

The Implementation of Inclusive Education for Students with Special Needs in Indonesia¹

Sunardi,^{a,*} Mucawir Yusuf,^a Gunarhadi,^a Priyono,^a and John L. Yeager^b

^aSebelas Maret University, Indonesia

^bUniversity of Pittsburgh, USA

Abstract

Over the last decade, inclusion has become a world trend in special education. In response to that trend, the Indonesian government has adopted a progressive policy to implement inclusive education. The aim of this research is to describe the implementation process by focusing on the institutional management, student admission/identification/assessment, curriculum, instruction, evaluation, and external supports. The sample consisted of 186 schools with a total student body of 24,412, 12 percent of which (3,419) were students with special needs. In those schools, there were also 34 gifted students (0.1 percent). Of all the students with special education needs (SEN) students, 56 percent were males and 44 percent were females. The results showed, in terms of institutional management, that the majority of inclusive schools had developed strategic plans (for inclusion), legally appointed coordinators, involved related and relevant parties, and conducted regular coordination meetings. However, there were still many schools that had not restructured their school organizations. In terms of student admission/identification/assessment, 54 percent of schools set a quota for SEN students. Only 19 percent applied a selection process in student admission, half of which used different procedures for SEN candidates. Approximately 50 percent of inclusive schools had modified their curriculum, including a variety of standards. In terms of instruction, 68 percent of inclusive schools reported that they modified their instructional process. Only a few schools, however, provided special equipment for students with visual impairment, physical impairment, speech and hearing problems, and autism and gifted and talented students. In a student evaluation, more than 50 percent reported that test items, administration, time allocations, and students' reports were modified. For the national exam, this number decreased dramatically. Finally, external supports in the forms of funding, coaching, and facilities were mostly provided by provincial governments and by the Directorate of Special Education.

Abstrak

Dalam decade terakhir, pembelajaran inklusif menjadi trend dunia di bidang pendidikan khusus. Merespon perkembangan ini, pemerintah Indonesia mengadopsi kebijakan progresif dalam rangka aimplemetasi pendidikan inklusif. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk memaparkan proses implementasi tersebut dengan focus pada manajemen institusi, penerimaan/identifikasi/penilaian siswa, pembelajaran, evaluasi, dan sarana penunjang eksternal. Sampel yang diteliti meliputi 186 sekolah dengan total 24.412 siswa, yang 12persen-nya (3.419) tergolong siswadengan kebutuhan khusus. Di sekolah-sekolah tersebut, juga terdapat 34 siswa luarbiasa atau gifted (0.1persen). Dari sekian siswa berkebutuhan khusus, 56persen-nya adalah lelaki dan 44persen-nya adalah perempuan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan, dalam hal manajemen institusi, mayoritas sekolah-sekolah ini telah mengembangkan rencana strategis (untuk program inklusif), secara sah mengangkat para koordinator, melibatkan beberapa kelompok terkait, dan menyelenggarakan nserangkaian rapat koordinasi rutin .Namun, masih banyak sekolah yang belum merestrukturisasi organisasi mereka. Mengenai penerimaan/identifikasi/penilaian siswa, 54persen sekolah telah menyiapkan kuota untuk siswa berkebutuhan khusus. Hanya 19,4persen sekolah yang menerapkan proses seleksi penerimaan siswa, yang mana separuhnya menggunakan prosedur berbeda untuk calon siswa berkebutuhan khusus. Kurang lebih 50persen sekolah-sekolah ini telah memodifikasi kurikulum mereka, termasuk beberapa standar. Terkait dengan pembelajaran, 68persen sekolah inklusif melaporkan, mereka telah memodifikasi proses pembelajarannya. Sayangnya, hanya sedikit sekolah yang menyediakan peralatan khusus bagi siswa dengan gangguan penglihatan, keterbatasan fisik, gangguan wicara dan pendengaran, dan siswa autisme, berbakat luarbiasa. Dalam hal evaluasi siswa, lebih dari 50persen sekolah melaporkan, mereka telah memodifikasi soal ujian, administrasi dan alokasi waktu, serta laporan kemajuan siswa. Ditengarai, terdapat penurunan dramatis untuk ujian nasional. Sementara itu, sarana penunjang eksternal dalam bentuk dana, pelatihan dan fasilita ssebagian besar disediakan oleh pemerintah provinsi dan Direktorat Pendidikan Khusus.

Key Words: Inclusion, Management, Curriculum, Instruction, Evaluation



¹ Funded by the World Class University Project, Sebelas Maret University, Solo, Indonesia.

*Corresponding author. Address: Special Education Program, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, Sebelas Maret University, Solo, Indonesia.

Email: nardi_ip@uns.ac.id.

Introduction

The education for individuals with special needs has been in existence in Indonesia since before the country received its independence (Sunardi 1997). Pioneer Ch. A. Westhoff opened a sheltered workshop for the blind in Bandung in 1901. Also in Bandung in 1927, a school for the mentally retarded was opened by Vereniging Bijzonder Onderwijs, promoted by Folker, so that the school became known as the Folker School. The first school for the deaf-mute was initiated in Bandung in 1930 by C. M. Roelfsema. After Indonesia's independence, a few special schools were established in other regions, mostly managed by private foundations, consisting of special school types for the blind, the deaf-mute, the mentally retarded, the physically handicapped, and the emotionally disturbed.

In 1984, as part of the implementation of primary school compulsory education, the government opened 208 primary special schools in 200 districts where no special schools existed. Different from special schools that only admit students with similar disabilities, special primary schools were designed to admit students with all types of disabilities. By 1990, there were 525 special schools (23 of them were state managed) and 208 special primary schools (all state managed), educating some 33,000 special needs students. By 2002/2003, the number schools had increased to 752, educating 35,000 students (Ministry of Education 2003).

Special education programs were initiated in regular schools in 1984 along with the implementation of primary school compulsory education. This was similar to what happened in the United States in the 1920s. A few regular schools were also developed to admit special needs students and these schools were known as integrated schools. Only special needs children with at least normal intelligence were admitted, mostly with visual impairments. They were expected to be able to complete academic programs in a manner similar to their non-disabled peers.

Since 1960, there have been a number of international policy documents pertaining to disability and education (Peters 2007), and one of the most influential policies is the Salamanca Statement, declared in the World Congress on Special Education in Salamanca in 1994. The central focus of this Statement is

delineated within the context of Education for All (EFA) and is undergirded by assumptions of inclusive education. The Statement assumes that human differences are normal and that learning must accordingly be adapted to the needs of the child rather than the child fitted to preordained assumptions regarding the pace and nature of the learning process. A child with disabilities is seen as one who has learning difficulties due to environmental disadvantages. The definition of disabled includes gifted and talented students, those with linguistic differences, and those in poverty, and extends from physical and intellectual disabilities to social and emotional disabilities. Governments must provide not only policies and resources, but accountability measures to address quality. The concept of inclusive education is clearly defined and international donors are called upon to endorse inclusive education.

Responding to the Salamanca Statement, many countries initiated inclusive education as a new trend in the provision of education for special educational need students. In Botswana, for example, although the first educational policy was enacted in 1977, it was not until 1994 that special education provisions were specifically introduced (Chhabra, Srivastava, and Srivastava 2010). Special education programs, as far as possible, should be based on the integration of children in the mainstream schools to prepare them for social integration. In the 2003 National Development Plan, a number of objectives for special education appeared, including the change from integrated education to inclusive education. By then, the enrollment in primary schools was 334,932; of this population, 0.27 percent was actively supported in units of special education. A national survey indicated that the majority of teachers in Botswana schools did not have favorable or supportive attitudes toward inclusion. One reason, they may have limited training to teach special need students. In addition, the majority of teachers were also concerned about inadequate equipment and the availability of paraprofessionals in schools serving students with disabilities.

In Finland, special needs education is seen as an important, but not dominant, aspect of inclusive policies (Halinen and Järvinen 2008). The 2007 special education strategy emphasizes that all students, including those with special education needs (SEN), have the rights to preschool and to attend regular comprehensive schools close to their homes. It focuses on mainstream education and developing intensified preventive support. The government realized that the biggest challenges revolved around learning to live with the growing diversity and multiculturalism in both society and schools. Teachers' competence, instructional practices, and heterogeneous study groups are, therefore, improved.

In Malaysia, their 1996 *Education Act* defines disability as visual impairment, hearing impairment, and learning disability

(Saad 2010). According to the 1996 *Education Act*, the government shall provide special education either in special schools or in regular schools, indicating a trend towards more integrated special education services. The 2002 *Disabled Education Act* stresses the significance of special education in the framework of EFA and parents who fail to send their children to primary schools will be brought to court. A limited survey showed that only 12 percent of regular school teachers understood inclusive education, the majority of respondents felt that they did not know their roles in teaching disabled students in regular schools, and among teachers who had experience working with disabled students, their high commitment was related to their tasks, not their emotional bond with disabled students.

Hong Kong has had a special education policy since 1977 (Heung 2003). The number of special schools established and the number of disabled students served has more than doubled since then, to include students with sensory and physical impairments, blind and/or deaf, physical handicaps, mentally impaired, maladjusted, mildly handicapped, and low learning ability. In 1980s, a form of integration was initiated by opening special and resource classes in regular schools. This integration was formally launched in 1997. In 2004, a new funding mode was launched, schools were encouraged to operate student support teams through setting up a school policy on catering for diversity, systematic record keeping, monitoring and evaluating of school based programs, peer support, and cooperative learning. Research showed that many teachers found differentiation difficult, intimidating, and over demanding. Teacher education was, therefore, improved by adding skills in content areas, diversification, accommodation and adaptation strategies for learners of verifying background, learning styles, abilities, and disabilities.

In Vietnam, the *Universal Primary Education Law* was issued in 1991 (Education for Development 2002). Alternative Basic Education (ABE) project was set up, designed to serve the large number of school aged children who had never been enrolled in schools or had dropped out of the educational system by providing classes at no cost with a flexible time, a shorter curriculum, and free textbooks. Over time, ABE evolved to serve other pressing needs in schools and communities and was used as a last resort for children with learning or behavioral impairments. This was inclusive education for the disadvantaged. In District 4 in Ho Chi Minh City, some constraints were revealed, including the low motivation of students, parental unawareness, limited educational resources, and limited teachers' competence.

In Indonesia, inclusive education was initiated in 2003, based on the *Direction Letter of the Directorate General of Primary and Secondary Education* No 380/C.66/MN/2003, dated 20 January

2003, about *Special Education in Regular Schools*. This Direction Letter stated that every district must operate at least four inclusive schools, one primary, secondary, general high and vocational higher type. As indicated by the rapid development of inclusive schools, this initiative had a number of unexpected positive impacts. By 2008, there were 925 inclusive schools in Indonesia consisting of 790 schools admitting disabled students and 135 schools with accelerated programs for the gifted from the kindergarten to higher school levels (Directorate of Special Education 2008). The inclusive policy then received strong legal support by the *Decree of the Minister of Education* No 70-2009 concerning Inclusive Education for Students with Disabilities and with Special Talents. It stated that every district must operate at least one inclusive high school and every sub district must operate at least one primary and one secondary inclusive school.

To support the implementation of this policy, each inclusive school was provided with a block grant of up to 50 million rupiahs. The fund could be spent for a variety of activities, including teacher training, workshops, or purchase of instructional and administrative materials. The government also published *A Guideline for the Implementation of Inclusive Schools*. There are six aspects described in the guidelines: school management (changes in the structure of school organization), students (admission/identification/assessment processes), curriculum (adaptation and modification), instruction (adaptation and modification), and evaluation (adaptation and modification).

Marilyn Friend and William D. Bursuck (2006) identified types of activities schools undertook to become inclusive:

- Developed mission statement that expressed the belief that all strive to meet the needs of all students.
- Recognized that working towards inclusive environment continues each year without end.
- Provided opportunities to discuss concerns about special needs students.
- Included all classroom teachers, special education teachers, support staffs, administrators, parents, students in the planning for special needs students.
- Clarified the expectations of special needs students who are integrated into a regular classroom.
- Arranged for sharing planning and instructional time with all team members.
- Provided adequate professional development for all staff members in pertinent topics.
- Created a comfortable and collaborative work environment.
- Planning addressed the needs of all students.

- Included Pilot program in inclusion prior to full implementation.
- Allocated start up resources for supporting inclusive practices.
- Rewarded for experimentation and innovation;
- Provided opportunities for all staff members to learn about all types of diversity.
- Involved parents and families in the development, implementation, and evaluation of inclusive practices.
- Developed a plan to carefully monitor the impacts of inclusive approaches.
- Identified benchmarks for use after the first year of implementation.

The more positive the responses educators make, the more likely it is that successful inclusive practices will be implemented.

Although inclusion is a relatively new concept in special education, considerable research has been conducted to investigate the effectiveness of this practice. A meta-analysis was conducted by Conrad Carlberg and Kenneth Kavale (1980) to the findings of 50 studies. The result showed an effect size of 0.15 for academic effect and 0.11 for social effects. Another meta-analysis was conducted by Wang and Baker (1985/1986) to the findings of 11 studies. The analysis showed an effect size of 0.44 for academic effect and 0.11 for social effect. Edward T. Baker (1994) conducted a meta-analysis to the findings of 13 studies for his doctoral degree at Temple University. The results indicated an academic effect size of 0.08 and a social effect size of 0.28. Thus as shown by these studies inclusion has positive effects both on the academic and the social development of special needs students.

In a review of research, Debbie Staub and Charles Peck (1994/1995) examined the effects of inclusion on achievement, on academic learning time, and on the behavior of normal students. Most research indicated that inclusion did not harm normal students in their achievement, amount of effective learning time, and social behavior. They also identified five positive effects of inclusion:

- The decrease of feeling fear of individual differences, better self-esteem and greater concerns for special need peers.
- Growth of social cognition.
- Improvement of self-concept.
- Development of personality.
- Meaningful, close, and full caring friendships.

Based on her intensive observation and research in inclusive classrooms, Mara Sapon-Shevin (2007) identified ten important lessons about inclusion:

- Understanding difference
- Perspective taking
- Real safety
- Exclusion hurts everyone
- Compassion
- Giving and getting help graciously
- Responsibility to one another
- Honesty about hard topics
- Courage
- Faith and hope

To date, there has been no research evaluating the implementation of the inclusive policy in these 'pioneer schools' in Indonesia. The aim of this research is to describe the implementation of inclusive education for special needs students in Indonesia and the resulting impact of this implementation. The results of this research are expected to be used by the government in improving inclusive policies and practices which determine that adequate education services are received by special needs individuals without sacrificing the quality of education provided for 'non-disabled special need students. Important implications of the findings include the kinds of supports required by schools from the government, such as new teacher employment, teacher training, modification in school administration and organization, facilities.

Methods

Population and Sample

The purpose of this research was to evaluate the implementation of inclusive education in Indonesia. The population was all inclusive schools in Indonesia. Data in 2008 showed that there were 925 inclusive schools distributed in all provinces and districts across the country. A random sampling technique was impossible because of the limited time available to conduct the research. For efficiency a purposive technique was used (i.e., selecting inclusive schools which were participating in workshops in inclusive education during the month of October 2010). The sample was 186 inclusive schools, consisting of seven schools in the town of Palembang, South Sumatra; eight schools in the town of Solo, 80 schools in the district of Wonogiri, three schools in the district of Sukoharjo, 12 schools in the district of

Karanganyar, 75 schools in the district of Boyolali, all in Central Java; and eight schools in the town of Makassar, South Sulawesi. The workshops were attended by all headmasters and some appointed teachers of each school.

Data Collection

This research used a descriptive technique by collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. According to the National Educational Standards, a school implementing inclusive education is required to modify its educational indicators, as described in the *Guideline for the Implementation of Inclusive Schools*, published by the Ministry of National Education. A check list followed by open ended questions was developed on the bases of the Guideline and consisted of six indicators:

- Management
- Students
- Curriculum
- Instruction
- Evaluation
- External Supports

For each indicator, descriptive statements were presented and the respondents, based on the condition of their school, had to choose between a *yes* or *no* response. These check lists were completed by school headmasters and teachers while they were attending the workshops.

Findings

Description of the Inclusive Schools

As shown in Table 1, the 186 sample schools had a total student body of 26,412, 12.95 percent of them (3,419) were students with special needs and less than 1 percent were considered gifted/talented students. Special education teachers were available in 60 schools (32 percent of the sample schools).

Table 1. Number of SEN Students in Participating Schools

	Number	Percentage
Number of special needs students	3,419	12.94
Number of non-SEN students	22,993	87.06
Total number of students in 186 schools	26,412	100.00

Source: Authors’ calculations, 2011.

Of the included SEN students, 56 percent were male and 44 percent were female (see Table 2). The prevalence of visible impairments (visual, hearing, physical, motor, emotional, autistic) was relatively low (below 3 percent). The majority of included SEN students—approximately 85 percent—were learning disabled, slow learners, or had intellectual problems.

Table 2. SEN Categories

Categories	Males	Females	Total	%
Learning Disabled, Slow Learners	1,437	1,184	2,621	76.66
Intellectual Problems	189	151	340	9.94
Emotional/Social Problems	88	37	125	3.66
Autistic	51	19	70	2.05
Visual Problems	33	26	59	1.73
Communication Problems	18	8	26	0.76
Gifted/Talented	11	23	34	0.99
Hearing Problems	27	12	39	1.14
Motivic/Movement Problems	18	7	25	0.73
Physical Impairments	21	17	38	1.11
Others	23	19	42	1.23
Total	1,916	1,503	3,419	100.00

Source: Authors’ calculations, 2011.

Institutional Management

Several statements related to institutional management were developed based on the government’s guidelines, such as ones about strategic plans, restructure of school organization, appointment of coordinator, involvement of relevant parties. As shown in Table 3, the majority of inclusive schools had developed strategic plans for inclusion, had legally appointed coordinators, had involved related and relevant parties, and had conducted regular coordinative meetings. However, there were still many schools that had not restructured their school organizations.

As suggested by Friend and Bursuck (2006), some of the important features of successful institutional management of inclusive education include a mission statement that expresses the belief that all strive to meet the needs of all students, inclusion of all classroom teachers, special education teachers, support staffs, administrators, parents, students in the planning for special needs students, opportunities for all staff members to learn about all types of diversity, and a plan to carefully monitor the impacts of the various approaches. Only about 75 percent of school administrators responded “yes” to the statements, which means

that extra efforts are still needed so that all schools are prepared to manage inclusive education.

Table 3. Institutional Management

Questions	Percentage who responded "Yes"
Your school has periodic monitoring and evaluations.	83.5
Relevant external parties have been involved in special schools, universities, NGO, and other inclusive schools.	81.0
Your school has a strategic plan for inclusion.	80.1
Your school conducts regular coordination meetings.	80.1
A special coordinator has been appointed.	78.9
Socialization practices have been done in all schools and parents have been included.	75.3
Your school has restructured institutional organization.	55.4

Source: Authors' calculations, 2011.

Students

Statements related to students include a quota for SEN students, selection process, identification, and assessment. As shown in Table 4, almost 54 percent of schools set a quota for SEN students. Only 19.4 percent applied a selection process in student admission, half of which used different procedures for SEN candidates. Only 59 percent had good identification and assessment system, including its documentation. The involvement of parents, special education teachers, university lecturers and nearby community health centers was still low. The involvement of psychologists, however, was higher, almost 35 percent. Seventy-five percent of the schools documented data of all included SEN students.

According to Friend and Bursuck (2006), the indicators for successful student management include addressing the needs of all students in planning and involvement of parents and families in the development, implementation, and evaluation of inclusive practices. These features are implemented through identification and assessment. Only 50 percent of schools reported to have adequate identification and assessment system. Only a few schools involved parents and relevant professions such as psychologist, health professions, and university lecturers in assessing SEN students. The identification and assessment system did not guarantee that the individual needs of students would be properly met in these schools.

Table 4. Students

Questions	Percentage who responded "Yes"
Individual data about students with special needs are available.	75.3
Your school has an identification and assessment system.	59.7
Identification and assessment results are well documented.	59.7
A quota is set for special educational needs students.	53.3
Parents are involved in the identification and assessment process.	51.1
Psychologists are involved in the identification and assessment process.	34.4
New coming students, including those with special needs, are selected.	19.4*
Special education teachers are involved in the identification and assessment process.	10.4
Nearby community health centers are involved in the identification and assessment process.	10.0
University lecturers are involved in the identification and assessment process.	2.3

*Among the participating schools, 9.1 percent used the same instrument for disables and non-disabled students; 10.3 percent used different instruments.

Source: Authors' calculations, 2011.

Curriculum

According to the government' guideline, an inclusive school must modify its curriculum to meet the needs of SEN students. Modifications can be applied to the graduate competency standards, subject matter competency standards, basic curricular competencies, indicators of achievement, syllabi, teaching materials, and other programs designed especially for SEN students. As shown in Table 5, approximately 50 percent of inclusive schools had modified their curriculum standards. A higher proportion of schools (up to 75 percent) modified the indicators of achievement and teaching materials. Less than 35 percent of schools had adapted sports education, arts education, and vocational education programs.

One important point in curriculum development in an inclusive setting is that a student's individual needs are properly met. Curriculum, syllabi and instructional materials had been modified in only 50 percent of the schools. Most schools did not have specially adapted sports, arts, and vocational education programs for disabled students. Teachers may not have had adequate

competence in adapting curriculum for SEN. As revealed in the answers attached open questions, many teachers wrote that they did not know how to modify curriculum and instructional materials. Some thought that special curriculum and instructional materials for including SE students must be provided (by the government), or, a curriculum specialist was needed in each inclusive school. They felt that they had not adequate competence in curriculum adaptation and therefore needed training.

Table 5. Curriculum

Questions	Percentage who responded “Yes”
Modification has been done to its teaching materials.	85
Modification has been done to its indicators.	71
Your school has modified its curriculum.	56
Modification has been done to its syllabi.	55
Modification has been done to its graduate competence standards.	53
Modification has been done to its basic competencies.	47
Modification has been done to its competency standards.	42
Your school has adapted sport programs for disabled students.	38.2
Your school has special arts programs for disabled students.	34.4
Your school has special vocational programs for disabled students.	23.1

Source: Authors’ calculations, 2011.

Instruction

Expected modifications to the instructional process include time, delivery, resources, media and equipment. Table 6 shows that 68 percent of inclusive schools reported that they modified their instruction process. Only a few schools (less than 10 percent), however, provided special equipment for students with visual impairment, physical impairment, speech and hearing problems, autism, and gifted and talented. A higher percentage (23 percent) of those schools reported to have special equipment, media, and resources for students with intellectual problems.

Friend and Bursuck (2006) identified key points in adapting instruction for inclusive education, such as the clarification of the expectations of special needs students who are integrated in the regular classroom, arrangements for sharing planning time and

instructional time for all team members, adequate professional development for all staff members in pertinent topics, willingness to work collaboratively, and allocation of start-up resources for moving toward inclusive practices. Only about 58 percent of schools reported to have modified their instruction, most schools did not have equipment, media, and resources for SEN. It is hard to imagine modifying instruction to meet individual needs of SEN without adequate media and resources. From the written responses, it was also revealed that most teachers were not specifically trained to manage heterogeneous classes. Preservice teacher training in Indonesian universities prepared teachers to teach homogeneous students. The Indonesian Ministry of National Education can learn from the cases in Botswana (Chhabra, Srivastava and Srivastava 2010), Hong Kong (Heung 2003), and Finland (Halinen and Järvinen 2008) that it is very important to provide teachers with skills in managing heterogeneous classes.

Table 6. Instruction

Questions	Percentage who responded “Yes”
Your teachers have modified their instruction (time, delivery, resources, media and equipment).	68.3
Your school provides special equipment, media, and resources for students with intellectual problems.	23.0
Your school provides special equipment, media and resources for students with visual problems.	7.0
Your school provides special equipment, media and resources for students with physical impairments.	5.0
Your school provides special equipment, media, and resources for students with speech and hearing problems.	4.0
Your school provides special equipment, media for gifted/talented students.	2.4
Your school provides special equipment, media, and resources for autistic students.	2.0
Your school provides special equipment, media, and resources for students with social and emotional problems.	2.0

Source: Authors’ calculations, 2011.

Evaluation

Indonesia requires national exams for all elementary, secondary, and high schools students for graduation. In addition, each district also administers uniform summative tests at the end of semesters for all subject matters and grades. For that reason, schools have to

do some modifications on the evaluation practices in their schools to meet the needs of students with special needs. In Table 7, more than 50 percent of the respondents reported that modifications were done to test items, administration, time allocation, and students' reports. To the national exam, however, 93 percent did not make any modification. Sixty-six percent of the schools applied retention of students, 74 percent had graduated SEN students, 72 percent gave the same certificates for all graduates, including SEN graduates, only 2 percent gave additional certificates to SEN students, and there was a 16 percent dropout rate in inclusive schools.

Table 7. Evaluation

Questions	Percentage who responded "Yes"
Your school has graduated SEN students.	74.7
The same certificates are provided for all students, including SEN students.	72.0
Your school applies retention of students.	66.7
Modification has been done to the evaluation of students (e.g., test items, administration, time allocation, site, reports).	51.1
Are there any DO students?	16.1
Modification has been done to the national exam process.	6.5
Your school provides additional certificates for SEN students.	2.0

Source: Authors' calculations, 2011.

The system of student evaluation is another important aspect of inclusive education. However, it does appear that some government policies regarding evaluation do not support inclusion. National exams for graduation and retention are good examples. Only SEN students with at least normal intellectual capability will be able to meet all requirements specified in the policy. Many respondents felt that they did not have enough competence to administer different evaluations to different students. The practice of ranking schools based on the national exam results was another problem, because some schools were afraid that accepting SEN in their schools would downgrade their school's ranks.

Types of Support

Support for the implementation of inclusive education is expected from parents, community, school committees, district governments, provincial governments, and the Directorate of

Special Education. As shown in Table 8, supports in the forms of funding, coaching, and facilities were mostly provided by provincial governments and by the Directorate of Special Education. The other supporting resources (i.e., parents, school committee, community, district government) provided motivation, ideas, and suggestions. It is questionable that there were many inclusive schools without receiving any external supports. If so, they might be self-initiated inclusive schools that admitted SEN students with their own funding.

Sapon-Shevin (2007) identifies some important lessons about inclusion, including understanding differences, perspective taking, real safety, exclusion hurts everyone, compassion, giving and getting help graciously, responsibility to one another, honesty about hard topics, courage, faith and hope. Inclusion is a comprehensive commitment that needs everyone's support. The level of external supports that schools received was very low. As indicated in the Vietnamese case (Education for Development 2003), low parental awareness and lack of educational resources became barriers in the implementation of inclusion. Inclusion is relatively new; therefore, parents and community might have a limited understanding about inclusion and its requirements. Many respondents recommended stronger legal supports from the government, for example, penalties for local governments that would not allocate their annual budget for inclusion, or, employment of new special education teachers and provision of additional learning facilities for all inclusive schools.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The following conclusions are drawn from this research. First, only about 75 percent of schools responded **yes** to the statements which indicated that extra efforts are still needed so that all schools are prepared to manage inclusive education. Second, only 50 percent of schools reported to have adequate identification and assessment systems. Since only a few schools involved parents and relevant professionals such as psychologist, health professions, and university lecturers in assessing SEN, it is not guaranteed that the individual needs of students are properly met in these schools. Third, curriculum, syllabi and instructional materials have been modified in only 50 percent of schools. Most schools do not have specially adapted sports, arts, and vocational education programs for disabled students. Further, teachers might not have adequate competence in adapting curriculum for SEN.

Fourth, only about 58 percent of schools reported to have modified their instructional program, but most schools lacked appropriate equipment, media, or resources for SEN. It is hard to imagine modifying instruction to meet individual needs of SEN without adequate media and resources. Fifth, it seems that some

government policies in evaluation do not support inclusion. National exam for graduation and retention are good examples. Only SEN students with at least normal intellectual capability will be able to meet all requirements of those policies. And finally, the

level of external supports that schools received was very low. Inclusion is relatively new; therefore, parents and community might have a limited understanding concerning the requirements of a successful inclusion program.

Table 8. Types of Support

Types of Support	Resources						
	Parents	Community	School Committee	District Government	Provincial Government	Dir. of Special Education	Others
Coaching	6	2	3	16	11	9	0
Motivation	17	27	44	10	4	3	0
Ideas/Suggestions	22	5	10	4	2	2	1
Coordination	7	6	7	6	2	3	0
Funding	4	2	7	4	47	16	2
Facilities	1	0	4	7	4	12	2
Socialization	0	2	5	2	2	1	0
Nothing	44	58	46	51	28	54	96
Total	101	102	126	100	100	100	101

Source: Authors' calculations, 2011.

Based on those findings, some recommendations are proposed to the government. First, in institutional management, student admission, identification, assessment, curriculum, instruction, and evaluation, data shows that there are still many schools which have made few or almost no modifications to accommodate inclusive programs. One possible reason is that the school personnel do not possess adequate competence to do the required modifications. Training is therefore needed for headmasters, teachers, and other school personnel. Second, most schools reported that they have limited equipment, media, and resources for special educational needs students. Additional equipment is required and they need supports for this. Third, the low level of external supports received by inclusive schools show the low awareness of the community. One of the possible reasons is that they have little understanding about inclusive education. In the last a few years, the Indonesia Ministry of National Education has conducted a TV campaign program about vocational education, and it has been successful. This mode of socialization can be applied with inclusive education, so that the community has better understanding of inclusive education

References

Baker, Edward T. 1994. "Meta-Analytic Evidence for Non-Inclusive Educational Practices: Does Educational Research Support Current Practice for Special-Needs Students?" PhD diss., Temple University, Philadelphia, USA.

Carlberg, Conrad, and Kenneth Kavale. 1980. "The Efficacy of Special vs Regular Class Placement for Exceptional Children: A Meta-Analysis." *The Journal of Special Education* 14 (3): 295-309.

Chhabra, Simmi, Rama Srivastava, and Ishaan Srivastava. 2010. "Inclusive Education in Botswana: The Perception of School Teachers." *Journal of Disability Studies* 20 (4): 219-228.

Directorate of Special Education. 2008. *Special Education in Figures*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.

Education for Development. 2003. *Inclusive Education for Disadvantaged Children in District 4, Ho Chi Minh City*. Ho Chi Minh City: Office of Education for Development.

Friend, Marilyn, and William D. Bursuck. 2006. *Including Students with Special Needs: A Practical Guide for Classroom Teachers*. Boston: Pearson.

Halinen, Irmeli., and Ritva Järvinen. 2008. Towards Inclusive Education: the Case of Finland. *Prospects*. 38: 77-97.

Heung, Vivian W. K. 2003. "Cultivating a Climate of Change for Inclusion in Hong Kong." Keynote address presented at the International Conference of Inclusive Education, Hong Kong, 15-19 December 2003.

Ministry of National Education. 2003. *Indonesia: Educational Statistics in Brief 2002/2003*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.

Peters, Susan J. 2007. "Education for All? A Historical Analysis of International Inclusive Education Policy and Individuals with Disabilities." *Journal of Disability Policy Studies* 18 (2): 98-108.

- Saad, S. 2010. *The Commitment and Roles of Teachers in the Implementation of Inclusive Education in Malaysia*. Unpublished report. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Ministry of Education.
- Sapon-Shevin, Mara. 1994/1995. "Why Gifted Students Belong in Inclusive Schools" *Educational Leadership* 52 (4): 64-70.
- Sapon-Shevin, Mara. 2007. *Widening the Circle: The Power of Inclusive Classrooms*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Staub, Debbie, and Charles A. Peck. 1994/1995. "What are the Outcomes for Nondisabled Students?" *Educational Leadership* 52 (4): 36-40.
- Sunardi. 1997. *Trends in Special Education*. Jakarta: Directorate General of Higher Education.
- Wang, Margaret C., and Edward T. Baker. 1985/1986. "Mainstreaming Programs: Design Features and Effects." *The Journal of Special Education* 19: 503-521.