

## **Evaluating the Effectiveness of Learning Outcomes Assessment for Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Education Schools in Jakarta**

**Indra Jaya\*, Rohmah Ageng Mursita, Citra Ashri Maulidina, Bahrudin Bahrudin, M. Arif Taboer**  
Special Education Study Program, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta

\*Email: [indrajaya@unj.ac.id](mailto:indrajaya@unj.ac.id)

**Abstract:** Assessment of learning outcomes for students with special needs (PDBK) in inclusive schools faces various challenges, especially in providing accommodations that suit individual needs. This study aims to collect empirical data regarding the evaluation of learning outcomes for students with special needs in primary schools that provide inclusive education in Jakarta. This study employs a quantitative approach with a descriptive design, gathering data from teachers in inclusive schools using questionnaires. We analyzed the data using descriptive statistical methods to provide a clear picture of the applied assessment practices. We conducted this research using quantitative methodology between March 2021 and November 2023, collecting data through questionnaires and analyzing it with descriptive statistical methods. The results indicated that evaluation practices in inclusive schools have not fully accommodated the needs of students with special needs. These findings emphasize the importance of improving teacher training and resources to support inclusive education and provide fair assessment for all students, including students with disabilities. Extending exam time, adjusting exam materials, and implementing more inclusive assessment procedures are some of the things that require improvement. These findings show that the current assessment methodology is inadequate and indicate the need for improvements to ensure more inclusive and equitable learning outcomes for students with special needs. The study also highlights the importance of improving teacher training and providing better resources to support inclusive education and ensure equal assessment for all students, including students with disabilities.

**Keywords:** Assessment of Learning Outcomes; Children with special needs; Inclusive Education; Assessment Accommodation; Inclusive School.

### **INTRODUCTION**

In recent decades, the topic of inclusive education has gained significant prominence in the field of global education, particularly following the publication of the Salamanca Statement in 1994. The statement highlights the significance of ensuring that all children, including those with special educational needs, have access to high-quality education without any kind of discrimination. This was stressed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 1994. Inclusive education seeks to not only integrate children with special needs into the same learning environment as their typical peers but also to establish a learning environment that is receptive and accommodating to the needs of all students, enabling each individual to achieve their maximum potential (Ainscow, 2020).

In Indonesia, inclusive education is considered a crucial approach to meet the nine-year learning requirement and provide educational opportunities for all students, including those with physical, emotional, mental, intellectual, and social disabilities (Bahrudin et al., 2020). Following the government's formalization as a component of national policy, inclusive education in Indonesia has seen notable advancements in both policy and execution. Nevertheless, despite the principle of inclusivity, there are significant concerns regarding the effective execution, particularly when it comes to evaluating the academic achievements of children with special needs (PDBK) in inclusive schools (Arifin, Suryani, & Taboer, 2021).

Evaluating learning outcomes is a critical component of the education process, as the outcomes serve as a foundation for measuring learning effectiveness, assessing student progress, and establishing future educational strategies (Brown & Knight, 2020). Within the framework of inclusive education, the assessment process becomes more intricate because

it must effectively cater to the diverse requirements of various people, including those with physical, developmental, or behavioral challenges. Assessments that fail to take into account special needs can be inequitable and impede student growth, undermining the very essence of inclusive education (Sailor, 2017).

While there have been several studies conducted on inclusive education, the research on evaluating the effectiveness and adaptability of learning outcomes for students with disabilities is still relatively scarce, particularly in Indonesia (Kustawan, 2015). A significant challenge for teachers when it comes to implementing inclusive assessments is the insufficient guidance and training on how to create and administer exams that can cater to the needs of children with disabilities while still maintaining academic standards (Mitchell, 2014). However, instructors frequently experience pressure to achieve national curriculum targets, which can limit their ability to modify evaluations for PDBK (Bambang & Hermawan, 2021).

This study seeks to address the requirement for empirical data about the implementation of learning outcomes assessment in primary schools that offer inclusive education in East Jakarta. This study will utilize a quantitative methodology to investigate the strategies employed by teachers in inclusive schools for designing and implementing assessments. Additionally, it will explore the obstacles encountered by teachers during this process. The goal is to design efficient assessment methods that can be applied in inclusive schools to ensure fair and unbiased assessment of all students, including those with impairments.

Teachers require pedagogical competence as one of their essential skills. Pedagogical competence refers to a teacher's capacity to comprehend students, create and execute effective learning strategies, foster student development, and assess student learning outcomes in order to help them reach their full potential (Abrar, 2020; Dego et al., 2019; Meutia & Mursita, 2018; Setiyowati & Arifianto, 2020). Prior studies have demonstrated that successful inclusive assessment should take into account multiple elements, such as the specific impairment of students, their cognitive capabilities, and their particular learning preferences and styles (Loreman, Deppeler, & Harvey, 2010). Furthermore, evaluations should offer a thorough representation of student accomplishment in multiple dimensions, encompassing not just academic performance but also social, emotional, and adaptive abilities (Florian, 2014). Portfolio-based assessment, formative assessment, and the utilization of assistive technology have been recognized as exemplary approaches in inclusive assessment (Smith & Tyler, 2010).

Nevertheless, the execution of these tactics in practical settings frequently encounters difficulties. Obstacles include inadequate resources, insufficient support from school administration, and opposition from individuals who hold conventional views on education and evaluation (Slee, 2018). This study will also investigate the methods instructors use to overcome these obstacles and identify solutions that could be applied to enhance the standard of assessment in inclusive schools.

This study is anticipated to have a significant impact on enhancing the quality of inclusive education in Indonesia, particularly in the area of evaluating learning outcomes. The results of this study are anticipated to serve as a foundation for the development of more explicit guidelines and policies on inclusive assessment. Additionally, the study aims to offer recommendations for enhancing teacher training in the implementation of accommodating assessment for PDBK (Arifin et al., 2021).

Furthermore, this study seeks to augment the existing body of scholarship on inclusive education in Indonesia, which remains significantly constrained in comparison to other nations. Hence, the findings of this research will not only be advantageous for educational

professionals in Indonesia but also serve as a point of reference for scholars and decision-makers in other nations facing comparable circumstances and obstacles in the implementation of inclusive education.

The primary objective of this research is to enhance comprehension regarding the effective implementation of learning outcomes assessment in an inclusive education setting. Additionally, this study seeks to offer recommendations that can be utilized to enhance the quality and fairness of assessment for all students, including those with special needs. This study will not only provide a practical and factual contribution within this particular framework, but also establish a conceptual basis that can be used to construct more effective and comprehensive evaluation frameworks in other times.

## **METHOD**

Part of this method is about the design of the study, the subject of research, data collection techniques, data analysis techniques presented in paragraph form. The aim of this study is to investigate and gather data on the implementation of learning outcomes evaluation in primary schools that offer inclusive education in DKI Jakarta. This study employed a quantitative methodology, as advised by Creswell (2014), who highlighted its efficacy in objectively assessing and elucidating educational phenomena. This study used descriptive methods and a survey design to get information from a representative sample and give a full picture of how assessment practices in the schools being studied affected students' learning outcomes (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2011).

Several previous studies, such as those conducted by Mitchell (2014) and Sailor (2017), suggest that effective inclusive education requires adjustments in evaluation procedures to ensure all student assessment equality. This study shows that even though people know that changes need to be made, they are not being made very often. Instead, there is a focus on uniform exam standards, aligning with the national exam policy that wants all exam materials to be identical.

Previous research that said tests should be changed to consider things like students' cognitive, social, and emotional intelligence goes against what this study found: insufficient tools or an environment suitable for tests. This shows that although previous research emphasizes the importance of adjustments in evaluation for PDBK, implementing this concept in the field is still hampered by factors such as the lack of adequate training for teachers and limited resources in inclusive schools.

Thus, despite the literature's consensus on the need for adjustments in evaluation to create better inclusivity, this study's results show a significant gap between theory and practice in the field, which should be an important concern for the development of inclusive education policies in Indonesia.

The survey included educators who teach in primary schools that provide inclusive education in East Jakarta. The participants for this study were selected using purposive sampling, specifically targeting teachers who were directly responsible for measuring the learning outcomes of kids with special needs (Patton, 2015). The data gathering tool used was a questionnaire that was specifically developed using inclusive education evaluation principles and prior research findings. The questionnaire included many items that assessed critical components of learning outcome evaluation, such as changes to test timing, test materials, and teacher assessment procedures (Muijs, 2011). The instrument's validity and reliability have been thoroughly evaluated to verify the obtained data's dependability.

In the study you shared, the subjects were teachers who taught at inclusive primary schools in East Jakarta. The subjects were selected using the purposive sampling method,

meaning only teachers directly responsible for evaluating the learning outcomes of students with special needs were selected as participants. The number of subjects from which data was collected was 30.

To ensure clarity on ethical clearance in this study, here are some points that need to be confirmed:

1. **Informed Consent:** Researchers must ensure that all participants (teachers) give clear consent to participate in the study and understand its purpose, benefits, and potential risks.
2. **Privacy and Confidentiality:** The identity of participants must be kept confidential, and the data obtained from them must be stored securely. Only data that does not identify individuals may be published.
3. **Free from Pressure:** Participation in research must be voluntary, without coercion or influence from the school or other agencies.
4. **Use of Data:** The data collected will only be used for approved research purposes, and participants must be informed about how the research results will be used.

The data gathering approach involved disseminating questionnaires to the chosen individuals. Every participant was allocated a certain period to complete the questionnaire on an individual basis, ensuring the anonymity of their responses. After collecting the data, we undertook analysis using descriptive statistical methods. This analysis involves computing the mode, median, and standard deviation, as well as presenting the data in tables and histograms. The selection of descriptive statistical techniques was made to provide a comprehensive summary of the assessment outcomes carried out by instructors in inclusive schools, as well as to detect patterns in the assessment's execution (Field, 2013). After gathering all the data, it was examined in order to derive dependable findings on the implementation of learning outcomes assessment in inclusive schools in DKI Jakarta (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2016).

## **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

### **Finding(s)**

This section provides an exposition of the processed data obtained from the study, including detailed descriptions and thorough analysis. The study concentrated on a solitary factor: the evaluation of educational achievements carried out by educators at inclusive elementary schools in East Jakarta. For each item or statement, the learning outcome assessments conducted by teachers at these inclusive schools are reported as percentages.

The study's ultimate findings center on assessing the evaluation methods employed by teachers in inclusive education environments. The evaluation of educational achievements was obtained by computing the mean score for each individual item was used to evaluate educational achievements. The following table displays the comprehensive outcomes of the learning assessments conducted by teachers at inclusive primary schools in East Jakarta.

The investigation reveals that instructors' evaluations of learning outcomes in inclusive schools are typically standardized and not fully tailored to the requirements of students with special needs (SWDs). The results emphasize that most teachers use standardized assessment criteria for all students, encompassing factors such as time allocation, exam structure, and content, irrespective of their individual variations. The motivation behind this approach could be the desire to fulfill overall educational goals, especially in anticipation of national standardized tests that prioritize consistency in exam material (Florian, 2014).

This observation aligns with the existing body of literature, which emphasizes the difficulties of adopting customized evaluations in inclusive educational settings. Mitchell (2014) asserts that effective inclusive education necessitates assessments that are adaptable and sensitive to the varied requirements of all students, including those with disabilities (SWDs). In addition, Sailor (2017) contends that the absence of suitable provisions in assessment methods can greatly disadvantage students with disabilities (SWDs), ultimately defeating the objectives of inclusive education.

The statistics also indicate that certain elements of assessment, such as the utilization of customized tools to accommodate individual requirements and the establishment of individualized evaluation environments, are infrequently put into practice. This indicates a deficiency in teachers' capacity or resources to adequately cater to students with disabilities (SWDs) during evaluations. According to Kustawan (2015), a major obstacle to successful inclusive education in Indonesia is the lack of opportunities for instructors to receive specialized training and resources. This prevents them from being able to modify evaluations to accommodate the unique requirements of students with disabilities.


Education policymakers, educational institutions, educators, parents, and other community stakeholders are encouraging the acceleration of inclusive development through the implementation of UDL, which means inclusive education (Anggraini & Subasno, 2024). However, several studies indicate that teachers are less motivated, thus affecting their attitudes towards inclusive education programs (Idris & Tahar, 2023). This study shows that inclusive education requires support from teachers and relevant stakeholders to run optimally (Jaya, et al, 2023).

Given these discoveries, it is crucial for educational policymakers and school administrators to prioritize creating and applying assessment frameworks that are specifically tailored for inclusive environments. This entails allocating resources towards professional development initiatives that provide instructors with the requisite expertise and resources to administer equitable and suitable evaluations for every student. Furthermore, further investigation is required to examine novel approaches for inclusive evaluation methods, specifically in varied and limited-resource educational settings such as Indonesia.

**Table 1. Learning Outcome Assessment**

No.	Rated Aspect	Always		Often		Rarely		Never		Average Score
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
1.	The time used in the assessment is extended.	0	0	0	0	12	28,6	30	71,4	1,3
2.	The time used in the assessment is extended.	0	0	0	0	14	33,3	28	66,7	1,3
3.	Questions are adapted to the material taught to children with disabilities.	0	0	0	0	4	9,5	38	90,5	1,1
4.	The evaluation is conducted individually.	0	0	0	0	6	14,3	36	85,7	1,1
5.	The evaluation is conducted orally or the teacher reads out the questions.	0	0	0	0	10	23,8	32	76,2	1,2
6.	Evaluation uses special tools according to the needs of the students.	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	100	1,0
7.	Different graduation standards.	0	0	6	14,3	36	85,7	0	0	2,1
8.	Different reporting systems.	0	0	14	33,3	28	66,7	0	0	2,3

No.	Rated Aspect	Always		Often		Rarely		Never		Average Score
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
9.	Processing and analyzing evaluation results.	0	0	14	33,3	28	66,7	0	0	2,3
10.	Classify learners' abilities.	0	0	14	33,3	28	66,7	0	0	2,3
11.	Identify needs for improvement and enrichment.	0	0	6	14,3	22	52,4	14	33,3	1,8
12.	Developing improvement and enrichment programs.	0	0	6	14,3	22	52,4	14	33,3	1,8
13.	Implementing improvement and enrichment	0	0	2	4,7	12	28,6	28	66,7	1,4
<b>Average Score</b>										<b>1,6</b>



**Figure 1. Evaluation of learning outcome assessment in inclusive schools**

This part presents a comprehensive examination of the processed data collected during the study, providing full descriptions and in-depth analysis. The study focused exclusively on one factor: the assessment of academic accomplishments conducted by educators at inclusive primary schools in East Jakarta. The learning outcome assessments completed by teachers at these inclusive schools are presented as percentages for each item or statement.

The study primarily focuses on evaluating the assessment methods used by teachers in inclusive educational settings. Educational achievements were assessed by calculating the average score for each specific item, which was then used for the evaluation. The table below presents the comprehensive results of the learning assessments carried out by teachers in inclusive primary schools in East Jakarta.

The analysis indicates that instructors' assessments of learning outcomes in inclusive schools are generally standardized and do not adequately cater to the specific demands of students with special needs (SWDs). The findings highlight that the majority of teachers employ standardized assessment standards for all students, taking into account elements such as time allocation, exam structure, and content, regardless of their individual differences. The rationale for adopting this method may stem from a need to achieve broader educational objectives, particularly in preparation for national standardized examinations that emphasize uniformity in exam content (Florian, 2014).

## **Discussion(s)**

The results of this study uncover various noteworthy concerns in the present methods of evaluating learning outcomes in inclusive education schools in East Jakarta. These problems emphasize the difficulties that teachers encounter while trying to carry out customized evaluations that cater to the varying requirements of students with disabilities (SWDs).

### ***Standardized Evaluation Methods***

The data suggests that teachers mostly use consistent assessment techniques, as seen by an average score of 1.6 across all evaluation criteria. This indicates a little variation in evaluation techniques. More precisely, 71.4% of teachers stated that they never prolong the duration of examinations, while an additional 28.6% indicated that they rarely do. This consistency is likely a result of prioritizing adherence to curriculum deadlines rather than adapting to the unique learning demands of individuals. Because there aren't many different assessment methods, it's not clear how well these methods help students with disabilities (SWDs) deal with the unique problems they face, since they might not get the help they need to show off their full abilities (Mitchell, 2014).

### ***Insufficient adjustment of evaluation instruments***

The remarkably low mean score (1.0) for the utilization of customized tools to cater to students' requirements is alarming, as all respondents reported never employing such tools. This highlights a notable deficiency in the availability of suitable accommodations for students with disabilities (SWDs), which is essential for guaranteeing fair and equal access to education. The lack of personalized tools and settings implies that SWDs may not be receiving the necessary assistance to effectively showcase their learning potential. This finding aligns with the current body of research, which highlights the significance of employing customized tools and environments to guarantee equitable evaluations for all students (Florian, 2014; Mitchell, 2014).

### ***Focus on Standardized Assessment***

The study also indicates that the components connected to standardized evaluation, such as varied graduation requirements and processing and analyzing evaluation findings, had the highest average scores of 2.1 and 2.3, respectively. Although these ratings are comparatively higher, they nevertheless reflect modest adjustments, indicating a predominant focus on preserving uniform evaluation criteria rather than addressing the varied requirements of students with disabilities (SWDs). This strategy may be motivated by the imperative to fulfill national standardized testing mandates, which favor consistency in examination material (Sailor, 2017).

### ***Difficulties in recognizing and resolving specific requirements***

Another crucial concern noted in this study is the absence of proactive procedures for recognizing and resolving the specific requirements of students with disabilities (SWDs). This is supported by the low average scores of 1.8 in identifying areas for improvement and

enrichment, as well as in implementing improvement and enrichment initiatives. According to the research, teachers may not have the appropriate tools or training to accurately identify and address the specific learning difficulties of students with disabilities (SWDs), which could impede their capacity to reach their maximum potential (Florian, 2014).

### ***Practical and policy-related implications***

These findings highlight the urgent need for modifications in assessment techniques within inclusive education settings. In order to ensure fair and equal possibilities for success among all students, including students with disabilities (SWDs), it is imperative that instructors undergo thorough training and have sufficient access to resources. The training should prioritize providing educators with the necessary skills to carry out differentiated assessments that address the varied learning needs of their pupils. In the absence of these reforms, the objectives of inclusive education remain unfulfilled, and students with disabilities (SWDs) may persist in encountering substantial obstacles to academic success.

Furthermore, this study emphasizes the importance of implementing specific guidelines and policies that necessitate the use of adapted assessment tools and approaches in inclusive educational institutions. Professional development programs should be provided alongside these guidelines to equip teachers with the necessary skills for designing and implementing inclusive assessments effectively. Kustawan (2015) emphasizes that the lack of specific training and resources poses a major obstacle to the attainment of effective inclusive education in Indonesia. The results of this study emphasize the importance of targeted initiatives to close this disparity and ensure that every student receives the necessary assistance to achieve success.

These findings highlight the urgent need for educational policymakers and school administrators to give top priority to creating and implementing evaluation frameworks that are specifically tailored for inclusive environments. This requires allocating resources towards professional development initiatives that provide instructors with the essential knowledge and tools to carry out equitable and suitable assessments for every student. Furthermore, additional investigation is required to examine novel approaches for comprehensive evaluation methods, specifically in varied and limited-resource educational settings such as Indonesia.

## **CONCLUSION**

The evaluation of learning outcomes in inclusive education programs is deemed to be of low quality. In terms of the assessment criteria, the highest scores are obtained in the areas of diverse reporting systems, processing and analyzing evaluation results, and categorizing students' abilities. Conversely, the lowest assessment is observed when evaluating learning outcomes using specialized tools tailored to students' needs and conducting individual evaluations.

To summarize, this study uncovers notable deficiencies in the present evaluation methods employed in inclusive education in Jakarta. The absence of distinct evaluations and modified instruments for students with disabilities (SWDs) underscores a crucial domain for improvement. Implementing these modifications is crucial for guaranteeing that all students, irrespective of their capabilities, have the chance to thrive in an all-encompassing educational setting.

This study recommends that teachers receive intensive training on adapting evaluations for students with special needs. This training needs to include inclusive teaching techniques, the use of aids, and the conduct of assessments that are fair and appropriate to students' individual needs.

It is important to continuously monitor and evaluate the implementation of inclusive education policies and the evaluation of student learning outcomes. Supervision from authorities can ensure proper adjustments and measure evaluation effectiveness. To ensure that the policies implemented are genuinely effective in improving the quality of education for students with special needs.

This study collected data through questionnaires designed to assess aspects of the teachers' evaluations. Limitations in the data collection instrument (i.e., the questionnaire) may affect the depth or detail of the findings obtained. We conducted this study in inclusive primary schools in Jakarta. Therefore, we cannot generalize the findings of this study to other areas outside Jakarta or schools that do not offer inclusive education.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We express our gratitude to all participants, particularly the teachers in inclusive primary schools in Jakarta, for their invaluable contributions to this research. We express our deep gratitude to the Special Education Program, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Jakarta for their invaluable provision of essential resources and unwavering support throughout the study endeavor. We would like to express our gratitude to our colleagues and advisers from the Indonesian Orthopedagogic Association (APOI) for their valuable experience and assistance, which have significantly enhanced the quality of this research. We would like to extend our gratitude to the editorial staff of ICSAR Journal for their consideration of our work for publication.

## REFERENCES

- Ading, A. (2022). Penerapan supervisi akademik kepala sekolah: studi tentang kompetensi pedagogik guru [The Implementation of Academic Supervision by School Principals: A Study on Teachers' Pedagogical Competence]. *Edukasiana Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan*, 1(2), 47-52. <https://doi.org/10.56916/ejip.v1i2.17>.
- Angraini, D., & Subasno, Y. (2024). Universal Design Learning: Rehabilitation and Inclusive Education in Multidisciplinary Perspective for Inclusive Development. *Journal of ICSAR*, 8(2), 245-257. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um005v8i2p245>.
- Ainscow, M. and Messiou, K. (2021). Inclusive inquiry: an innovative approach for promoting inclusion in schools. *Revista Latinoamericana De Educación Inclusiva*, 15(2), 23-37. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-73782021000200023>.
- Arifin, Z., Suryani, L., & Taboer, M. A. (2021). Penilaian Hasil Belajar bagi Peserta Didik Berkebutuhan Khusus di Sekolah Inklusif [Assessment of Learning Outcomes for Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Schools]. *Journal of Educational Evaluation*, 9(3), 211-225.
- Bambang, B., & Hermawan, E. (2021). *Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif Pada Madrasah [The Implementation of Inclusive Education in Madrasah]*. Bandung: MDP Media.
- Brown, S. and Knight, P. (2012). Assessing learners in higher education. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203062036>.
- Cole, S., Murphy, H., Frisby, M., & Robinson, J. (2022). The Relationship Between Special Education Placement and High School Outcomes. *The Journal of Special Education*, 57, 13 - 23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669221097945>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics (4th ed.)*. London: SAGE.
- Florian, L. (2014). The sage handbook of special education: two volume set. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446282236>
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2011). *How to design and evaluate research in education (8th ed.)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2016). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences (10th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Haegele, J. and Hodge, S. (2015). Quantitative methodology: a guide for emerging physical education and adapted physical education researchers. *The Physical Educator*. <https://doi.org/10.18666/tpe-2015-v72-i5-6133>.
- Idris, N. H., & Tahar, M. M. (2023). Internal Motivation and Attitude in the Implementation of Inclusive Education Program between General Education and PPKI Teachers. *Journal of ICSAR*, 7(2), 195-204. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um005v7i22023p195>
- Jatmiko, A., Hadiati, E., & Oktavia, M. (2020). Penerapan evaluasi pembelajaran anak usia dini di taman kanak-kanak [The Implementation of Early Childhood Learning Evaluation in Kindergartens]. *Al-Athfaal Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 3(1), 83-97. <https://doi.org/10.24042/ajipaud.v3i1.6875>.
- Jaya, I., Maulidina, C. A., Kasirah, I., Taboer, M. A., Bahrudin, & Yusro, M. N. (2023). Collaboration in Education Services for Children with Special Needs in Inclusive Schools. *Journal of ICSAR*, 7(2), 288-294. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um005v7i22023p288>.
- Krämer, S., Möller, J., & Zimmermann, F. (2021). Inclusive Education of Students With General Learning Difficulties: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 91, 432 - 478. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654321998072>.
- Kurniawati, F. (2021). Exploring teachers' inclusive education strategies in rural Indonesian primary schools. *Educational Research*, 63, 198 - 211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2021.1915698>.
- Kustawan, D. (2015). *Pendidikan Inklusif dan Upaya Implementasinya [Inclusive Education and Its Implementation Efforts]*. Jakarta: PT. Luxima Metro Media.
- Loreman, T., Deppeler, J., & Harvey, D. (2010). *Inclusive Education: A Practical Guide to Supporting Diversity in the Classroom*. Routledge.
- Marlina, M., Kusumastuti, G., & Ediyanto, E. (2023). Differentiated Learning Assessment Model to Improve Involvement of Special Needs Students in Inclusive Schools. *International Journal of Instruction*. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16425a>.
- Mitchell, D. (2014). *What really works in special and inclusive education*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203105313>.
- Nijakowska, J. (2024). Inclusion and accessibility in teacher education. *Neofilolog*, 62(1), 43-60. <https://doi.org/10.14746/n.2024.62.1.4>.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Sailor, W. (2017). *Handbook of research on inclusive education*. Taylor & Francis.
- Setyaputri, N., Lasan, B., & Permatasari, D. (2016). Pengembangan Paket Pelatihan 'Ground, Understand, Revise, Use (GURU)-Karier' untuk Meningkatkan Efikasi Diri Karier Calon Konselor [Development of the 'Ground, Understand, Revise, Use (GURU)-Career' Training Package to Improve Career Self-Efficacy of Prospective Counselors]. *Jurnal Kajian Bimbingan dan Konseling*, 1(4), 132-141. Retrieved from <http://journal.um.ac.id/index.php/bk/article/view/6783>.
- Sheehy, K., Vacková, P., Van Manen, S., Turnip, S., Rofiah, K., & Twiner, A. (2022). Inclusive disaster risk reduction education for Indonesian children. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2022.2115156>.
- Shelly, D. R. (2010). Periodic, chaotic, and doubled earthquake recurrence intervals on the deep San Andreas fault. *Science*, 3(2), 45-51.
- Slee, R. (2018). *Inclusive education isn't dead, it just smells funny*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429486869>
- Smith, D. D., & Tyler, N. C. (2010). *Effective inclusive education: Equitable education for all learners*. Pearson.
- Sparrow, D. G. (2010). *Motivasi Bekerja dan Berkarya [Work and Creativity Motivation]*. Jakarta: Citra Cemerlang.

- Utama, A. H. (2021). Model desain penyelenggaraan pendidikan inklusif [Design Model for Inclusive Education Implementation]. *Edudikara: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.32585/edudikara.v6i3.244>.
- Wilkinson, R. (1999). *Sociology as a marketing feast*. In M. Collis, L. Munro, & S. Russell (Eds.), *Sociology for the New Millennium*. Paper presented at The Australian Sociological Association, Monash University, Melbourne, 7-10 December (pp. 281-289). Churchill: Celts.
- Winkel, W. S., & Hastuti, M. S. (2005). *Bimbingan dan Konseling di Institusi Pendidikan [Guidance and Counseling in Educational Institutions]*. Media Abadi.