
INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AT FAITH-BASED AND NON-FAITH BASED UNIVERSITIES: A POLICY, TEACHING, AND CURRICULUM ANALYSIS

Zulkipli Lessy¹, Abd Rachman Assegaf², Sangkot Sirait¹

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia

E-mail: zulkipli.lessy@uin-suka.ac.id

Received: 05th January 2021; Revised: 28th March 2021; Accepted: 28th June 2021

Abstract

This study recruited participants from UIN Sunan Kalijaga and Universitas Sanata Dharma in Yogyakarta and the University of Sydney, and the University of Western Sydney in Australia and aimed at investigating whether policies are implemented as a bridge to accommodate disabled students for admission and academic pursuits. In this combined policy research and case study, individual, group, and policymaker interviews were conducted. The findings indicate that, while university policymakers admit students with special needs, a lack of academic advocates among faculty has hampered understanding of pertinent policies. As a result, some lecturers do not pay attention to inclusiveness. There are environmental impediments, a dearth of services throughout the enrollment process, a lack of faculty competencies, and a paucity of information in syllabi indicating where impaired students can access resources. In Australia, colleges are more forthright about accommodating students with special needs during the enrolling process and during class time. Both campuses have disability assessment clinics. However, some are more physically and centrally positioned to facilitate impaired students who self-refer for services. The purpose of this paper is to argue that genuinely inclusive education is not segregated schooling that separates 'normal' pupils from those with special needs. For authentic inclusion, disabled populations require considerate, if not extraordinary, care and services.

Keywords: disability; inclusiveness; policy; strategy; barrier; curricula

Abstrak

Penelitian ini merekrut partisipan di UIN Sunan Kalijaga dan Universitas Sanata Dharma di Yogyakarta serta University of Sydney dan University of Western Sydney di Australia dan bertujuan untuk investigasi apakah kebijakan sebagai sarana untuk mengakomodasi mahasiswa difabel pada proses pendaftaran dan pencapaian akademik. Penelitian kebijakan dan studi kasus ini dilakukan melalui serangkaian interview dengan individu, kelompok, pembuat kebijakan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa meskipun para pengambil kebijakan menjamin penerimaan mahasiswa dengan kebutuhan khusus, lemahnya dukungan para pengajar telah mengurangi perhatian penerapan kebijakan yang relevan. Akibatnya, beberapa pengajar kurang menaruh perhatian pada inklusivitas. Terdapat halangan lingkungan, kurangnya layanan selama proses pendaftaran dan kompetensi para pengajar, serta kurangnya petunjuk dalam silabus menjelaskan dimana mahasiswa difabel mengakses sumber-sumber yang diperlukan. Kampus-kampus di Sydney lebih transparan dalam memfasilitasi mahasiswa difabel selama proses pendaftaran dan kuliah. Terdapat banyak pusat layanan, beberapa secara struktural terpusat di kampus untuk diakses. Artikel ini berargumentasi bahwa pendidikan inklusif itu bukan sistem kelas yang memisahkan mahasiswa 'normal' dari yang berkebutuhan khusus. Untuk inklusi, mahasiswa difabel perlu digandeng dan mendapatkan pengajaran dan layanan yang memadai.

Kata kunci: disabilitas; inklusif; kebijakan; strategi; halangan; kurikulum

How to Cite: Lessy, Z., Assegaf, A. R., Sirait, S. (2021). Inclusive Education at Faith-Based and Non-Faith Based Universities: A Policy, Teaching, and Curriculum Analysis. *TARBIYA: Journal of Education in Muslim Society*, 8(1), 1-15. doi:10.15408/tjems.v8i1.18992.

Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/tjems.v8i1.18992>

*Corresponding author

Introduction

Inclusive education comprises services provided for all children to learn together at schools by giving special attention to diversity and to those who are in need (Garnida, 2015). As the number of those with special needs increases, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) (2015) have indicated that about 75 million children around the world are excluded from education and that over 650 million people with special needs are denied their full participation in society (Mittler, 2005). Moreover, millions of children live in households with parents or relatives who are disabled. These children have little hope of going to school, getting a job, having home ownership, creating a family, raising children, enjoying a social life, or even voting. UNICEF calls upon member states to adopt an inclusive education approach in the design, implementation, monitoring, and assessment of educational policies as a way to further accelerate the attainment of Education for All (EFA) goals and to contribute to building more inclusive societies. The ultimate goal of inclusive quality education is to end all forms of discrimination and to foster social cohesion (Right to Education, 2017).

The 2015 EFA report states that although globally comparable and reliable data are difficult to obtain, it is notable that one widely cited source estimates 150 million children worldwide are living with disabilities. Also, around 80 percent of all such children are located in developing countries (UNICEF, 2015). At all ages, incidence of both moderate and severe disability is higher in the low- and middle-income countries, including Indonesia and Australia. Therefore, governments and academics should give special attention to this concern so that those with special challenges can obtain basic needs, including education.

Indonesia has formulated policies for implementation strategies to optimize inclusive education. In 2018, there were 1,600 schools in Indonesia which served students with special needs (Ministry of Education & Culture, 2018). Such sites include what are variously called schools with special needs (SLB), elementary schools with special needs (SDLB), or integrated schools (*Sekolah Terpadu*). Around 33% of these are state-owned schools. This means that education for children with special needs is provided by both government and private institutions. The number of students having access to the three types of schools is 49,647 children (Right to Education, 2017). As for higher education, no exact or official figures for university and college special-needs student enrollments have been recorded by the public institutions. Even so, the estimated number has been predicted to grow significantly at UIN Sunan Kalijaga, where about sixty are registered as active students (PLD, 2020).

The population of disabled people, according to the National Socio-Economic Survey in Indonesia for 2015, was 2,45% (6.515.500) out of the 244.919.000 total population in Indonesia that year (Ministry of Health, 2015). While the percentage may seem small, the number of disabled is quite notable, due to the large size of Indonesia's population. Also, out of the over 6 million disabled, fewer than 5.000 held bachelor degrees in 2015 (Ministry of Health, 2015), and this statistic reveals a shortage in the quality of service the disabled students received on campus. There is a lack of effective regulations requiring educational institutions to serve these students well. In order to create inclusiveness on campus, the country should augment specific policies towards inclusivity. Since 1994 Indonesia has had policies to give access for everyone,

including those who are disabled, to obtain education from elementary through university levels. As the Act states, “every disabled child is entitled to gain education from the preschool level to secondary one” (Acts 1997). But the policy statements did not specify the services, regulations, or quality assurance that the educational institutions should establish.

Then in 2016 the Disability Acts No. 8 Year 2016 highlighted new policies comprising educational assurance, access, and adequate facilities, as well as setting sanctions for institutions who fail to comply. Also, the Acts established the National Committee of Disability (Acts 2016). This gave increased hope to the disabled students after they had experienced 19 years with policy statements but without such specifics. In addition to service assurance, the Acts state the obligation for educational institutions to provide accommodation under the Units of Disability Service. This function is for detection as early as possible of the potential disabilities and to coordinate with faculties and other units (Acts 2016). The Units of Disability Service influence the quality of student learning because disabled students are especially concerned about accessibility. Even with the best teaching strategies, the teaching is not fruitful if savvy disabled students lack access to lectures. The importance of accessibility is easily overlooked by non-disabled people, but it is critical for all students in order to achieve maximum potential and worthy results.

Even with governmental policy statements, university students with special needs often encounter barriers, dilemmas, and contradictions that have resulted from reforms being superficial, ad hoc, or incomplete. Indonesia and Australia, for example, have directed much concern to implementing the right to education for students with special needs at primary and secondary levels, but university students have not received as much consideration (Cornish, 2017). Therefore, there remain many reforms to educational practices and administrative policies that are still needed in order to improve the strategies and practices at universities. Further improvements will require systematic changes and full support from all of us. This is why our research on the policy analysis of governmental regulations and implementation strategies of university authorities concerning the right to education became important, along with our focus on two universities in Indonesia and two in Australia. The research is designed to develop appropriate models for inclusive education at these campuses, based on mapping the problems of disabilities, in order to recommend better strategies.

Some practices of inclusive education

Rustemier (2002) defines inclusive education as “all children and young people, with and without disabilities or difficulties, learning together in ordinary preschool provision, schools, colleges, and universities.” The definition indicates that the process of inclusive education must occur across all levels; however, our preliminary research showed that there is little research focusing on inclusive education at college or university level. We did find that Andayani and Ro’fah (2014) focused their study on how students with special needs could be facilitated to have better understanding if there were practices that alleviate their difficulty in comprehending the mathematics symbols and other special written characters used by lecturers for statistics and for foreign languages. It would be wise for the lecturers to learn ways of presenting symbols understandably for such students. Meanwhile, Rosita (2015) focused her study on the important role of student volunteers helping students with special needs. She contends that this voluntarism

could provide significant assistance for special needs students in higher education. Moreover, Fikri (2014) asserts that pathways should exist for people with special needs to become active in politics so that they can contribute to positive regulatory and policy changes. Much of the other research focuses on investigation of inclusive education at elementary and secondary schools (Friend & Bursuck, 2015; Garnida, 2015; Ilahi, 2013; McNary, Glasgow, & Dicks, 2005; Olson & Platt, 1992; Smith, 2015). Other studies have suggested that there is a necessity for further research focusing on university settings, especially those in developing countries (Adams & Brown, 2006; Lessy, Kailani, & Jahidin, 2021), and on the importance of establishing materials for undergraduate students (Race, 2002). Therefore, our research is responding to this need by being based on the existing theories for inclusive education and comparative studies, with our results to be considered significant for producing new theories and concepts for inclusive practices benefitting university students with special needs. The new theories are in the context of instillment and internalization of religious and cultural values, the status of local wisdom, the nature of each national culture, and the perspectives found in the developing models for inclusive education.

Inclusive education in Indonesia and Australia has been expanded from a narrow and limited perspective to more diverse horizons and multiple perspectives because students with disabilities refer to those who not only have physical impairments such as blindness and deafness, or mutism, but also have depression, Down's syndrome, and conditions impairing the ability to cope with daily routines. In such a process it should emphasize dimensions of input, process, and outcomes, as well as external factors that are related to and dependent upon the context of culture. Bosi's (2004) research on the pilot implementation of inclusive education concluded that principals and teachers were concerned about the inadequate professional preparation of teachers for inclusive education and about the difficulties of coping with children with special needs when they are placed in traditional classroom settings. These findings led to the development of an explanatory model to assist understanding the approach to a further implementation of inclusive education. The participants agreed that inclusive education enhances social inclusion among the students and thus minimizes stereotypes placed on students with disabilities. The findings also showed that collaboration between the mainstream teachers and the special education teachers is important and that there should be clear guidelines established when implementing inclusive education for all of the school administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders who are directly or indirectly involved in the implementation.

Meanwhile, Tarsidi (2015) argues that inclusive education in Indonesia was initiated in the early 1960s for a few blind students in Bandung with the support of the organization of persons with visual impairments acting as a pressure group. In the late 1970s, the government began to pay attention to the importance of integrated education. Eventually, towards the end of the 1990s, new efforts were made to develop inclusive education, and since then UNESCO has been actively involved in the promotion of inclusive education in West Java. The government of Indonesia also enacted Acts No. 4 Year 1997, which stipulates that a "citizen with a disability shall have the right of attending education at all types and levels of school." Similarly, Hadis (2005) reported that the Ministry of Education and Culture has been cautious about the implementation of inclusive education because many controversies arose in society. As a result, a

variety of implementation factors must be considered, such as student input, curricula, teachers' and trainers' roles, facilities, funds, management, and the environment.

The majority of the research on inclusive education, as far as our study could discover, has been focused on the primary and secondary levels when examining school students, teacher's perceptions on inclusive education, and strategies applied in dealing with students who have special needs, whereas little research has studied situations for university students. In addition, for any level of schooling, no precise statistical data about students with disabilities was found, and this presents difficulties for revealing concerns and comparing alternative solutions. So now our research seeks to document and analyze the current policies for the educational rights of students with disabilities, in order to propose improvements, to study effectiveness of strategies, and to make refinements in the models for inclusive education.

UNESCO considers inclusive education to be a process of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all learners by means of increasing participation in schools, cultural environments, and communities and by reducing exclusion both from and within education venues. This involves changes and modifications in content, structures, approaches, and strategies, with a common vision to include all children of appropriate age range and with a conviction that the regular mainstream system is responsible for educating all children (Right to Education, 2017).

In the inclusion model, both special and general students are educated in the same classrooms for all courses, regardless of how severe the disability may be. Special education teachers come into the general education classrooms to assist the special education students with their academic needs. According to Mitchell (2006), full inclusion is established when a special needs student participates completely in a general education classroom in which special education services are implemented. By contrast, the traditional or "pull-out" model of special education service delivery involves removing students from the regular classroom settings in order to work on areas of deficit. This can mean that the special education student receives assistance in a resource room or in a classroom setting separately designated for special needs. Mitchell (2006) found that there were no significant differences between students in the inclusion model versus the traditional model and "...that inclusion should be concerned with making schools responsive to all students, not just those with special educational need arising from disabilities" (p. 2). The common thought is that the traditional model fails to provide students an education in the least restrictive environment. Zigmond and Baker (1995) found that students who were placed in an inclusive setting were not achieving at an acceptable rate, despite the push for students to be part of the inclusion model. According to Dyson (2005), students with disabilities in inclusive environments "improve in social interaction, language development, appropriate behavior, and self-esteem." However, concerns also exist that the academic performance of all students will decline because the teacher may spend too much time attending to struggling students, taking away from instructional time (Whittaker & Kenworthy, 2002).

It is understandable that the previous studies are concerned largely about classroom treatment and assistance, because the main problems faced by students with disabilities are their responses to teaching-learning processes and about their interactions with their classmates. Inclusive education may not be seen as a normal transmission of knowledge, due to the extra

requirement for careful management to meet the needs of disabled students. Accordingly, new approaches and models should be invented or further developed for coping with university students who differ in personal characteristics, social-cultural backgrounds, or religious affiliations. Our research therefore sought to review and analyze the existing conditions faced by the students with special needs and thereby to develop a new model of inclusive education in higher institutions and to shape the model to be appropriate for the students in Indonesia by holding a comparative investigation in Australia.

Based on our review of literature and our summary of theoretical discussions, our first research objective was to document and analyze the policy issues generated by governmental and university authorities towards the right to education and the use of inclusive practices for students with special needs. The next objectives were to compare and assess the effectiveness of various implementations and to develop a model for the education of students with special needs, considering the information from our research and from faculty who teach inclusive education related courses. The final goal has been two-fold, namely to recommend effective policy improvements that can be made by each country's government and to advise university authorities of policies, strategies, and models that can improve implementation of inclusive education for their students with special needs.

Method

Policy research

The research method applied in our study is a combination of policy research and case study. Policy research is scientific inquiry and investigation focusing on policies made by organizations and governments which direct their activities to attain goals (Midgley, 2009). Policy research is applied herein for systematic evaluation of the educational viability of alternative policies, implementation strategies, and consequences for policy adoption. It deals with the government regulations on education, especially for students with special needs, and with university authorities' strategies of inclusive practices (Lightful, 2009). Since such regulations and policies have already existed in both Indonesia and Australia, the policy analysis adopted in our research is *ex-post evaluation* of policy achievements and programs' effectiveness. The procedures used in policy analysis commonly consist of at least three steps which are relevant to our study: defining and analyzing the problems, developing evaluation criteria, and constructing and assessing policy alternatives.

Typically, such research focuses on finding the best formulation for inclusive education in higher institutions in Indonesia and Australia and attempts to analyze barriers which the students with special needs encounter. The study includes in its overall investigation the ways to persuade stakeholders by providing them with wider opportunities and access to education. A comprehensive analysis of problems will yield findings towards recommended alternative suggestions for implementing policies of inclusive education in higher education, both in Indonesia and Australia. Prior to this goal, we shall evaluate criteria and alternatives of thoughts towards improving inclusive education.

Case study

A case study is used herein for describing the nature of existing conditions of students with special needs, for identifying standards against which existing conditions can be compared, and for determining relationships that exist between specific events (Cohen & Manion, 1994). Sources of evidence for data collection in our study are interviews, on-site observation, and study of documents. Documentary research involves the use of texts and [documents](#) as source materials, and of the three major types of educational research, it arguably has been the most widely used throughout the history of education and social sciences. Therefore, our research tries to investigate printed materials, such as curricula, programs and activities, journals, encyclopedias and indexes, bibliographies, papers, newspapers, as well as non-printed materials, such as digital publications, the Internet, software, and various types of e-learning.

In a case study, people are asked a series of questions that may provide information concerning the research topic. “The case study is an in-depth form of research that may focus on a person, a group, a program, an organization, a time period... or a community” (Earnshaw, Firrek & Ruckdeschel, 1994; Dudley, 2005). In this context, our respondents are university and faculty leaders, lecturers, administrative officials, and students. They were interviewed and in some cases were given a set of questionnaires seeking their responses regarding attitudes, knowledge, and implementation strategies relevant to students with special needs. The university students with special needs were interviewed with the snowball technique of sampling to identify their problems and to identify others who could qualify for inclusion, continuing until the data were sufficient for analysis. Interviews were conducted through conversations. The overall goal of this technique was to gather general themes, where sample size is not strictly decided. Most respondents were chosen purposely within a specific community inside the campus. Also important is that convenience sampling method was applied.

Data collection

We collected data in four locations, namely two universities in Yogyakarta and two others in Sydney. We applied a purposive sampling via corresponding participants who knew about inclusive activities and practices as well as disability issues, and by which we planned to get a detailed understanding of other people’s perspectives (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Taylor & Bogdan, 1994). In Yogyakarta, we met with eight students with disabilities from whom we gathered data through focused group discussions. We did three interviews and two follow-ups to enable us to collect sufficient data. In addition, we met with a volunteer from whom we collected information about his/her wealth of experience, because we considered him/her as expert in disability. And in particular, at UIN Sunan Kalijaga we also investigated a series of journal articles on disability published by the Center for Disability Services (PLD) to extract findings related to policy, strategy, and teaching for students with disability at UIN Sunan Kalijaga. Many authors were students of UIN Sunan Kalijaga or of other universities who were writing graduating papers, theses, or dissertations on disability and inclusive education, and we considered these resources as secondary data. Also in Yogyakarta, we visited Pusat Studi Individu Berkebutuhan Khusus at Universitas Sanata Dharma, where we interviewed the manager and conducted a focus-group discussion with him/her and six volunteers at the center.

In Sydney we stayed for two weeks in two locations. The first week was at the University of Sydney, where we observed the environment of the School of Education and Social Work relative to the implementation and inclusive education life. At this place, we received Internet access to search for disability policies at this campus and in Australian higher education in general. During this first week we also visited Fisher Library to investigate activities and practices of inclusive education which have existed in Australia. These we considered secondary data, while the primary data was gained through interviewing two lecturers at the School of Education and Social Work, as they were our research partners. One of them has a specialization in special education, and he functioned as our research mentor, having conducted research and workshops on similar areas in Indonesia, Tanzania, and China. The other lecturer specializes in social work and has conducted field practicum projects in Yogyakarta and West Java. In addition, we visited the Student Support Services, where we did a focus-group discussion, and we visited the Center for Disability at the Medical School, where we discussed with its director about gathering data on students with intellectual disability. Such students take a certain number of courses in order to obtain employment. Then we attended a nighttime celebration in Sydney for persons with intellectual disability, as this event had a connection with the University of Sydney.

During the second week, we focused our data investigation at the Western Sydney campus. There we met with the person who was responsible for the students with disability located on Western Sydney's campus in Parramatta. We met this person for two interviews in order to get sufficient data, and we did a follow-up. And we found that the term 'disability' as she perceived it at University of Western Sydney now is not limited to a conventional definition, but it is also applied also to students who suffer from depression, mental health, Down's syndrome, or other personal problems that influence their social relationships. Therefore, the number of students who qualified to disability consideration each year at the University of Western Sydney could reach a thousand or more, since this is one of the biggest campuses in New South Wales.

Data analysis

Data analysis consisted of extraction of qualified chosen documents, fact findings, and interpretation of logical and policy analysis by using online databases, references, and sources prescribed in such printed and non-printed materials. The attempt to make the study conducive to such analysis can inhibit the development of other aspects of the study. In addition, Neuman (1997) has suggested specific methods for qualitative data analysis which include "the illustrative method, analytic comparison alternative, domain analysis, and ideal type" (p. 432). The illustrative method is used to lay a foundation of empirical evidence to develop theory. By this method, the researcher applies the theory of inclusion into the real setting as he or she observes, interviews, and studies documents related to the application of inclusive education on campuses in Indonesia and Australia. An analytic comparison is used in the research to compare policies and regularities relating to inclusive education in both countries. The goal is to discover both similar and contrasting patterns. Furthermore, domain analysis is applied to focus on domains in the cultural setting. Typically, Neuman (1997) defines such domains as themes that result from interpreting "a cultural scene or social setting" (p. 429). Finally, ideal type is applied as "mental abstractions of social relations or processes" (p. 432). Borrowing Weber's *ideal type*, Neuman (1997) summarizes that a researcher in context should draw conclusions after identifying what is

called ideal and what is reality. In this situation, the researcher weighs the ideals in theories of inclusive education in Indonesia and Australia as they are confronted by realities the researcher encounters in the field. Accordingly, the right implementation strategies, policies, and curriculum structures for inclusive practices to benefit university students with special needs are evaluated as to how they enhance the overall capacity for building social cohesion and for engaging effective involvement with teaching and learning processes.

Results and Discussion

The natural qualitative method took its settings at four campuses: two in Yogyakarta, namely UIN Sunan Kalijaga and Universitas Sanata Dharma and two in Sydney, namely the University of Sydney and the University of Western Sydney. Data collection was done by the researcher through individual and group interviews with students with disabilities, practitioners, and volunteers from these campuses. Pursuant to the task, we conducted an in-depth interview with seven students representing students with disabilities at UIN Sunan Kalijaga. Then we continued interviewing two volunteers who had been working during the last four years with disability and inclusive education matters, and we studied documents considered relevant to the policies, curricula, and teaching strategies at UIN Sunan Kalijaga, including a review of applicable journal articles. While data analysis was in progress, the researcher conducted a series of peer reviews with the participants and continued interviewing heads of the Student Support Centers at the University of Sydney and the University of Western Sydney. Also, we reviewed documents, such as books published in Indonesia or abroad, which we found credible to elucidate issues of disability and inclusive education.

The method of analysis in this report was synthesis via integrating our research results from the two cities and locating the themes and the research relevant to the research topic (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009; Wolcott, 2001). For this process the three focus topics were the policies for receiving students with disability, the teaching strategies, and the curriculum implementations.

Policies

The authorities of both Indonesia and Australia have enacted policies about the integrated schooling called inclusive education. The Indonesian government through Act No. 26 Year 2012 suggested that schools and educational institutions under the Department of Education and Culture should facilitate students with mild, medium, and severe disabilities to pursue education. Historically speaking, inclusive education has been considered special education and was implemented in schools commissioned by authorities as being for “special education” or “extraordinary education”. This model had existed at levels from elementary through higher education. However, the model of education had typically led to students with disabilities staying in their separate environment and limiting their social interactions due to lack of access to wider pursuits, such as intellectual abilities, socialization and adaptation to other cultures, and acquisition of new languages. This was different from policies that were being implemented in developed countries such as Singapore, Japan, the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, where student integration was encouraged by criteria that allow students with light and mild disability to be included in classrooms.

In Australia there are schools established specifically for physically handicapped students, and this has been the situation for decades. But new aspects in Australian schools are embracing the global procedures in which schools select student candidates based on the level of disability. A student assessed to be in the light or mild category will attend one of the fully inclusive schools, while a student with severe disability will attend a school specialized for persons with disabilities. This approach is being adapted by many universities, so that severe disability students can receive special training via programs like the one at the University of Sydney. Such students are called intellectual disability persons, and they participate in a special program with particular courses that provide preparation for obtaining employment.

Inclusive education in Australia has been practiced for twenty years. This can be seen in a variety of university practices. In Sydney, our research found that the University of Sydney's inclusive education has been implemented in both academic and non-academic activities. There are disability services to support students who have personal, social, cultural, or spiritual barriers during their studies (Foreman, 2000). The Student Support Center assesses students primarily during initial enrollment by providing greater opportunities for student candidates to disclose concerns about what disabilities they may possess. For those with problems, their visits to the Support Center office is encouraged by means of the information and the forms provided. This encouragement has led to group discussions at the Center, where students feel more free to discuss many issues. It was even found that many students during initial application for admission and during enrollment had not wanted to frankly disclose their problems due to fearing that they would not be admitted. Students would initially cover up what they felt and feared, but later they would experience the consequences of lack of support. Only then would they meet with the Student Support Center's counselors, who work with students to examine causes and find solutions. The Student Support Center stated that it has had thousands of students coming for assistance.

In terms of policies, it must be recognized that impediments begin even during the application process. In an interview at UIN Sunan Kalijaga, our research found that most respondents stated that the best thing about being at this university was that it was the only one that was willing to accept their applications. Most of these students had applied first to other state universities that were their favorites but had not been accepted. Some applied to many state universities but were not able to pass the required national examination. One respondent stated that he had applied to four different universities, and then when none accepted him, he opted for UIN Sunan Kalijaga as his last choice.

UIN Sunan Kalijaga has accommodated students with disabilities since 2005 with the goal of providing opportunities for everyone regardless of his or her background. In 2006, UIN Sunan Kalijaga established the Center for Disability Services (PLD) with the major aim of shadowing and monitoring the activities related to disability, and since that time the number of those students has increased every year. The founding fathers of the center have grappled with the fact that many buildings on campus should be built or modified to enable disabled student access. Modifications such as ramps would allow disabled students in wheelchairs to pass into and through classrooms, worship places, and locations such as bus stops, shops, banks, or food stalls. Although many ramps are available, no single disabled student could walk on the ramps because there are no railings to guide and guard them. The lack of safely navigable ramps and of elevators

prohibits many students with disabilities, and especially the blind at this campus, from using wheelchairs or canes to go from building to building or to access higher and lower floors of a building. Often the students with disabilities must rely on friends to guide them or even to leverage their wheelchairs to higher levels.

The finding at UIN differs from the one we found at Universitas Sanata Dharma. At this campus the authorities have applied policies that reduce burdens for students with disabilities. For example, lifts are available at the main building and at the adjacent buildings. In every lift a notice is posted to say that the lift is to be used only by the disabled and by staff and faculty. This has been a policy enacted by the university authority to accommodate their students with disabilities. Another accommodation observed was the existence of wide doors for access to toilet facilities and the designation of those installations as being provided especially for students with disabilities at Sanata Dharma.

A policy for traversing parking lots has not yet been implemented fully. Safety for students with disabilities is every day at odds with the parking needs among students who bring their own motor vehicles to campus. In the interviews and by observation, the plausibility of developing a policy for such coexistence seemed in doubt. Students with disabilities at UIN Sunan Kalijaga encounter movements by vehicles in the parking lots that decrease their mobility on campus. For example, various school policies at the university may change the parking area locations and pathways. Also, logs of bamboo which stand like fences may hinder disabled students' walking paths unexpectedly. Inconsistency in managing the environment may cause disorientation or even danger. There was even a report that a student with disability had fallen into a broken and uncovered drainage system while trying to avoid barriers on the street.

At universities such as Sanata Dharma, the idea of creating Pusat Studi Individu Berkebutuhan Khusus (PSIBK) came into realization in 2016; even earlier, in 2006, UIN Sunan Kalijaga had established the PLD. As a pioneer in disability studies in Indonesia, PLD has had challenges to surmount in finding the ideal model. It started with serving the blind students in terms of mobility, internet surfing at libraries and exam proctoring. Furthermore, the PLD has campaigned to develop the use of friendly inclusiveness practices among the faculty. This has been promoted through seminars, training, and teaching practice simulation. Therefore, since 2006, the UIN Sunan Kalijaga has increasingly been able to serve the disabled. All disabled who enrolled have been treated in helpful ways to provide accessibility and thereby foster a situation of objective assessment.

UIN Sunan Kalijaga with its inclusive paradigm has committed to having all academicians at this campus to be aware of disabilities, as they affect classrooms, academic services, library usage, extracurricular units, and social interaction. This paradigm is believed to be far better than one that tries to serve students with disabilities without changing the policies and the environmental practicalities on campus. The best campus is measured not only through the disabled students receiving services but also by academic personnel being aware of and knowledgeable about the issues of inclusiveness, so that all are responsive to disability. It is hoped that these practices will spread to the entire campus so that other units will function similarly and, consequently, the separate disabled services, such as PLD, will no longer be needed.

As of 2017 there were almost 80 students with disabilities at UIN Sunan Kalijaga, spread among all departments. Most of these students are blind; others are physically handicapped or deaf, and some have cerebral palsy and sensory disability. Creating a campus that can accommodate such diverse conditions is clearly not an easy task; accordingly, PLD has networked with regional and international NGOs. Some of these are Kerjabilitas and PERTUNI. From 2014 through 2017 there has also been a partnership with Academics without Borders, through which about 300 volunteers have worked toward the dream of inclusiveness on campus becoming reality.

This situation differs from Universitas Sanata Dharma, which has established the Pusat Studi Individu Berkebutuhan Khusus (PSIBK). PSIBK has 15 students with disabilities among all departments, and their disabilities are varied, physical and psychological. This is a good fit with the main objective of PSIBK, which more focuses on the psychology and education of individuals with special needs so that they can strengthen their own capacity and competency to teaching the deaf teachers in Indonesia. PSIBK has adopted a segregation paradigm, namely special treatment towards individuals with special needs, for both teaching and services. PSIBK uses the term “individual with special needs” overall, because everyone has different needs based on each person’s different ability and the best way for each person to adapt. This paradigm affects the policies that are needed for support.

Strategy of teaching

Policy at national and institutional levels must articulate practical strategies for the implementation of services to accommodate the varied needs of students with disabilities. There has been a notable strategy implemented at PLD of UIN Sunan Kalijaga, as compared to PSIBK at Universitas Sanata Dharna. UIN Sunan Kalijaga has set a paradigm for implementation of inclusive factors with steps that are intended to achieve campus-wise inclusivity. This approach not only serves disabled students via centralized policy but also advocates for subsidiary schools and units at the university to have their faculties take responsibility for inclusivity in teaching methodology and to have their departmental staff attuned to the obligation of serving such students. The task of PLD is to encourage all faculties and units to develop and understand the ways of teaching and delivering services that are suitable to the characteristics of students with disabilities. Such a strategy aims to foster an academic environment in which students with disabilities can study independently without relying so much on centralized aid from PLD. This can be better achieved when faculty and staff consider and understand the needs of the disabled.

While waiting for its campus to become fully inclusive, PLD gives direct services to the students with disabilities, such as providing those who are left in classrooms with sign-language interpreters and note-takers. Such partners can serve as stenographers for transcribing answers from the blind, low sensory, and cerebral palsy students when they must take written exams. And there is similar pairing in campus mobility partnerships for the physically handicapped. The partnership approach can also provide Internet surfing assistance for the blind. All services are done by a PLD volunteer group called “Sahabat Inklusi”, comprised of students from UIN Sunan Kalijaga and from other campuses. The helpers serve without seeking any financial gift or other tangible in return because PLD believes an earthly reward would taint the charitable actions. Furthermore, the volunteer helpers stated that they consider the disabled students as colleagues

and friends and that by offering their services free of charge, they are engaging in genuine benevolence. In fact, whenever disabled students offer to pay for the services, the volunteers object because they consider that their reward exists in creating an inclusive campus. This belief suggests that all students should voluntarily support the disabled as part of establishing an inclusive, multicultural, and friendly campus.

PSIBK at Universitas Sanata Dharma has focused on direct services such as advocacy for sign language, note-taking for the deaf, and similarly useful services for other types of disabilities among students. The PSIBK has officially sought to recruit students interested in giving services to the disabled students. Because PSIBK prefers to have a more professional approach, the Universitas Sanata Dharma pays each volunteer Rp 60.000 per hour. The intent is to enhance the quality of services, but this practice may not create an overall campus environment for inclusiveness since faculty and staff will have an assumption that students with disabilities are fully helped by PSIBK. This will result in most schools and units at the university feeling that they have no necessity or responsibility to make their own helpful changes for students with disabilities.

Making the campus inclusive and providing professional services are two different approaches. Inclusivity will cause a mainstream absorption of the status of the disabled as students in general because the goal is for everyone to be treated according to what he or she needs prior to encountering lecturers and university staff. Giving services professionally will tend to maintain labeling of students with disabilities because they are always treated differently, even with good intentions for the services. Perhaps the disabled students become reluctant to socialize with non-disabled students because services are only given by PSIBK. Certainly it is easier to give services directly to disabled students rather than establishing an overall culture of inclusiveness on campus. But academics suggest that creating campus-wide inclusivity can mean inclusive curricula, friendly services in every location, accessibility due to comprehensive policy, and mobility for everyone in and between all campus buildings.

Creating an inclusive campus is not so simple as we may imagine. PLD has existed for almost ten years with facilities it is allotted and with aid it receives. Yet there are still many complaints from disabled students. Many motorcycles and cars do not park in the proper lots, and this often negatively affects students with disabilities. The blind and the physically handicapped, especially, unintentionally touch or bump into vehicles that have been parked askew or in the wrong places. Also, since there still are no helpful signs attached to buildings, nor to classrooms, there is frequent confusion for the students with disabilities in trying to move and walk on campus. Another issue is that traditional lectures spoken aloud or using audiovisual media become an impediment for deaf or blind students and can also diminish their ability to interact or ask questions during the lectures. Many schools and units are not fully equipped to make the teaching processes friendly for people with disability. The efforts towards cultural change still face challenging situations despite a relatively long time during which efforts have been tried, such as regional and international seminars on disability issues, workshops for teaching inclusivity to lecturers, service training for units on the campus, and other social actions to encourage and implement inclusiveness.

Research journals are indicators of the ability and the efforts to address such issues, and when the very qualified and well-reputed journals include articles on disability and on inclusion, there can be wider understanding of such topics. PLD UIN Sunan Kalijaga has published the *Inklusi Journal* since 2014, with two editions in a year and with six to eight articles per edition. The journal was accredited in 2018 and is already considered to be influential in actively and consistently contributing to the advancement of disability studies. In addition, this journal is the first to address disability in Indonesia, differing from PSIBK at Universitas Sanata Dharma, which has not established their own journal yet. However, PSIBK is active with articles published in other journals and by posting items sourced from theory, prior practices, opinions, and clippings on its website.

In Australia the inclusive education is academically practiced by informing all students through enrichment materials about respecting disabled students, and these materials are provided by all faculty to the students. This method of disseminating information has long been afforded overall in the university, and it also helps all faculty to be knowledgeable. At the University of Sydney and at Western Sydney University, there has been established in every department a role designated as “faculty champion on disability issues”. Duties include raising awareness and empathy in support of student candidates. Many such applicants have gone through the admissions office, yet they may not understand fully what they will need in student life and what the drawbacks will be. Interviews with officials at the Student Support System revealed that there are more than a thousand students categorized with disability. Social and peer support is needed at the departmental level, where there is closer contact and knowledge about the nature of student needs. The faculties involved in each department committee usually discuss what strategies they might adopt in their teaching to deal with students with special needs. From this, a more inclusive education emerges with a view that in each classroom there can be ways to minimize factors that unintentionally maintain discrimination. Faculty efforts are considered, such as clear explanation in syllabi showing important resources on campus for students with special needs. Therefore, no matter what class a student attends, they will learn of and be reminded of the sources of help on campus, such as a writing center, a center for learning, a student counseling center, or a career planning center.

This research suggested that teachers should use effective strategies for classroom teaching on campuses, and they should favor a student-centered approach. Teachers’ role as instructors becomes a role as facilitators or guides or consultants during their lecturing. Also, the research suggested that the syllabi may have most of the students’ grades being based on research projects rather than on conventional examinations. Even so, there must be an awareness that today’s multicultural and inclusive classrooms may mistakenly result in students with special needs having insufficient guidance if the goal is simply the expectation of being accepted by their peers. Adjustments are needed in such an approach. Outside of the classroom, students with special needs are given the freedom to seek volunteers and shadowers whose help is importantly needed to aid their understanding.

Curriculum implementation

Curriculum is a complex aspect in determining the quality of a university. When the university has designed its curriculum for universal and inclusive reasons, then the process of

learning is accessible and productive, producing inclusive outcomes. An inclusive curriculum is not only one that adds more courses about inclusivity or disability but also one in which the teaching methods allow curriculum content to be accessed and understood by all students. Engaging students with disabilities fully in every course is important, so that there is an equal justice status among both the disabled students and the others (Skubikowski, Wright, & Graf, 2009). The Indonesian legal act has stated that universities providing teacher education should have courses on inclusive education in their curricula. New policies on higher education related to inclusive education suggest that the aim is to give early understanding to teacher candidates so that they can learn both the concept of inclusive education and the practical experiences that strengthen inclusivity. These policies are implemented in Indonesian universities, including UIN Sunan Kalijaga and Universitas Sanata Dharma. The School of Islamic Education and Teacher Training of UIN Sunan Kalijaga has taught an inclusive education course since 2013 as an elective. Recently it has become a required course. The School of Education and Teacher Training at Universitas Sanata Dharma has a similar requirement. Their course is valued at two credits, and it comprises both the theory of disability and the practice of inclusive education. This model of teaching inclusivity is comprehensive so that students gain full understanding.

PLD of UIN Sunan Kalijaga usually does a road-show to visit every school each semester in order to encourage inclusive education and to call for faculty to customize their syllabi to be more inclusive. Many faculty have consulted about their syllabi with PLD, and this has resulted in their courses gaining enrollment among students with disabilities. Curriculum accessibility can be achieved via content, media, or strategy, and these three components can be interwoven according to the needs of students. Such efforts are part of creating an inclusive university. By contrast, at PSIBK of Universitas Sanata Dharma the focus is on professional services and on clinical issues to serve individuals, rather than on having the schools and departments as part of the process in accommodating disability. And there are specific faculty appointed by PSIBK to deal with students with disabilities who face difficulties in their studies. There are also many programs run by the PSIBK such as partnering with students who have special needs, conducting seminars with academics about understanding disabilities, and sharing experiences with organizations inside or outside the campus (PSIBK, 2020).

Conclusions

Based on the discussions, we concluded that Indonesian and Australian universities have been innovative in their processes to achieve inclusiveness on campus. Over the past ten years, UIN Sunan Kalijaga has pioneered inclusive education by facilitating disabled students, primarily the blind and the vision-impaired, to have volunteer assistants. The disabled students thereby have support, such as brochures, awareness, support, and Braille assistants during visits to the library. The situation is similar at Universitas Sanata Dharma. PSIBK has been able to pave the way towards professional inclusive education whereby student volunteers can be paid at a student rate. This is in contrast with volunteers at UIN Sunan Kalijaga, who work without receiving wages. Even so, at UIN Sunan Kalijaga the aid offered by volunteers is abundant because many students are self-motivated to help their peers, especially the disabled. And at UIN the number of

volunteers is near 80 now. This is a fantastic number compared to other campuses in Indonesia and even in Australia.

Inclusive education is defined as integrating students of all backgrounds into classrooms, regardless of race, ethnicity, language, culture, and academic or physical ability. An inclusive campus is open and supportive for anyone to learn there. The implication of the definition may be that UIN Sunan Kalijaga has long been an inclusive campus for anyone to be admitted for study. But its policy then has been slow to fully become a model for campus inclusivity. In Australia, our observations found that policies on inclusive education have been instituted on almost all campuses, yet we rarely saw anyone disabled on campus. Policies at Australian campuses only recently have indicated that disability should be considered to include not only overt physical handicaps but also many less visible, yet challenging, physical and psychological needs. This finding is important to our study in light of our finding that in Indonesia the definition of the word “disability” is rendered as a narrower meaning and may overlook psychological barriers that students encounter, such as depression and lack of self-esteem.

In terms of inclusive classrooms, many faculty have not yet been fully aware of the presence of disabled students. Our research found many faculty who assumed that in their classrooms, the disabled ought not to feel psychological burdens. Accordingly, faculty sometimes assess achievement mostly based on sympathy and discretion. But faculty can provide more constructive responses, such as giving disabled students homework. This seems to be true because their status is “student” and therefore they participate in the responsibility for doing assignments. Some faculty increasingly realize, from having taught disabled students in class, that they should change their teaching strategies. For example, when using Power Point slides, teachers may be unaware of whether all their students have normal vision. A student with impaired or zero vision cannot benefit fully from such presentations, even due to such moments as when the teacher explains a slide, yet says only “this” or “that” in the verbalized reference. Many teachers fail to consider that vision-impaired students may hear such explanations yet not be able distinguish which items are being explained. In Australia, the classrooms have been structured in a such way that students are facilitated to bring attention to such issues so that there will be discussions in school committees to determine better teaching strategies. Indeed, many disabled students there do become proactive in bringing concerns to faculty. Many also use the Student Support Center for assistance, and the faculty syllabi include information on resources that students with disabilities can use in order to succeed in their studies. Also, faculty do not change the quality of their teaching as it used to be; instead, the students are encouraged to adjust their learning styles based on circumstances. Because of this, they become active in seeking helpers, learning support, and peers.

The curricula of inclusive education in Indonesia and Australia are not specific because anyone with his or her background may enroll in regular classes, and everyone is accorded their rights and is responsible to fulfill his or her obligation. In this context, hidden curricula should also be considered. Our findings show that universities have determined policies and standards in teaching with no reduction and accommodation unless there is discretion from particular faculty due to recognition of such circumstances. UIN Sunan Kalijaga’s curriculum adopted the interconnection of multiple disciplines that requires one to learn a variety of materials. This is similar to the curriculum at Universitas Sanata Dharma as well as the one at the University of Sydney and the University of Western Sydney. UIN Sunan Kalijaga encourages students to be

volunteers for disabled students, and its PLD plays a role as facilitator. The implication for inclusive education is that both syllabi and instructional materials should be designed to be adaptable to their full audience. Therefore, all faculty should consider locations, content, and purposes in their syllabi and associated course materials. Other considerations include options for suitable locales and for resources to enable faculty to have the ability to adapt their methods and choices appropriate to rooms and to ability of the faculty. This study concludes that such procedures can impact how well the curricula can attract and serve students with disabilities. The goal is to make improvements that enhance flexibility, responsibility, and inclusivity in university education for the students with disabilities.

References

- Acts 1997. UU Penyandang Cacat No. 4.
- Acts 2012. UU Penyediaan Fasilitas bagi Individu Berkebutuhan Khusus No. 26.
- Acts 2016. UU Tentang Jaminan Pendidikan dan Akses No. 8.
- Adams, M., & Brown, S. (2006). Introduction. In M. Adams & S. Brown (Eds.), *Towards inclusive learning in higher education: Developing curricula for disabled students* (pp. 1-9). London: Routledge.
- Andayani, & Ro'fah. (2014). Strategi pembelajaran adaptif untuk statistik. *Inklusi: Journal of Disability Studies*, 1(1), 83-108.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bosi, W. (2004). The pilot implementation of inclusive education in Malaysia, *Dissertation*, Massey University North Shore Auckland, New Zealand.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Cornish, L. (2017). Australian aid's innovative approach to education in Indonesia. *Inside Development/Australian Aid*. Available in <https://www.devex.com/news/australian-aid-s-innovative-approach-to-education-in-indonesia-91524>
- Dudley, J.R. (2005). *Research methods for social work: Becoming consumers and producers of research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Dyson, A. (2005). Philosophy, politics and economics? The story of inclusive education in England. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Contextualizing inclusive education: Evaluating old and new international perspectives* (pp. 63-88). London: Routledge.
- Earnshaw, P., Firrek, A., & Ruckdeschel, R. (1994). The qualitative case study and evaluation: Issues, methods, and examples. In E. Sherman & W. J. Reid (Eds.), *Qualitative research social work* (pp. 251-278). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fikri, A. (2014). Partisipasi politik masyarakat difabel dalam pembentukan kebijakan pendidikan tinggi inklusif. *Inklusi Journal of Disability Studies*, 1(1), 110-128.
- Foreman, P. (Ed.). (2000). *Integration and inclusion in action*. Sydney: Harcourt.

- Friend, M., & Bursuck, W.D. (2015). *Menuju pendidikan inklusif: Panduan praktis untuk mengajar*. Terj. Annisa Nuriowandari. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Garnida, D. (2015). *Pengantar pendidikan inklusif*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Hadis, F.A. (2005). Toward inclusive education in Indonesia: A country report. Paper Presented at Seisa University, Ashibetsu-shi Hokkaido Japan, July 9, 2005. Available in <http://new-indonesia.org/beranda/images/upload/dok/sdgs/>
- Ilahi, M.T. (2013). *Pendidikan inklusif: Konsep dan aplikasi*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Lessy, Z., Kailani, N., & Jahidin, A. (2021). Barriers to employment as experienced by disabled university graduates in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review*, 15(2), 133-144. <https://org.doi/10.1111/aswp.12226>
- Lightful, E. (2009). Social policies for people with disabilities. In J. Midgley & M. Livermore (Eds.), *The handbook of social policy* (pp. 445-462). Los Angeles: Sage.
- McNary, S.J., Glasgow, N.A., & Hicks, C.D. (2005). *What successful teachers do in inclusive classrooms: Research-based teaching strategies that help special learners succeed*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
- Midgley, J. (2009). The definition of social policy. In J. Midgley & M. Livermore (Eds.), *The handbook of social policy* (pp. 3-20). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Ministry of Education & Culture. (2018). Desain pengembangan pendidikan inklusif nasional 2019-2014. Available in <https://www.jogloabang.com/pendidikan/desain-pengembangan-pendidikan-inklusif-nasional-2019-2024>
- Ministry of Health. (2015). *Situasi penyandang disabilitas*. Jakarta: Kementerian Kesehatan.
- Mitchell, D. (2006). Sixteen prepositions on the contexts of inclusive education. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Contextualizing inclusive education: Evaluating old and new international perspectives* (pp. 1-21). London: Routledge.
- Mittler, P. (2005). The global context of inclusive education. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Contextualizing inclusive education* (pp. 22-36). London: Routledge.
- Neuman, W.L. (1997). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Olson, J.L., & Platt, J.M. (1992). *Teaching children and adolescents with special needs*. Upper Saddle River: Merrill.
- Pusat Layanan Difabel. (2020). Profil: Pusat Layanan Difabel UIN Sunan Kalijaga. Available in <http://pld.uin-suka.ac.id/p/profil.html>
- Pusat Studi Individu Berkebutuhan Khusus. (2020). Kategori archive kegiatan. Available in <https://www.usd.ac.id/pusat/psibk/category/kegiatan/>
- Race, D.G. (2002). *Introduction*. In D.G. Race (Ed.), *Learning disability: A social approach* (pp. 1-4). London: Routledge.

- Right to Education. (2017). The right to education for persons with disabilities. Available in unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002325/232592E.pdf
- Rosita, N. (2015). Peran relawan terhadap kemandirian difabel di PLD UIN Sunan Kalijaga. *Inklusi Journal of Disability Studies*, 2(2), 223-220.
- Rustemier, S. (2002). Inclusion informative guide. Available in <http://inclusion.uwe.ac.uk/csie/inclusionguide.htm>
- Skubikowski, K., Wright, C., & Graf, R. (2009). *Social justice education: Inventing faculty to transform their institutions*. Sterling: Stylus Publishing.
- Smith, D.J. (2015). *Sekolah inklusif: Konsep dan penerapan pembelajaran*. Trans. Denis and Enrica. Bandung: Nuansa Cendana.
- Tarsidi, D. (2015). *Inclusive education in Indonesia*. Available in <http://d-tarsidi.blogspot.com/2015/11/inclusive-education-in-indonesia.html>
- Taylor, S.J., & Bogdan, R. (1994). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meaning*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- UNICEF. (2015). Fixing the broken promise of education for all: Findings from the global initiative on out-of-school children. Available in http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/fixing-broken-promise-efa-findings-global-initiative-oosc-education-2015-en_2.pdf
- Whittaker, J., & Kenworthy, J. (2002). *Education services: Why segregated special schools must close*. In D.G. Race (Ed.), *Learning disability: A social approach* (pp. 68-84). London: Routledge.
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S.G. (2009). *Research methods in education: An introduction*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Wolcott, H.F. (2001). *Writing up qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Zigmond, N., & Baker, J.M. (1995). An exploration of the meaning and practice of special education in the context of full inclusion of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Special Education*, 29(2), 1-25.