

Schools Providing Inclusive Education from the Perspective of Special Education Teachers in Aru Islands Regency: Partners or Competitors?

Bintang Lony Vera Victory¹, Wa Ode Nabila Jan Jan², Amelia Laim³

^{1,2,3} Elementary School Teacher Education Program, Faculty of Teacher Education and Educational Sciences,

Pattimura University, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: bintang.victory@lecturer.unpatti.ac.id

Proceedings of the Kalijaga International Conference on Education 2026

Abstract. This study aims to examine the views or perceptions of Schools Providing Inclusive Education (SPIE) among teachers at the Aru Islands State Special Education School (SES). Through qualitative research using data collection methods such as in-depth interviews, observations, and documentation, an overview of the role of the SES as a partner for SPIE was obtained. Interview instruments were used to explore SES teachers' understanding and willingness to collaborate across five aspects: a) SES teachers' understanding of SPIE principles, b) their willingness to serve as Special Education Teacher (SETs) at SPIE, c) their willingness to participate in developing curriculum modifications, d) their willingness to participate in developing Individualized Education Program (IEP), and e) their willingness to lend learning aids to Students With Special Needs (SWSN) at SPIE. The responses were categorized into three groups: proactive partners, passive partners, and competitors. Among initiative-driven partners, special education teachers demonstrated a willingness to collaborate by proposing concrete ideas or concepts for forms of cooperation with the SPIE. Among partners without initiative, special education teachers merely expressed willingness without specifying the form of cooperation. Among competitors, special education teachers tended to recommend other parties capable of collaborating with the SPIE, held the view that students with special needs would be better off receiving their education at special education schools, and were reluctant to engage in cooperation. Based on the collection, reduction, and presentation of data, it was found that a) 80% of special education teachers are willing to serve as SETs at SPIE, b) 30% are willing without taking the initiative and 30% are willing to take the initiative to participate.

Keywords: *Inclusive Education; Schools Providing Inclusive Education; Special Education Teachers; Curriculum Modifications; Individualized Education Programs.*

INTRODUCTION

No longer merely an option, inclusive education is a mandatory educational philosophy that, in principle, upholds opportunities for students with special needs (SWSN) to participate in the learning environment (accessibility), transforms limitations into opportunities (availability), and enables SWSN to succeed (affordability) through curriculum adaptation based on the needs of SWSN (curriculum adaptation) [1]. The obligation for teachers to implement inclusive education is often not clearly defined, particularly in resource-limited schools [2]. Resource-limited schools face the challenge that inclusive education practices are often reduced to mere administrative formalities [3].

Collaboration between regular teachers and Special Education Teachers (SET) can serve as an initial step to catalyze the implementation of educational inclusivity [3], [4], [5]. Special Education Teachers (SET) are preferably those with academic qualifications in special education; however, professionals from other fields may also be considered provided they have completed training provided by the ministry and attained a proficient level [6]. Unfortunately, there are currently no teachers or educational staff with qualifications in special education in Aru Islands Regency, including at its special education schools, even though the majority have earned bachelor's degrees.

Special education teachers play a strategic role as SETs—or collaborative partners—for subject teachers at SPPI. SPPI is a regular, non-special education school that provides educational services for students with special needs. A SET is a special education teacher assigned to assist from the parent special education school [7]. The primary role of SETs at SPPI is to identify needs, map out learning barriers experienced by students with special needs, assist classroom teachers in developing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), and

modify instructional materials, methods, and media according to the students' abilities. Special education teachers support students with special needs during classroom instruction without taking over the primary responsibilities of the classroom teacher [8]. Special Education Teachers (SET) serve as a resource for regular teachers, parents, and school administrators regarding how to manage student behavior or meet the needs of students with disabilities.

According to the 2023 core education data, only 10,244 regular teachers and 4,695 Special Education Teachers (SET) have been trained to support students with disabilities [9]. Training is essential for guiding students with special needs. In addition to the lack of training, the SET shortage is also caused by the fact that only 13 universities in Indonesia offer a bachelor's degree program in Special Education. To implement inclusive education, it is necessary to have qualified special education teachers who have experience or a comprehensive understanding of supporting students with special needs.

METHODS

Study area

This qualitative study employed data collection methods including in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation. The study utilized an in-depth interview instrument to gather comprehensive information. The interview instrument was designed to explore teachers' understanding of six aspects: the meaning of Inclusive Education, Schools Providing Inclusive Education (SPIE), Special Education Teachers (SET), curriculum modifications, Individualized Education Programs (IEP), the provision of facilities and infrastructure, and special learning aids. The instrument was designed to assess the level of familiarity and understanding that special education teachers have regarding these six aspects.

Procedures

After the researchers collected the data, data processing was conducted [10], consisting of three steps, namely: Step One, Data Reduction and Coding. After the interview results were transcribed, coding was performed based on two major themes: the "Partners" theme, which covered willingness to conduct joint training, openness to providing assistance and support to SPIE, and other actions demonstrating openness to collaborating with SPIE; and the "Competitors" theme, which covered Respondents' competition for SWSN quotas, social jealousy regarding regional facilities or incentives, or a lack of communication between educational institutions. The other theme is "Competitors," which pertains to Respondents who exhibited competition for SWSN quotas, social jealousy regarding regional facilities or incentives, or a lack of communication among educational institutions. Step Two: Data Display, which utilized a contrast matrix in tabular form to map the "Partners" aspect in cooperative relationships and the "Competitors" aspect in relationships that trigger competition. Step Three: Data Analysis and Drawing Conclusions. Data analysis employs data/source triangulation. The same instrument was administered to 10 different informants or Respondents. Findings obtained from one Respondent were cross-checked with those from others to ensure validity.

Data Analysis

Triangulation enhances the validity and reliability of case studies by utilizing various data sources, which helps strengthen findings and reduce weaknesses in the data [11]. The type of data triangulation used here is source triangulation, in which the same data is examined from various sources. Interviews were conducted with 10 educators at the Aru Islands State Special Education School: 1 principal, 1 vice principal for academic affairs, 1 vice principal for student affairs, and 7 classroom and subject teachers. The same in-depth questions were posed to all 10 informants. Questions were modified or expanded when new information was obtained.

Table 1. Key Findings Analyzed Using Source Triangulation

Focus of Findings	Principal of the Special Education School	Vice Principal of the Special Education	Teachers	Conclusion
Partners Indications	A teacher was asked to serve as an expert witness for the prosecutor's office on the topic of deafness	The agency that has signed a memorandum of understanding is the Aru Islands District Attorney's Office	The teacher explained that he had once served as a witness for the District Attorney's Office	Valid: Cooperation has been established only with the Aru Islands Prosecutor's Office
Competitor Indicators	No training has ever been provided to special education teachers on inclusive education, SPIE, SET, curriculum modification, IEP, or the use of facilities, infrastructure, and learning aids.	There has been no training related to inclusive education. However, KKG meetings are held regularly once a year to discuss how to develop teaching modules. KKG meetings are held on a regional basis.	Although no training related to inclusive education has been conducted yet, the teachers participated in a KKG in October 2025, which was hosted by the Aru Islands Special Education School (SES N) for four days.	Valid: There has never been any training on inclusive education for special education teachers, which has led to the perception that SPIE poses a threat to the continued operation of the Aru Islands Public Special Education School.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research results were grouped based on six aspects of data that were collected and analyzed, namely: a) understanding of the meaning of Inclusive Education, b) understanding of SPIE, c) understanding of SET and willingness to serve as a SET at SPIE, d) understanding of curriculum modification and willingness to participate in its development at SPIE, e) understanding of IEP and willingness to participate in its development at SPIE, f) provision of facilities, infrastructure, and special learning aids, which are presented in detail in this section.

Result-1 (Understanding of Inclusive Education)

First, this study yielded findings regarding the percentage of special education teachers' understanding of inclusive education, based on various criteria of understanding detailed in the following table.

Table 2. Criteria for Special Education Teachers' Understanding of Inclusive Education

No	Criteria for Understanding Inclusive Education	Percentage
1	Never heard of it	30%
2	Have heard of it but don't understand it yet	40%
3	Have heard of it and understand it	30%
4	Have participated in a training session	10%
5	Willing to participate in another training session	100%

Thirty percent of Respondents had never heard of inclusive education, 40% had heard of it but did not understand it, and the remaining 30% had heard of it and understood it. Only 10% of Respondents had ever participated in inclusive education training. All Respondents expressed a willingness to participate in inclusive education training. This indicates that all special education teachers are eager to improve their understanding of the implementation of inclusive education.

Result-2 (Understanding of SPIE)

Second, this study measured the percentage of special education teachers' understanding of SPIE, as detailed in the following table.

Table 3. Criteria for Special Education Teachers' Understanding of the SPIE

No	Understanding of SPIE	Percentage
1	Have never heard of it	30%
2	Have heard of it but do not understand it yet	10%
3	Have heard of it and understand it	60%
4	Are not yet willing to teach at SPIE	20%
5	Are willing to teach at SPIE	80%

Thirty percent of Respondents had never heard of the term SPIE, 10% had heard of it but did not understand it, and 60% had heard of it and understood it. Twenty percent of special education teachers were not yet willing to become SETs at SPIE, while the remaining 80% were willing. The reason for their unwillingness was limited time and energy. This percentage of willingness indicates that 80% of special education teachers are partners with SPIE teachers.

Result-3 (Understanding of SET and Willingness to Participate as a SET)

Third, the study measured the percentage of special education teachers' understanding of SET and their willingness to serve as SETs in the SPIE, as detailed in the following table.

Table 4. Criteria for Special Education Teachers' Understanding of SET

No	Special Education Teachers' Understanding of SET	Percentage
1	Have never heard of it	50%
2	Have heard of it but do not understand it yet	20%
3	Have heard of it and understand it	30%
4	Are hesitant to become a SET	20%
5	Are willing to become a SET	80%

Fifty percent of Respondents had never heard of the term "SET," 20% had heard of it but did not understand it, and the remaining 30% had heard of it and understood it. When asked about their willingness to become a SET, 20% of Respondents were hesitant and 80% were willing. When Respondents were asked about the form of collaboration between SES and SPIE, 40% viewed it as a partnership with initiative, 40% as a partnership without initiative, and 20% as a competitive relationship. Respondents who favored a "partnership without initiative" merely expressed willingness without any specific ideas or concepts for collaboration, whereas those who favored a "partnership with initiative" were able to propose forms of collaboration. Respondents who viewed the relationship as a "competition" indicated that SWSN is much better handled at special education schools (SES).

Result-4 (Understanding of Curriculum Modifications and Willingness to Participate in the Development Process)

Fourth, this study measured the percentage of special education teachers' understanding of curriculum modifications and their willingness to participate in developing them for students with special needs at SPIE, as detailed in the following table.

Table 5. Criteria for Special Education Teachers' Understanding of Curriculum Modifications

No.	Criteria for Special Education Teachers' Understanding of Curriculum Modifications	Percentage
1.	Have never heard of it	70%
2.	Have heard of it but do not yet understand it	20%
3.	Have heard of it and understand it	10%
4.	Experience sharing information about curriculum modifications with SPIE	10%

A total of 70% had never heard the term "curriculum modification" in the context of inclusive education, 20% had heard it but did not understand it, and 10% had heard it and understood it. Only 10% of Respondents had experience sharing information about curriculum modification with SPIE. When Respondents were asked about collaboration between special education schools (SES) and SPIE regarding curriculum modification, Thirty percent of Respondents demonstrated a "partnership with initiative" attitude, 30% demonstrated a "partnership without initiative" attitude, 30% demonstrated a "competitive" attitude, and 10% exhibited signs of misconceptions. Respondents who demonstrated a partnership with initiative were willing to collaborate and able to propose forms of collaboration regarding curriculum modification. Respondents who demonstrated a partnership without initiative were willing to collaborate but under certain conditions or suggested that another institution serve as the implementer because they were not yet ready. The

misconception identified was the mistaken belief that modifications were unnecessary because the school was already using the national curriculum.

Result-5 (Understanding of IEP and Willingness to Participate in the Development Process)

Fifth, this study measured the percentage of special education teachers' understanding of IEP and their willingness to participate in developing IEP for students with special needs at SPIE, as detailed in the following table.

Table 6. Criteria for Special Education Teachers' Understanding of IEP

No	Criteria for Understanding the Individualized Learning Program	Percentage
1	Have never heard of it	50%
2	Have heard of it but do not yet understand it fully	40%
3	Have heard of it and understand it	10%

Fifty percent of Respondents had never heard of the term "Individualized Learning Program," 40% had heard the term but did not understand it, and 10% had heard of it and understood it. None of the Respondents had any experience sharing information about the Individualized Learning Program with the School-Based Professional Development Program. Sixty percent of Respondents demonstrated a "partnership with initiative" attitude, while 40% demonstrated a "partnership without initiative" attitude. Respondents who demonstrated a "partnership with initiative" attitude were willing to collaborate and able to propose specific forms of collaboration regarding the development of the IEP. Respondents with a "partnership without initiative" attitude merely expressed their willingness to collaborate without specifying the form it would take.

Result-6 (Understanding of Facilities, Infrastructure, and Learning Aids also Willingness to Share Facilities)

Sixth, this study measured the percentage of special education teachers' understanding of the facilities, infrastructure, and learning aids at SPIE, as well as their willingness to share them, as detailed in the following table.

Table 7. Criteria for Special Education Teachers' Understanding of Facilities, Infrastructure, and Learning Aids

No	Criteria for Understanding Facilities, Infrastructure, and Learning Aids	Percentage
1.	Have heard of the terms "ramp," "handrail," and "guiding block"	80%
2.	Have heard of "Braille" and "hearing aids"	90%

Eighty percent of Respondents had heard of ramps, handrails, and guiding blocks, and 90% had heard of Braille and hearing aids. All Respondents stated that infrastructure such as ramps and handrails is very important because it helps students learn and communicate effectively. When Respondents were asked about the nature of collaboration between special education schools (SES) and the Special Education Teachers' Association (SPIE) regarding infrastructure, 20% of Respondents expressed a "partnership with initiative" attitude, 40% a "partnership without initiative," and 40% a "competitive" attitude. Respondents with a "partnership with initiative" attitude proposed collaboration between SES and SPIE, in which SES would open its doors as widely as possible to visits from SPIE. Respondents who favored a "partnership without initiative" attitude showed reluctance to become overly involved; their support was demonstrated by recommending other institutions that might be able to provide facilities and infrastructure. Respondents who adopted a "competitive" attitude were unable to express any opinion when asked about the form of collaboration between SES and SPIE in the area of facilities and infrastructure.

When asked about learning aids for students with visual and hearing impairments—specifically Braille and hearing aids—30% of Respondents demonstrated a partnership attitude with initiative, 40% demonstrated a partnership attitude without initiative, and 30% demonstrated a competitive attitude. Respondents with a "partnership with initiative" attitude proposed collaboration between special education schools (SES) and the Indonesian Association of the Deaf (SPIE) regarding the loan of learning aids such as Braille and hearing aids. Respondents with a "competitive" attitude were unable to offer any ideas when asked about collaboration with SPIE.

Discussion

In addition to measuring the level of awareness and understanding among special education teachers regarding six aspects—namely, the meaning of inclusive education, the role of Educational Institutions Providing Inclusive Education (SPIE), the role of Special Education Teachers (SET), the development of modified curricula, Individualized Education Program (IEP), and facilities, infrastructure, and learning aids for students with special needs (SWSN), this study also provided insights into special education teachers' perspectives on: a) their views on the existence of SPIE, b) their willingness to serve as SET, c) their

involvement in curriculum modification in collaboration with SPIE, d) their involvement in developing IEP in collaboration with SPIE, and e) their involvement in the shared use of SWSN learning aids.

Special education teachers' views on these aspects were categorized into three groups: partnership with initiative, partnership without initiative, and competitors. The "partnership with initiative" category is indicated by statements that demonstrate a willingness to participate, provide support, and propose ideas or concepts for collaboration between special education schools and SPIE. The "partnership without initiative" category is indicated by a willingness to participate without any concrete ideas or concepts regarding the form of collaboration between special education schools and SPIE. The "competitor" category is indicated by a reluctance to actively participate in collaboration between special education schools and SPIE.

Special Education Teachers' Views on the Existence of SPIE

When asked about their views on SPIE, 30% of special education teachers expressed a partnership attitude, while 70% expressed a competitive attitude. Respondents expressed a competitive attitude through statements such as: "Other schools, such as junior high schools, senior high schools, and vocational high schools, should not admit students with special needs; these students can receive a better education at special education schools" (Respondent 1), "Students with special needs will feel more comfortable learning with peers who also have special needs" (Respondent 4), "SPIE is not yet able to conduct initial assessments, whereas we at the special education school already can" (Respondent 5), "The large number of students at SPIE may result in students with special needs not receiving adequate attention" (Respondent 6), "Even SES teachers with more experience still face difficulties; SPIE teachers would face even greater challenges" (Respondent 7), "Students with special needs are at greater risk of being bullied at SPIE" (Respondent 8), "It's better for students with special needs to study at SES; the teaching methods at SPIE are different and may not be a good fit" (Respondent 9). Meanwhile, three Respondents highlighted the connection through the following statements: "SPIE plays a role in providing a comfortable learning environment and fostering self-confidence in students with special needs" (Respondent 2), "SPIE is a school that accepts and supports students with special needs" (Respondent 3), "SPIE represents a form of social justice for students with special needs" (Respondent 10).

The lack of trust among special education teachers toward SPIE stems from the negative stigma that children with disabilities may face [12]. In fact, the principles underlying inclusive education in SPIE are to improve education for children with disabilities, reduce stigma against them, and eliminate their marginalization [13]; [14]. We need to understand that an inclusive learning environment is a differentiated learning environment that accommodates diverse needs without discrimination [15]. Special education teachers have little trust in SPIE because social stigma against students with disabilities remains a major concern, particularly in areas with low literacy rates, such as the 3T regions and the Aru Islands [16]. In another archipelago region of Indonesia—the Thousand Islands—28% of teachers still do not understand students with special needs and score below the ideal level [17]. Intensive outreach is needed to reduce stigma and discrimination against children with special needs [18]. Local governments need to enact local regulations that align with central government regulations to effectively implement inclusive education [19].

Willingness SES to Serve as a SET

When Respondents were asked about the form of collaboration between special education schools (SES) and special education teacher training institutions (SPIE) in the context of SES teachers serving as SETs, 40% of Respondents viewed the relationship as a partnership with initiative, 40% as a partnership without initiative, and 20% as a competitive relationship. Respondents who viewed the relationship as a "partnership without initiative" merely expressed willingness without any ideas or concepts regarding the form of collaboration, whereas those who viewed it as a "partnership with initiative" were able to propose specific forms of collaboration. Respondents in the "partnership with initiative" category made statements such as: "Special education schools can share knowledge on how to handle students with special needs, the development of learning programs, and the curriculum used" (Respondent 3), "SPIE can mentor the support teachers at SPIE" (Respondent 4), "Special education schools can provide information sessions on the types of students with special needs and how to handle them" (Respondent 6), "I am willing to share my knowledge once I fully understand the role of the SET" (Respondent 7). Unfortunately, one of the Respondents regarding the partnership initiative exhibited a misconception in the form of reluctance to share the initial SWSN identification instrument. It would be much better if the instrument could be shared and studied together.

Respondents in the "partnership without initiative" group were unable to articulate their own ideas; they merely expressed their willingness to serve as SETs. Respondents in this group made statements such as: "Special education teachers can assist with SPIE classes as long as it does not interfere with special education classes" (Respondent 1), "SPIE can discuss this with the special education school principal, and the principal can assign a teacher to assist as a SET" (Respondent 2), "I'm willing if I'm asked to help teach at some point in the future" (Respondent 9), "I'm willing to help teach at SPIE if needed, as long as there's an official

request” (Respondent 10). Unfortunately, one of the “partnership” Respondents, who lacked initiative, exhibited a misconception in the form of reluctance to serve as a SET because they believed the SES had a greater need. The “competitor” Respondents indicated that SWSN is much better handled at the SES.

Respondents who displayed a competitive attitude made statements such as: “Learning activities could be organized where some SES teachers visit SPIE, but it would be better if only SWSN students went to the SES” (Respondent 5), “Teachers can consult with the Department of Education to coordinate in finding or identifying teachers who can assist elementary schools (inclusive)” (Respondent 8).

SETs play a crucial role as needs analysts, developers of Individualized Learning Programs (IEPs), and social mediators in the classroom. SETs are responsible for identifying students with special needs, conducting initial assessments of their needs, and implementing instruction tailored to their characteristics; optimizing assistive devices to provide simple stimuli for these students; and involving parents in the learning process [20]. It is reasonable that SETs who do not have a background in Special Education should undergo training in inclusive education [7] as a means of ensuring teacher competence [21]; [22]. A teacher’s professional background or specialized training can support and strengthen their role as a SET [23]. Strengthening the role of teachers can be achieved through certification, collaboration among stakeholders, and the provision of adaptive facilities and infrastructure to create an inclusive learning environment [24]. Lumajang Regency, for example, has provided training for SET whose academic qualifications are not in Special Education or Special Learning Needs (PLB) [14].

SES Involvement in Curriculum Modification with SPIE

When Respondents were asked about collaboration between special education schools (SES) and SPIE regarding curriculum modification, 30% of Respondents demonstrated a “partnership with initiative” attitude, 30% demonstrated a “partnership without initiative” attitude, 30% demonstrated a “competitive” attitude, and 10% exhibited signs of misconceptions. Respondents who demonstrated a “partnership with initiative” attitude were willing to collaborate and able to propose forms of collaboration regarding curriculum modification. Respondents in this category made statements such as: “Collaboration can take the form of sharing methods for creating general and specialized teaching modules, handling strategies, characteristics of students with special needs, and suitable foods” (Respondent 2), “Outreach sessions could be held for us, special education teachers and regular teachers, to design a curriculum for students with developmental disabilities” (Respondent 6), “One of the special education teachers could serve as a resource person, such as Ms. Lia” (the teacher recommended a colleague) (Respondent 9).

Respondents in a partnership but without initiative were willing to collaborate but were not yet ready or able to propose forms of collaboration. Respondents in the “partnership without initiative” category also recommended other institutions that have established partnerships with SPIE. Respondents in this category made statements such as: “SPIE should ensure that those handling students with special needs can participate in training or workshops organized by the local education office,” (Respondent 1), “I am willing to share my knowledge once we are also able to make modifications” (Respondent 4), “The MGMP invited special education teachers and SPIE teachers to a meeting” (Respondent 5).

Respondents from competing institutions were unable to suggest ideas for collaboration regarding curriculum modification and were reluctant to pursue such efforts. Respondents who exhibited a competitive attitude made statements such as: “There has never been any collaboration, so we don’t know” (Respondent 2), “I don’t know what form the collaboration would take” (Respondents 7 and 10). One of the Respondents with a competitive attitude also exhibited signs of a misconception, stating: “Special Education Schools (SES) follow the national curriculum, specifically the MBKM based on deep learning, so we don’t need to make any modifications.” Meanwhile, Respondents who exhibited signs of a pure misconception made statements such as: “Special education teachers can teach at SPIE, but only with the support of regular teachers.” In reality, it is the SPIE teachers who need support from special education teachers to assist students with learning disabilities—not the other way around.

To adapt to the diverse needs of students with special educational needs, teachers must have an understanding of an adaptive curriculum [23]. There are at least several forms of curriculum modification: duplication, modification, substitution, omission, and acceleration [25]. Duplication involves using the same curriculum for both regular students and students with special educational needs; modification involves changing part of the content, process, or assessment of the regular curriculum; substitution involves replacing some material or activities with more functional alternatives; and omission involves removing certain parts of the regular curriculum because they are not feasible for students with special educational needs [1].

SES Involvement in the Development of the IEP in Collaboration with SPIE

When asked about the involvement of special education schools (SES) in the development of the IEP in collaboration with the SPIE, 60% of Respondents indicated a “partnership with initiative” attitude,

while 40% indicated a “partnership without initiative” attitude. Respondents who expressed a “partnership with initiative” were willing to collaborate and able to propose forms of collaboration regarding the development of the IEP. Respondents in the “partnership with initiative” group made statements such as: “We will first improve teachers’ understanding at the SES through workshops led by local experts. After that, we’ll try to understand the cases at SPIE” (Respondent 1), “Collaboration can take the form of seminars or workshops on curriculum modification for SPIE students, led by special education schools” (Respondent 3), “conducting joint discussions or training sessions related to the IEP” (Respondent 4), “The most needed forms of collaboration—such as workshops, seminars, and training—are getting to know each student and developing teaching modules in accordance with IEP” (Respondent 5), “We can hold meetings and work together on development because special education schools also still need training” (Respondent 7), “Special education schools and IEP can conduct joint training” (Respondent 9). Unfortunately, two of the Respondents regarding partnerships with initiatives showed signs of a misconception, interpreting IEP as a learning activity involving one student and one teacher in a classroom. Respondents in partnerships who lack initiative are willing to collaborate but only under certain conditions, or they suggest that another organization take the lead because they are not yet ready.

Respondents in the “partnership without initiative” category merely expressed their willingness without specifying the form of collaboration. Respondents in this category made statements such as: “Collaboration can take place as long as the principal is aware of it and provides instructions” (Respondent 2), “I’m willing to participate in training and share once I fully understand IEP” (Respondent 6), “I’m willing to participate if training on IEP development is ever conducted” (Respondent 8), “I’m willing to share once I fully understand IEP” (Respondent 10). Unfortunately, one Respondent from the partnership group exhibited signs of a misconception, believing that a teacher might not create a IEP if they lack sufficient time—provided the teacher creates teaching modules and learning materials that can be used by every student in the classroom by designing learning materials that capture each student’s attention. This is because creating a separate learning material for each student would be exhausting. In this regard, no Respondents exhibited a competitive attitude.

The teaching styles and strategies of Special Education Teachers are outlined in the IEP, which is based on the results of the curriculum modification framework assessment [26]. Teaching styles are differentiated to meet the diverse needs of students with special needs [3]. Effective inclusive education strategies are needed for children’s learning programs that are specialized, unique, and diverse [27]. The IEP helps teachers develop learning strategies tailored to each individual’s needs, thereby creating differentiated instruction [5], [15]. Personalized and specifically designed learning programs, such as those in IEP, can influence long-term learning outcomes [28].

SES Involvement in the shared use of SWSN learning aids

When Respondents were asked about the form of collaboration between SESs and SPIEs regarding facilities and infrastructure, 20% of Respondents indicated a “partnership with initiative,” 40% a “partnership without initiative,” and 40% a “competitive” attitude. Respondents in the “partnership with initiative” group proposed a collaboration between SESs and SPIEs in which SESs would open their doors as wide as possible to SPIE visits.

Respondents who favored a “partnership with initiative” made statements such as: “SPIE can visit SES to see what the facilities and infrastructure for SWSN look like” (Respondent 6), “SPIE can borrow resources from SES” (Respondent 9). Respondents who favored a “partnership without initiative” were unable to propose ideas for collaboration and recommended other institutions as collaboration partners for SPIE rather than themselves.

Respondents in the “partnership without initiative” category showed reluctance to get too deeply involved; their support was demonstrated by recommending other institutions that might be able to provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure. Respondents in the “partnership without initiative” group made statements such as: “We don’t know yet; perhaps SPIE can submit a proposal to the agency” (Respondent 3), “Perhaps SPIE can ask the agency to handle the procurement” (Respondent 5), “We don’t know yet; once we’ve coordinated with SPIE, we’ll be able to determine the form of collaboration” (Respondent 7), “The school can submit a request to the department for procurement” (Respondent 8). Competitor Respondents had no ideas regarding the form of collaboration.

Competitor Respondents were unable to offer any opinions when asked about the form of collaboration between SES and SPIE in the area of facilities and infrastructure. One competitor Respondent offered the following opinion: “There hasn’t been any cooperation yet, and we haven’t thought about what form it might take” (Respondent 10).

When asked about learning aids for students with visual and hearing impairments—specifically Braille and hearing aids—30% of Respondents expressed a “partnership with initiative” attitude, 40%

expressed a “partnership without initiative” attitude, and 30% expressed a “competitive” attitude. Respondents with a “partnership with initiative” attitude proposed collaboration between special education schools (SES) and the Indonesian Association of the Deaf (SPIE) regarding the loan of learning aids such as Braille and hearing aids. Respondents who adopted a partnership attitude with initiative made statements such as: “collaborate with parties that can manufacture or provide them” (Respondent 3), “collaborate with parties that can manufacture or provide them” (Respondent 7), and “SPIE needs to strive to procure devices appropriate for students’ specific disabilities; it is acceptable to borrow from SES as long as there are students who use such devices within that SPIE” (Respondent 9).

Respondents in the “partnership without initiative” category are willing to collaborate with SPIE but not at this time because they are not yet ready, and they recommend other institutions that could facilitate such collaboration. Respondents from the “partnership without initiative” group made the following statements: “Schools submit reports to the department to request assistance with procurement” (Respondent 1), “No SPIE has borrowed equipment yet, but if it’s needed at some point in the future, that’s fine” (Respondent 2), “SPIE can submit a proposal to the relevant department” (Respondent 5), “It’s possible that someday they might borrow special assistive devices if needed and we have them” (Respondent 8). Competitor Respondents were unable to offer any ideas when asked about collaboration with SPIE.

Competitor Respondents provided the following statements: “I don’t know” (Respondent 4), “I’m not sure yet because equipment procurement depends on BOS funding” (Respondent 6), “It has never happened, but I could envision what it might look like if there were a meeting with SPIE” (Respondent 10).

Educational infrastructure, such as the availability of classrooms, is a key factor in assessing the success of contextual learning implementation for SWSN teachers [23]; [29]). Inadequate or incomplete infrastructure must be addressed immediately to achieve effective inclusive learning [30]. Strengthening infrastructure can also enhance support for the identification of children with special needs [12]. The identification process for children with special needs requires a comprehensive understanding of the challenges faced by children in general. Identification steps include behavioral observation, assessment, and interviews with parents, psychologists, and therapists [31]. Together with special education schools (SES) and the Department of Education, the SPIE needs to pay attention to the condition of primary infrastructure (classrooms, playgrounds, and libraries) as well as supporting facilities (cafeterias, restrooms, and parking areas), which should be equipped with handrails and guiding blocks to ensure they are accessible to children with special needs.

CONCLUSION

Some special education teachers exhibited a competitive attitude toward the existence of SPIE. The majority of special education teachers demonstrated a partnership attitude regarding their willingness to become SETs. The majority of special education teachers demonstrated a partnership attitude—both proactively and passively—in collaborating with SPIE on curriculum modifications; however, the number of teachers exhibiting competitive attitudes and misconceptions cannot be considered small. All special education teachers demonstrated a partnership attitude toward developing the IEP with SPIE, although some of them still lacked a clear idea of what form this collaboration would take. Most special education teachers demonstrated a partnership attitude regarding collaboration on the use of facilities, infrastructure, and learning aids, although the number of special education teachers who viewed themselves as competitors was also significant.

Essentially, special education teachers serve as partners or SET for SPIE. This role is crucial because SPIE teachers generally require specialized support to work with students with special needs. Forms of partnership can include: a) jointly developing identification, observation, and assessment tools; b) designing modified curricula and IEP for students with SWSN at SPIE; and c) providing recommendations on adaptive learning models and instructional media so that learning materials can be optimally absorbed by students with SWSN. Unfortunately, this role often conflicts with the competencies of special education teachers, which still need to be developed. Therefore, comprehensive training for special education teachers is necessary so that they can optimally fulfill their role as partners of SPIE.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. P. Bintang Lony Vera Victory, *Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif di Sekolah Dasar*. Deepublish, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=brMnEQAAQBAJ>
- [2] M. Mosala and M. M. Sefotho, “Examining Teachers’ Responsibilities and Rights in Implementing Inclusive Education within the Legal Framework,” *Int. J. Spec. Educ. IJSE*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 106–117, Jul. 2025, doi: 10.52291/ijse.2025.40.9.

- [3] S. Y. Umar, F. I. P. Pratama, and A. F. Mannassai, "ANALISIS PEMAHAMAN GURU TERHADAP KONSEP DASAR PENDIDIKAN INKLUSIF," *Educ. J. Inov. Pendidik. Pengajaran*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 225–232, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.51878/educational.v6i1.9137.
- [4] A. Annisa, D. P. Fatmawati, L. Hidayat, and R. Aningrum, "Dinamika Kolaborasi Guru Reguler dan Guru Pembimbing Khusus dalam Pendidikan Inklusi: Studi Kualitatif di SMP Kota Yogyakarta," 2026.
- [5] I. P. Viratama, A. A. Saputri, D. Irawan, E. Diana, F. Azahra, and I. F. M. Papua, "PERAN GURU DALAM MENDUKUNG KEMANDIRIAN ABK: STUDI KASUS DI SEKOLAH INKLUSIF SLB PROVINSI PAPUA," vol. 17, no. 1.
- [6] J. J. Sudirman, "KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN, KEBUDAYAAN, RISET, DAN TEKNOLOGI".
- [7] H. Hanaa and E. Mia Evani, "Peran Penting Guru Pembimbing Khusus Dalam Pendidikan Inklusi Di SDI Al-Muttaqin," *J. Rev. Pendidik. Dasar J. Kaji. Pendidik. Dan Has. Penelit.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 167–171, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.26740/jrpd.v8n3.p167-171.
- [8] U. C. Barlian, R. P. Wulandari, M. Said, and N. Lathifa, "Peran Guru Kelas Dan Guru Pendamping Khusus Dalam Meningkatkan Layanan Pendidikan Inklusi Di TK Ibnu Sina," *J. Islam. Stud.*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2023.
- [9] M. T. B. Pandito and A. R. Diva, "Melintasi Jalan Berliku: Problematika Pendidikan Inklusif bagi Siswa Disabilitas," *Melintasi Jalan Berliku: Problematika Pendidikan Inklusif bagi Siswa Disabilitas*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.unaindonesia.org/2024/05/14/melintasi-jalan-berliku-problematika-pendidikan-inklusif-bagi-anak-berkebutuhan-khusus/>
- [10] Muhajirin, Risnita, and Asrulla, "Pendekatan Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif serta Tahapan Penelitian" *Journal Genta Mulia*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 82–92, <https://ejournal.uncm.ac.id/index.php/gm/article/view/903>
- [11] R. D. Mishra, "TRIANGULATION AN ESSENTIAL TOOL TO ENHANCE THE VALIDITY OF A CASE STUDY".
- [12] R. S. Putri, O. F. Wardany, Muh. M. Mubar, T. Meidina, and D. Sulasminah, "Hambatan Guru dalam Identifikasi Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus di Sekolah Dasar Inklusif X Kabupaten Gowa," *J. Basicedu*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 52–61, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.31004/basicedu.v10i1.11608.
- [13] A. R. I. Ompusunggu, Y. Achidiani, and G. I. Permata Nastia, "Inclusive Education as an Alternative to Improve Access to Education for Children with Disabilities in Society," *J. Pendidik. Non Form.*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 6, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.47134/jpn.v2i3.1528.
- [14] E. Y. Wardah, "PERANAN GURU PEMBIMBING KHUSUS LULUSAN NON-PENDIDIKAN LUAR BIASA (PLB) TERHADAP PELAYANAN ANAK BERKEBUTUHAN KHUSUS DI SEKOLAH INKLUSI KABUPATEN LUMAJANG," *JPI J. Pendidik. Inklusi*, vol. 2, no. 2, p. 93, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.26740/inklusi.v2n2.p93-108.
- [15] C. Julvianti, G. G. Gmaries, and N. Qonitah, "PERAN GURU DALAM MENGAJAR BAGI ANAK BERKEBUTUHAN KHUSUS DI SEKOLAH DASAR".
- [16] Ruth Agustaria, Yunita Lingga, Amelia Magdalena Sitorus, Samuel Hotasi Silalahi, and Rahmilawati Ritonga, "Peran dan Tantangan Guru dalam Pendidikan Inklusi," *Morfol. J. Ilmu Pendidik. Bhs. Sastra Dan Budaya*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 180–188, Jun. 2025, doi: 10.61132/morfologi.v3i4.1956.
- [17] S. N. Komariyah, R. Bagarkorowati, and L. Lianty, "PEMAHAMAN GURU TERHADAP PESERTA DIDIK BERKEBUTUHAN KHUSUS DI SEKOLAH DASAR INKLUSIF WILAYAH KEPULAUAN SERIBU," *PARAMETER J. Pendidik. Univ. Negeri Jkt.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 216–222, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.21009/parameter.292.09.
- [18] F. Fitriani, S. Nirmalasari, and D. S. Rahmi, "Peran Guru dalam Meningkatkan Dukungan Sosial bagi Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus di Lingkungan Sekolah Inklusi," *Tabularasa J. Ilm. Magister Psikol.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 34–44, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.31289/tabularasa.v6i1.3624.
- [19] W. Achmad, "Implications of Inclusive Education Policy in Guaranteeing the Rights of Children with Special Needs," *AL-ISHLAH J. Pendidik.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 4288–4297, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.35445/alishlah.v15i4.3847.
- [20] Siti Nuraini, Sudrajat Sudrajat, and Shafa' Annisa Puspasari, "Peranan Guru dalam Pendidikan Inklusif di Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini," *Inov. Pendidik. Dan Anak Usia Dini*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 25–37, Jul. 2025, doi: 10.61132/inpaud.v2i2.595.
- [21] A. P. Ramadani, F. A. Husnah, N. Aulianisa, S. Azzahra, and D. Mustika, "Persepsi Guru Terhadap Pendidikan Inklusi Sekolah Dasar di Padang Pariaman".
- [22] N. Q. Syarif, "Persepsi Guru Terhadap Penerapan Pendidikan Inklusif Di SLB Negeri 1 Makassar : Tantangan Dan Peluang," 2024.
- [23] B. Abduh, K. F. Khairuddin, M. M. Tahar, and M. S. Zainal, "Special Education Teacher Contextual Scale (SETCS): The Development and psychometric testing," *Int. J. Spec. Educ. IJSE*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 199–209, Jul. 2025, doi: 10.52291/ijse.2025.40.16.
- [24] D. N. Fithriyah, M. Pd, D. R. N. Tias, and A. F. Zaini, "PERAN GURU PENDAMPING KHUSUS(GPK) DALAM PEMBELAJARAN INKLUSI DI SEKOLAH DASAR," vol. 9, 2025.
- [25] Khoiruman, W. Azka Fikriyy, and Moh. A. Shohifur Rizal, "DESAIN KURIKULUM PENDIDIKAN BERBASIS INKLUSI ADAPTIF MERDEKA," *GAHWA*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–15, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.61815/gahwa.v2i1.301.
- [26] D. Suryana, R. Jusdijachlan, and S. Ridwan, "Model Implementasi Kurikulum di Sekolah Pendidikan Inklusif di Kota Bandung," *J. Pendidik. Dan Kebud. Nusantara*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–13, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.38035/jpkn.v2i1.958.
- [27] A. R. Sahna, N. A. Ningrum, T. Febriati, I. Masfia, and Z. Fahmy, "HUBUNGAN SELF-EFFICACY GURU DENGAN SIKAP GURU TERHADAP PENYELENGGARAAN PENDIDIKAN INKLUSI DI SEKOLAH DASAR DI KOTA SEMARANG," *J. Ilm. Pendidik. Citra Bakti*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 832–846, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.38048/jipcb.v11i3.3745.
- [28] E. A. Karkkulainen, K. Pihlainen, and E. Kärnä, "Students' Perceptions of School-based Feedback in Vocational Education and Training in Finland: the Case of Students with Learning Difficulties," *Int. J. Spec. Educ. IJSE*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 78–92, Jul. 2025, doi: 10.52291/ijse.2025.40.7.

- [29] Hasna Jauza Faujiyyah, Aisya Sahara, and Ichsan Fauzi Rachman, “Studi Tentang Persepsi Guru Terhadap Pendidikan Inklusi di Indonesia : Hambatan dan Peluang,” *Harmoni Pendidik. J. Ilmu Pendidik.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 48–60, May 2025, doi: 10.62383/hardik.v2i3.1717.
- [30] A. Santi, L. Komariah, and W. G. Mulawarman, “Strategies for Managing Facilities and Infrastructure in Inclusive Schools”.
- [31] H. Masri and T. L. Wati, “Shadow Teacher Support and Cognitive Development in Inclusive Primary Education: Dukungan Guru Pendamping dan Perkembangan Kognitif dalam Pendidikan Dasar Inklusif,” *Indones. J. Educ. Methods Dev.*, vol. 21, no. 4, Feb. 2026, doi: 10.21070/ijemd.v21i4.1042.