

Managerial Leadership of School Principals in Implementing Inclusive Education: A Qualitative Study in Public Elementary School

Rika Septiyani*, Soedjono, Widya Kusumaningsih

Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia, Semarang, Indonesia

Email: *azkaaufazakri@gmail.com

Abstract: Inclusive education has become a strategic policy within the national education system aimed at ensuring equal learning opportunities for all students, including those with special needs. Its successful implementation at the school level largely depends on the principal's managerial leadership capacity. This study aims to analyze the principal's role as a manager in implementing inclusive education at SD Negeri Panjang Wetan 03, Pekalongan Utara District, Pekalongan City. The research employed a qualitative case-study design. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, participatory observations, and document analysis, and analyzed using data reduction, data display, and conclusion-drawing techniques, with triangulation to ensure data validity. The findings reveal that the principal performed managerial functions integratively through participatory planning based on students' needs, collaborative organizing among teachers, actuating through supportive supervision and instructional leadership, and reflective evaluation oriented toward continuous improvement. Rather than proposing a novel theoretical framework, this study provides a context-specific insight into how classical management functions are enacted and adapted within a resource-constrained, inclusive elementary school setting. The findings indicate that the implementation of inclusive education in this context is shaped by adaptive, collaborative, and context-responsive managerial leadership, although its outcomes are influenced by structural constraints such as limited resources and institutional support.

Keywords: principal leadership; educational management; inclusive education; managerial role; elementary school.

INTRODUCTION

Education is a fundamental right of every citizen, without discrimination, including children with special needs, as mandated by Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System and reinforced by the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. At the global level, this commitment is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goal 4, which emphasizes inclusive and equitable quality education (UNESCO, 2020). Despite these strong normative frameworks, the implementation of inclusive education remains uneven, particularly in developing countries, including Indonesia, where gaps between policy and practice persist (Rasmitadila et al., 2020).

Inclusive education is conceptually understood as a systemic approach that ensures access, participation, and learning success for all students through adaptive curriculum, pedagogy, and learning environments (Florian, 2021). It is not merely the physical placement of students with special needs in regular classrooms, but a continuous process of removing barriers to participation and achievement (Ainscow, 2020; UNESCO, 2020).

However, translating this conceptual framework into practice requires strong institutional capacity, particularly at the school level.

In the Indonesian context, several structural and operational challenges hinder the effective implementation of inclusive education. These include limited teacher competence in differentiated instruction, inadequate infrastructure, and inconsistencies in policy implementation at the school level. Although inclusive policies have been formally adopted, their implementation often depends on the readiness of school-level leadership and management (Rasmitadila et al., 2020). This condition highlights a critical issue: inclusive

education in Indonesia is not only a pedagogical concern but also a managerial and leadership challenge.

Within this context, school principals play a pivotal role as managerial leaders who translate policy into practice. Contemporary studies consistently demonstrate that leadership significantly influences inclusive school culture, teacher collaboration, and instructional practices (Nguyen et al., 2022; Yıldızoğlu & Topcu, 2025). Principals who integrate managerial functions with an inclusive vision are more capable of fostering adaptive learning environments and supporting teachers in implementing inclusive pedagogy (DeMatthews et al., 2020; Feng et al., 2025; Stavrou, E., & Kafa, A., 2024). Thus, leadership is not merely administrative but transformative in shaping inclusive education.

Managerial leadership in inclusive education can be understood through four core functions: planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling (Bush, 2020). Planning involves formulating an inclusive vision and allocating resources based on students' needs (Bush, 2020; Pirmanuddin et al., 2025). Organizing includes structuring inclusive teams and ensuring accessible facilities (DeMatthews et al., 2020). Implementation focuses on empowering teachers through training, supervision, and collaborative culture (Rivana et al., 2025). Meanwhile, controlling emphasizes data-based monitoring and evaluation of both academic and socio-emotional outcomes (Yang et al., 2025). These functions collectively determine how effectively inclusive education is operationalized at the school level.

Although previous studies have highlighted the importance of leadership in inclusive education, there remains a limited understanding of how managerial leadership is enacted in specific school contexts, particularly in Indonesian public elementary schools. Existing research tends to emphasize general leadership roles or policy analysis rather than examining how principals operationalize managerial functions to address real implementation challenges. This indicates a research gap in understanding the practical dynamics of managerial leadership in inclusive education at the school level.

This gap is particularly evident in SD Negeri Panjang Wetan 03, located in the North Pekalongan District of Pekalongan City. Based on the 2023–2024 Education Report Card, instructional leadership indicators remain relatively stable; however, classroom management and instructional quality have declined. This suggests challenges in implementing adaptive and inclusive learning practices. At the same time, the school has initiated several inclusive programs, such as inclusive literacy initiatives, provision of disability-friendly books, and strengthened teacher–parent collaboration. This contrast indicates a discrepancy between inclusive policy intentions and their practical implementation.

Therefore, this study aims to analyze the managerial leadership of school principals in implementing inclusive education at SD Negeri Panjang Wetan 03. By focusing on how managerial functions are enacted in practice, this study seeks to contribute both theoretically to the development of inclusive educational leadership and practically to improving the effectiveness of inclusive education implementation in Indonesian elementary schools.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative, intrinsic case-study design to develop an in-depth understanding of the principal's managerial leadership in implementing inclusive education in its real-life context. A qualitative approach enables the exploration of meanings, processes, and interactions as experienced by participants in natural settings (Creswell & Poth, 2021; Sugiyono, 2022; Merriam & Tisdell, 2020; Arikunto, 2022). The case study design was selected because the research focuses on a single unit of analysis, namely the principal of SD Negeri Panjang Wetan 03, Pekalongan City, allowing for a holistic and

contextual examination of managerial practices in planning, organizing, implementing, and supervising inclusive education (Yin, 2023; Sugiyono, 2022).

The study was conducted at SD Negeri Panjang Wetan 03, North Pekalongan District, Pekalongan City, which has been officially designated as an inclusive school. The site was purposively selected for its relevance and richness of information on inclusive education practices (Patton, 2020; Sugiyono, 2022). The research was carried out over a six-month period, from July to December 2025, enabling prolonged engagement to gain a comprehensive understanding of the school's organizational dynamics and culture (Creswell & Poth, 2021; Arikunto, 2022).

Participants were selected using purposeful sampling, focusing on individuals directly involved in implementing inclusive education. The informants consisted of the principal as the key informant, three classroom teachers, one subject teacher, two students with special needs, and one representative of the school committee. The principal was designated as the key informant given their central managerial role, while other participants were included to provide multiple perspectives and enable data triangulation (Patton, 2020; Creswell & Poth, 2021; Arikunto, 2022).

Given that the principal holds formal authority within the school, this study explicitly considered potential power dynamics during data collection. To minimize hierarchical bias, interviews with teachers, students, and the school committee representative were conducted independently, without the principal present. Informants were assured of confidentiality and encouraged to share their perspectives freely. This approach was intended to create a safe and non-threatening environment, thereby enhancing the authenticity and credibility of the data.

Data were collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews, passive participant observation, and document analysis. Interviews were used to explore participants' experiences and perceptions regarding managerial leadership in inclusive education, allowing flexibility while maintaining alignment with the research focus (Brinkmann, 2021; Arikunto, 2022). Observations were conducted to capture actual managerial practices in their natural context, ensuring that the data reflected real behaviors rather than reported practices (Uwamusi & Ajisebiyawo, 2023; Sugiyono, 2022). Document analysis was carried out on relevant school documents, including the School Work Plan (RKS), Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), evaluation reports, and meeting minutes, to corroborate findings from interviews and observations (Bowen, 2020; Arikunto, 2022).

In qualitative research, the researcher acts as the primary instrument (human instrument) responsible for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting the data (Creswell & Poth, 2021; Sugiyono, 2022). In this study, the researcher maintained reflexivity by continuously reflecting on their positionality, assumptions, and potential biases throughout the research process. Reflexive notes were recorded during data collection and analysis to ensure that interpretations remained grounded in participants' perspectives rather than the researcher's preconceptions. To support systematic data collection, interview guides, observation sheets, and document analysis formats were developed in line with the research focus (Arikunto, 2022).

The trustworthiness of the data was ensured through credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 2020). Credibility was strengthened through triangulation of data sources and methods, as well as member checking to validate findings with participants. Transferability was supported by providing a thick description of the research context, while dependability and confirmability were ensured through an audit

trail documenting all stages of the research process. (Sugiyono, 2022; Arikunto, 2022; Creswell & Poth, 2021; Tracy, 2020; Lincoln & Guba, 2020).

Data analysis followed the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2020), consisting of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. Data condensation involved selecting, focusing, and coding data in accordance with the research focus. Data were presented in narrative and thematic forms to identify patterns and relationships. Conclusions were drawn inductively and continuously verified throughout the research process. The analysis was conducted iteratively alongside data collection to allow ongoing reflection and refinement of interpretations, thereby strengthening the depth and credibility of the findings (Miles et al., 2020; Yin, 2023; Sugiyono, 2022; Arikunto, 2022; Creswell & Poth, 2021; Moleong, 2021).

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Finding(s)

The findings of this study were obtained through in-depth interviews, passive participant observation, and document analysis conducted from July to December 2025 at SD Negeri Panjang Wetan 03, North Pekalongan District, Pekalongan City. The analysis focused on four managerial functions of the principal in implementing inclusive education: (1) planning, (2) organizing, (3) actuating (mobilizing), and (4) program evaluation.

The Principal's Role in Planning the Inclusive Education Program

The findings indicate that the principal carried out the planning function in a strategic, participatory, and adaptive manner. Based on interview data, the principal emphasized that the school's inclusive policy rests on three main pillars:

“Our main policy is built on three pillars: first, resource advocacy by formally requesting assistant teachers from the Education Office; second, regulatory literacy by studying the legal foundations of inclusive education; and third, partnerships with external parties to support the needs of students with special needs that cannot be fulfilled independently by the school.” (Principal, December 5, 2025)

The principal further stated that planning was conducted collectively with teachers and the school committee:

“I do not design the inclusive program alone. We discuss it together with teachers and the committee so that everyone feels ownership and responsibility.” (Principal, December 5, 2025)

Regarding budget constraints, the principal openly acknowledged:

“There is not yet a specific budget allocation for inclusion. We still manage it flexibly from the school operational funds based on priority needs.” (Principal, December 5, 2025)

However, further analysis indicates that the absence of a dedicated budget has practical implications that extend beyond administrative flexibility. Teachers reported that certain adaptive learning tools and specialized support services were provided, requiring them to rely on improvisation and personal initiative. This condition suggests a structural limitation that potentially constrains the consistency and sustainability of inclusive practices.

Observations revealed that the school's vision and mission explicitly commit to inclusion and are regularly communicated during teacher meetings. Official documents, including the School Work Plan (RKS), Annual Work Plan (RKT), and School Budget Plan (RKAS), list inclusive programs as school priorities. Teachers also confirmed their involvement in individualized instructional planning:

"We identify the needs of students with special needs together with the principal, then prepare Individualized Education Programs and adjust lesson plans according to the students' abilities." (Classroom Teacher 2, December 12, 2025)

Nevertheless, while participatory planning was consistently reported, some discrepancies emerged between planning intentions and implementation capacity, particularly regarding resource allocation and time constraints.

Triangulated data indicate that inclusive planning is conducted participatively and grounded in students' actual needs, although it still faces structural limitations, particularly in dedicated budget allocation and resource adequacy.

The Principal's Role in Organizing the Inclusive Education Program

In the organizing function, the principal acted as an active coordinator. The principal stated:

"We coordinate almost every working day, Monday to Thursday, so that any difficulties in the classroom can immediately be addressed." (Principal, December 5, 2025)

Teachers corroborated this statement:

"We often discuss after lessons. If there are difficulties in handling students with special needs, we immediately discuss them with the principal." (Classroom Teacher 1, December 10, 2025)

The principal emphasized inclusion as a core school value:

"I always stress that inclusion is not merely a regulatory obligation, but a value of humanity and social justice that defines our school's identity." (Principal, December 5, 2025)

From the students' perspective, the inclusive atmosphere was tangibly experienced:

"I feel that I am not treated differently. The teacher helps me when I have difficulties." (Student 1, December 17, 2025)

Observations showed that the principal directly monitored classroom instruction and provided moral support to teachers. Although task distribution for inclusive responsibilities had been implemented, administrative documentation still requires strengthening.

In addition, some teachers implicitly indicated that the high intensity of coordination, while beneficial, also increased their workload, particularly in managing individualized instruction alongside regular teaching responsibilities. This reflects a tension between collaborative expectations and practical workload demands. Nevertheless, collaboration among school stakeholders was well organized, creating a safe and supportive learning climate.

The Principal's Role in Actuating the Inclusive Education Program

In the actuating function, the principal served as the primary driver through a supportive supervision approach. The principal explained:

"I apply a supportive academic supervision approach. The focus is not on finding mistakes, but on monitoring differentiated instruction and providing constructive feedback." (Principal, December 5, 2025)

Teachers confirmed this approach:

"The supervision conducted by the principal makes us feel supported, not inspected to find faults." (Classroom Teacher 3, December 11, 2025)

In decision-making processes, the principal emphasized the importance of prompt responses:

"If there is a problem concerning students with special needs, it must not be delayed. It has to be discussed immediately, and decisions must be made." (Principal, December 5, 2025)

Students also expressed positive outcomes from the implementation of inclusive programs:

"My grades are good. I am proud because I can complete my assignments well." (Student 2, December 17, 2025)

Despite these positive perceptions, observational data suggest that the effectiveness of program mobilization may vary with teacher capacity and classroom conditions. In some instances, differentiated instruction was not fully implemented due to limited time and varying levels of teacher readiness.

Documentation revealed records of parenting meetings, supervision reports, and intensive communication with parents of students with special needs. These findings confirm that program mobilization was carried out collaboratively and sustainably, although its effectiveness is not uniformly experienced across all classroom contexts.

The Principal's Role in Evaluating the Inclusive Education Program

In the evaluation function, the principal demonstrated a reflective and open attitude toward program shortcomings. The principal stated:

"Honestly, we evaluate that this program has not been fully successful. The main constraint is the limited instructional time compared to the intensive guidance required by students with special needs." (Principal, December 5, 2025)

However, evaluation did not stop at identifying constraints. The principal outlined follow-up improvement strategies:

"Based on the evaluation, we have taken two strategic steps: revitalizing the curriculum to make it more adaptive and strengthening collegiality through training and teacher collaboration." (Principal, December 5, 2025)

Teachers also experienced ongoing evaluation processes:

"After evaluation meetings, there is usually clear follow-up, such as adjustments in teaching strategies or more effective role distribution." (Classroom Teacher 2, December 18, 2025)

Observations showed that the principal led evaluation meetings in a structured manner. The assessment of students with disabilities was conducted individually using modified indicators.

Despite these structured evaluation processes, some challenges persist, particularly in translating evaluation outcomes into systemic improvements, especially when constrained by limited resources and time allocation.

Synthesis of Findings

The findings demonstrate that the implementation of inclusive education at SD Negeri Panjang Wetan 03 is carried out through the integration of four interconnected managerial functions of the principal, confirmed through data triangulation.

In the planning aspect, alignment between the principal's statements, participatory meeting practices, and formal planning documents indicates institutionalized inclusive policy. However, the absence of a dedicated budget not only reflects administrative limitations but also has tangible implications for resource availability and program sustainability.

In the organizational aspect, collaboration and coordination are strong, yet they also introduce workload pressures that may affect consistency in implementation. In the actuating aspect, supportive leadership is evident, but its effectiveness varies with teachers' readiness and classroom realities. In the evaluation aspect, reflective practices are well established, although structural constraints limit the extent to which evaluation results can be fully operationalized.

Overall, while the principal's managerial leadership demonstrates strong commitment and positive impact, the findings also reveal underlying tensions between policy aspirations and practical constraints, particularly related to resources, workload, and implementation capacity. These contradictions highlight the complexity of implementing inclusive education at the school level.

Discussion

The Principal's Role in Planning the Inclusive Education Program

The findings indicate that the principal of SD Negeri Panjang Wetan 03 performed the planning function for inclusive education in an adaptive, participatory, and needs-based manner, particularly in addressing the needs of students with disabilities. Planning was not merely understood as the preparation of administrative documents, but as a strategic process involving student needs assessment, resource advocacy, and collaboration with various school stakeholders (DeMatthews et al., 2020; Ainscow, 2020; Yang et al., 2025).

The finding that the principal relied on resource advocacy, regulatory literacy, and external partnerships reflects contextual strategic leadership in addressing the school's internal limitations (Harris & Jones, 2020; Bush, 2020; Silviana & Mulyanto, 2025; Kurniadiningsih et al., 2025). This approach aligns with the concept of adaptive leadership (Óskarsdóttir et al., 2020). However, rather than merely confirming adaptive leadership theory, these findings suggest that such leadership in this context is driven by structural constraints, particularly limited internal resources and institutional support.

The involvement of teachers and the school committee in the planning process demonstrates the implementation of distributed leadership (Harris & Jones, 2020; Sari et al., 2025; Padmadewi et al., 2024). Yet, the findings also indicate that this distribution of responsibility may partly function as a compensatory mechanism to address resource limitations, rather than purely as a deliberate leadership strategy.

However, the absence of a specific budget allocation suggests that inclusive planning still faces structural challenges to financial sustainability (Yang et al., 2025; Arzani et al., 2025; Azman et al., 2025; DeMatthews et al., 2020). Empirical findings show that this limitation has direct implications, including restricted access to specialized learning resources and reliance on informal adaptations by teachers, which may reduce program consistency.

This condition suggests that inclusive planning in this context operates within a "constrained effectiveness," where strategic intent is present but bounded by structural limitations. Thus, the planning of the inclusive education program reflects strategic and participatory leadership, but its effectiveness should be interpreted cautiously, as it is contingent upon external support and resource availability rather than fully institutionalized capacity (Ainscow, 2020; Chaaban et al., 2022; White et al., 2025).

The Principal's Role in Planning the Inclusive Education Program

The organization of the inclusive education program demonstrates intensive coordination practices, flexible role distribution, and adaptive resource management (Apriliani et al., 2024; Shaliati & Hamid, 2024; DeMatthews et al., 2021; Aryani et al., 2025; Riowati et al., 2022).

Routine coordination reflects collaborative leadership responsive to inclusive classroom dynamics (Lelinge & Alwall, 2022; Hollweck & Lofthouse, 2021; Parashchenko, 2025; Ayu et al., 2025). However, empirical findings indicate that such intensive coordination also increases teachers' workload, particularly in managing individualized instruction alongside regular teaching responsibilities.

Although task distribution has functioned effectively, it has not been comprehensively documented. This indicates a gap between functional practice and administrative governance (Bush, 2020; Muslimin & Muqowim, 2021; Setiawan & Tohari, 2025). This gap suggests that organizational effectiveness remains reliant on informal coordination rather than on formal institutional systems, which may limit scalability and sustainability.

Creative resource management demonstrates the principal's adaptive capacity (Padmadewi et al., 2024). Nevertheless, reliance on adaptive strategies alone may mask deeper systemic issues, such as insufficient institutional support and policy alignment.

Overall, organizational practices have fostered collaboration, but they also reveal underlying tensions between collaborative expectations and practical workload realities, suggesting that organizational effectiveness is situational rather than uniform.

The Principal's Role in Actuating the Inclusive Education Program

In the actuating function, the principal acted as an instructional leader promoting inclusive learning through supportive supervision and participatory decision-making (Bellibaş et al., 2021; Kilag & Sasan, 2023; Mngo & Mngo, 2018).

Supportive supervision reflects a leadership approach aimed at strengthening teacher capacity (Saripudin, 2025; Rismita et al., 2024).

However, empirical findings indicate that the impact of this supervision varies across teachers, depending on their prior experience, competence, and readiness in implementing inclusive pedagogy.

Decision-making involving teachers reflects collaborative leadership (Harris & Jones, 2020; Ayu et al., 2025). The effectiveness of such collaboration is not uniform, as some instructional practices remain only partially differentiated due to time constraints and limited technical expertise.

Parental engagement strengthens social support (Yang et al., 2025; Van Mieghem et al., 2020; Sari et al., 2026; DeMatthews et al., 2020; Sider et al., 2021). Nevertheless, this support does not fully compensate for structural limitations within the school, particularly regarding specialized services and the allocation of instructional time.

Thus, program mobilization reflects collaborative and reflective leadership, but its outcomes should be interpreted as context-dependent rather than consistently effective across all learning situations.

The Principal's Role in Evaluating the Inclusive Education Program

The evaluation of the inclusive program demonstrates a reflective, continuous-improvement-oriented approach (Wijaya et al., 2021; Nur'aini & Purnawanto, 2025). A data-informed evaluation approach reflects continuous improvement practices (Fullan, 2020; Schildkamp et al., 2021). However, empirical findings suggest that translating evaluation results into systemic improvement is constrained by limited resources and institutional capacity.

An individualized assessment demonstrates principles of adaptive evaluation (Padmadewi et al., 2024). The sustainability of such individualized approaches remains uncertain under workload and time constraints. Evaluation informs policy adjustments (Bush, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2020; Pont, 2020; Saripudin et al., 2025; Sahudin et al., 2023). Nevertheless, these adjustments tend to be incremental rather than transformative, reflecting limitations in structural support and systemic alignment.

Integratively, the four managerial functions identified are consistent with contemporary literature (Ainscow, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2020; Pont, 2020). However, rather than fully confirming these theoretical frameworks, the findings extend them by demonstrating how managerial leadership operates under conditions of structural constraint, where effectiveness is negotiated rather than assumed.

The study indicates that leadership in inclusive education should not be viewed as inherently effective, but as contextually bounded, shaped by resource availability,

institutional support, and teacher capacity. Thus, the implementation of inclusive education in this case reflects a form of “adaptive managerial leadership under constraint,” in which leadership practices are simultaneously enabled and constrained by systemic factors.

The principal demonstrates the ability to integrate planning, organizing, actuating, and evaluating functions (Harris & Jones, 2020; Saripudin et al., 2025; Sahudin et al., 2023). However, the extent to which this integration translates into sustained inclusive outcomes remains dependent on broader structural conditions beyond the school level.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the principal of SD Negeri Panjang Wetan 03, North Pekalongan District, Pekalongan City, has carried out managerial roles integratively in implementing inclusive education through the functions of planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating programs. In the planning stage, the principal applied a participatory, needs-based approach focused on students with disabilities. In organizing, the principal established collaborative coordination among teachers and adaptively optimized available resources. In the actuating function, the principal served as an instructional leader, promoting supportive supervision and participatory decision-making. Meanwhile, program evaluation was conducted reflectively and with a focus on continuous improvement. Overall, the implementation of inclusive education in this school reflects the principal’s capacity to integrate managerial functions in a synergistic manner; however, its effectiveness should be understood as context-dependent and closely linked to existing resource conditions and institutional support.

The contribution of this study is primarily contextual rather than purely theoretical, as it provides an in-depth illustration of how managerial leadership is enacted within a resource-constrained inclusive school setting. This study highlights how classical management functions (planning, organizing, actuating, and controlling) are operationalized in practice and adapted to address real challenges faced by inclusive schools.

Rather than proposing a wholly new theoretical model, this study extends existing perspectives by demonstrating how managerial leadership operates within structural constraints, offering a grounded, context-sensitive understanding of the implementation of inclusive education. Consequently, this research provides empirical contributions to the development of inclusive educational management studies at the elementary school level, particularly in regions with limited structural support.

However, this study has several limitations. First, the scope of the research was confined to a single school, limiting the generalizability of the findings. Second, the qualitative approach relied heavily on the depth of interview and observational data. Additionally, this study did not quantitatively measure the direct impact of the principal’s managerial leadership on the academic and non-academic outcomes of students with disabilities.

In terms of transferability, the findings of this study may be relevant to other inclusive elementary schools that share similar contextual characteristics, such as limited resources, reliance on collaborative practices, and adaptive leadership approaches. However, caution should be exercised when applying these findings to contexts with significantly different policy environments, resource availability, or institutional capacity.

Therefore, future research is recommended to employ a mixed-methods design or a comparative quantitative approach across multiple inclusive schools to obtain broader and more measurable insights. Further studies may also examine the influence of principals’ leadership competencies on the effectiveness of inclusive learning or explore inclusive management models that can be replicated in other elementary school contexts.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
- Apriliani, I., Pahrudin, A., Koderi, K., & Syafril, S. (2024). Management of inclusive education: An implementation. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 5(1), 112–125. <https://doi.org/10.31538/munaddhomah.v5i1.935>
- Arikunto, S. (2022). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik* [Research procedures: A practical approach] (Rev. ed.). Jakarta, Indonesia: Rineka Cipta.
- Aryani, W. D., Dermawan, O., Kayadibi, S., & Sain, Z. H. (2025). Inclusive education management: A systematic review of practices, challenges, and solutions in educational institutions. *Nidhomul Haq: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 10(3), 853–866. <https://doi.org/10.31538/ndhq.v10i3.285>
- Arzani, S., Sameri, M., & Mortazanezhad, N. (2025). Financial stewardship as a foundational dimension of educational leadership: A hierarchical framework for equity in under-resourced schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-11-2025-0910>
- Ayu, A. A. S. C., Bunyamin, B., & Sudana, I. M. (2025). A quantitative study on the determinants of collaborative culture in inclusive primary schools: The role of social competence, work motivation, and organizational climate. *Journal of ICSAR*, 303–320. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um005v9i22025p303-320>
- Azman, N. S., Abu Hassim, A., & Shamsudin, M. F. (2025). Financial management strategies and challenges in Malaysian educational institutions: A systematic review of educational technology integration. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol15.1.6.2025>
- Bellibaş, M. Ş., Kılınc, A. Ç., & Polatcan, M. (2021). The moderation role of transformational leadership in the effect of instructional leadership on teacher professional learning and instructional practice: An integrated leadership perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 57(5), 776–814. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X211035079>
- Bowen, G. A. (2020). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Brinkmann, S. (2021). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). London, England: Sage Publications.
- Chaaban, Y., Badwan, K., & Arar, K. (2025). Educational leadership for social justice: A systematic review of empirical evidence. *Review of Education*, 13(2), e70077. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.70077>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2021). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeMatthews, D. E., Billingsley, B., McLeskey, J., & Sharma, U. (2020). Principal leadership for students with disabilities in effective inclusive schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(5), 539–554. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2019-0177>
- DeMatthews, D. E., Kotok, S., & Serafini, A. (2020). Leadership preparation for special education and inclusive schools: Beliefs and recommendations from successful principals. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 15(4), 303–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1942775119838308>
- Feng, Y., Zhou, Y., & Wei, X. (2025). School leadership and inclusive education literacy: The mediating role of teacher agency and job stress. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(11), 1572. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15111572>
- Florian, L. (2021). Inclusive pedagogy: A transformative approach to individual differences but can it help reduce educational inequalities? *Scottish Educational Review*, 47(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1163/27730840-04701003>

- Fullan, M. (2020). *Leading in a culture of change* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID-19–School leadership in disruptive times. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(4), 243–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1811479>
- Hollweck, T., & Lofthouse, R. M. (2021). Contextual coaching: Levering and leading school improvement through collaborative professionalism. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 10(4), 399–417. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-01-2021-0019>
- Kilag, O. K. T., & Sasan, J. M. (2023). Unpacking the role of instructional leadership in teacher professional development. *Advanced Qualitative Research*, 1(1), 63–73. <https://doi.org/10.31098/aqr.v1i1.1380>
- Kurniadiningsih, R. S., Miftahuddin, M., & Bustari, M. (2025). School Principal Leadership in Developing Non-Academic Student Achievements: Adaptive Strategies in Resource-Constrained Contexts. *Journal of Innovation and Research in Primary Education*, 4(4), 4096–4114. <https://doi.org/10.56916/jirpe.v4i4.2641>
- Lelinge, B., & Alwall, J. (2022). School Improvement and Teachers' Collaborative Professional Development for Inclusive Education: A Swedish Case. *International Journal of Whole Schooling*, 18(2), 28–54.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2020). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mngo, Z. Y., & Mngo, A. Y. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of inclusion in a pilot inclusive education program: Implications for instructional leadership. *Education Research International*, 2018(1), 3524879. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/3524879>
- Moleong, L. J. (2021). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* [Qualitative research methodology] (Rev. ed.). Bandung, Indonesia: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Muslimin, L. L. Y. L., & Muqowim, M. (2021). Peran kepala sekolah terhadap kebijakan pendidikan inklusi di tingkat sekolah dasar [The role of school principals in inclusive education policy at the elementary school level]. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran, dan Pembelajaran*, 7(3), 708–718. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v7i3.3468>
- Nguyen, D., Harris, A., & Ng, D. (2020). A review of the empirical research on teacher leadership (2003–2017): Evidence, patterns and implications. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(1), 60–80. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-02-2018-0023>
- Nur'aini, S., & Purnawanto, A. T. (2025). Development of performance evaluation model for elementary schools implementing inclusive education. *Jurnal Pedagogi*, 18(2), 74–80. <https://doi.org/10.63889/pedagogy.v18i2.315>
- Óskarsdóttir, E., Donnelly, V., Turner-Cmuchal, M., & Florian, L. (2020). Inclusive school leaders—Their role in raising the achievement of all learners. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(5), 521–537. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-10-2019-0190>
- Padmadewi, N. N., Artini, L. P., & Sukadana, I. M. S. A. (2024). Teaching an inclusive education in EFL setting: A phenomenological study. *The Art of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TATEFL)*, 5(2), 186–195. <https://doi.org/10.36663/tatefl.v5i2.905>
- Parashchenko, L. (2025). The Educational Leader as a Catalyst for Inclusive School Culture. *Pedagogy and Education Management Review*, (1 (19)), 42–48. <https://doi.org/10.36690/2733-2039-2025-1-42-48>
- Patton, M. Q. (2020). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pirmanuddin, P., Yamin, M., & Anwar, K. (2025). Strategy for improving the quality of education through transformational leadership in Islamic educational institutions. *Academic Journal Research*, 3(1), 50–69. <https://doi.org/10.61796/acjoure.v3i1.306>
- Pont, B. (2020). A literature review of school leadership policy reforms. *European Journal of Education*, 55(2), 154–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12398>

- Riowati, R., Hendriani, W., & Paramita, P. (2022). School-based inclusive education management as a quality assurance system in Indonesia. *Jurnal Kependidikan*, 8(2), 437–449. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v8i2.4363>
- Rismita, R., Chairunnisa, C., Istaryatiningtias, I., & Dwiputra, Y. (2024). *Kekuatan kepemimpinan instruksional kepala sekolah dalam mengkoordinasikan pendidikan inklusif* [The strength of principals' instructional leadership in coordinating inclusive education]. *EDUKATIF: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 6(5), 5980–5990. <https://doi.org/10.71242/ks6q2m85>
- Sari, N. M., Purwanta, E., Cahyani, L. A., & Prihandini, F. (2025). Multidimensional parental involvement in inclusive education: A multiple case study of students with special needs. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 15(4), 2727–2740. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v15i4.pp2727-2740>
- Saripudin, S. (2025). Strategi Kepala Madrasah Dalam Meningkatkan Kinerja Guru Di MTs Plus Al-Hikam Sumedang. *Al-Hasib: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 2(1), 245-256. <https://doi.org/10.71242/ks6q2m85>
- Schildkamp, J. M., Bijleveld, B. B., van Veen, H. H., & Yeo, S. (2021). *The teacher as educator, communicator, leader and professional: An interdisciplinary framework for the improvement of teacher effectiveness* (Bachelor's thesis).
- Setiawan, F., & Tohari, T. (2025). Inclusive education management in Indonesia: A literature analysis of policies and implementation practices. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 5(1), 273–282. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v5i001.569>
- Sider, S., Maich, K., Morvan, J., Villella, M., Ling, P., & Repp, C. (2021). Inclusive school leadership: Examining the experiences of Canadian school principals in supporting students with special education needs. *Journal of research in special educational needs*, 21(3), 233-241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12515>
- Stavrou, E., & Kafa, A. (2024). School Principals' Leadership Styles on Implementing Inclusive Education: The Entrepreneurial Leadership Effect. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(1), 40-56.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan R&D* [Qualitative, quantitative, and R&D research methods]. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta.
- Tracy, S. J. (2020). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education – All means all*. Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.54676/WWUU8391>
- Uwamusi, C. B., & Ajisebiyawo, A. (2023). Participant observation as research methodology: Assessing the defects of qualitative observational data as research tools. *Asian Journal of Social Science and Management Technology*, 5(3), 19-32.
- Van Mieghem, A., Verschueren, K., Petry, K., & Struyf, E. (2020). An analysis of research on inclusive education: A systematic search and meta-review. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(6), 675–689. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1482012>
- White, R., Lowery, C., & Johnson, J. (2025). Enhancing high-quality education through systemic school leadership: A systematic review. *Quality Education for All*, 2(1), 227–244. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QEA-09-2024-0096>
- Wijaya, N. T. I., Ruqaiyah, R., & Zulaikha, S. (2021). Evaluation of Inclusive Education Program at Elementary Schools. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 13(3), 1979-1985.
- Yang, C., Wang, T., & Xiu, Q. (2025). Towards a sustainable future in education: A systematic review and framework for inclusive education. *Sustainability*, 17(9), 3837. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17093837>
- Yin, R. K. (2023). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yıldızoğlu, H., & Topcu, Z. (2025). Teachers' Perspectives on Inclusive Leadership Behaviors of School Administrators. *International Journal on Lifelong Education and Leadership*, 11(2), 62-77. <https://doi.org/10.25233/ijlel.1773556>