). Virtual reality and augmented reality as strategies for teaching social skills to individuals with intellectual disability: A systematic review. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities*.
- 6) Salleh, R. B. (2023). Rethinking teaching strategies: Considerations for promoting equity, diversity, and inclusion. *The International Journal of Education Management and Sociology*.
- 7) Wolfberg, P., LePage, P., & Cook, E. P. (2020). Innovations in inclusive education: Two teacher preparation programs at the San Francisco State University.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.