



Integrated School-Based Support for Students with Disabilities in Indonesia

Ali Fauzi*, **Atok Miftachul Hudha**, and **Daroe Iswatiningsih**

To cite this article: A. Fauzi, A. M. Hudha, and D. Iswatiningsih, “Integrated School-Based Support for Students with Disabilities in Indonesia,” *Women, Educ. Soc. Welf.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 1162–1172, 2026.
<https://doi.org/10.70211/wesw.v3i3.562>



Published online: September 29, 2026



Submit your article to this journal



View crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<https://journal.wiseedu.co.id/index.php/jiswel/about>



Integrated School-Based Support for Students with Disabilities in Indonesia

Ali Fauzi*, Atok Miftachul Hudha, and Daroe Iswatiningsih

Received: June 12, 2026

Revised: July 11, 2026

Accepted: September 22, 2026

Online: September 26, 2026

Abstract

Inclusive schooling requires coordinated support beyond classroom placement, yet evidence on how Indonesian secondary schools organize these services remains limited. This qualitative case study examines the School Cares for Exceptional Children Program (SPAHE; Indonesian: Program Sekolah Peduli Anak Hebat) at Muhammadiyah 10 Senior High School (SMA Muhammadiyah 10 Surabaya). Data were collected through interviews, classroom and extracurricular observations, and school documents and analyzed through data reduction, thematic display, and verification. School records identified 105 students receiving SPAHE services in 2025/2026: 27 in support clusters 1-2, 46 in cluster 3, and 32 in cluster 4. The service model integrates religious, emotional, social, and health support; sport, art, and entrepreneurship; career preparation; adapted academic learning; and parent and community engagement. Practices included flexible instructional materials, regular parent consultation, peer participation, university and employer partnerships, and opportunities in arts, sports, and work. Individualized teaching and access to placements remained difficult. The findings describe how one school coordinated services for participation and post-school opportunity; they do not establish causal effects. The case indicates the value of coordinated support across school, family, professional, and community actors and the need for direct student perspectives and longitudinal outcome tracking.

Keywords: Inclusive Education; Disability; School Support; Social Participation; Career Transition; Indonesia.

Publisher's Note:

WISE Pendidikan Indonesia stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright:

©

2026 by the author(s).

License WISE Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education is a question of access, participation and support across a student's school life. A systematic review found no uniform advantage or disadvantage of placement alone across academic and psychosocial outcomes, underscoring the importance of implementation conditions [1]. Students in secondary schools identify relationships, teaching practices, leadership and accessibility as central to their experiences [2]. Syntheses of young people's accounts similarly show that being present in a mainstream setting does not guarantee a sense of belonging or meaningful participation [3].

Support needs extend beyond lessons. A review across countries locates barriers in schools, communication between families and teachers, service availability and policy arrangements [4]. Evidence on interventions in lower-resource settings is uneven and context-dependent [5]. An Indonesian literature review identifies continuing implementation gaps [6], while a later review highlights management and professional-capacity constraints [7]. A design study in Indonesia likewise emphasizes adapting instruction to student needs [8]. Teachers commonly request professional learning, personnel and workable resources to enact inclusion [9].

Secondary schooling adds demands associated with subject specialization and transitions beyond school [10]. Differentiation and individualization require coordinated decisions about teaching and assessment rather than a single technique [11]. Individual education plans may organize goals, but the quality and use of their contents warrant scrutiny [12]. Family partnership also needs institutional arrangements that make parents active participants [13]. Research on teacher readiness in Indonesia and across Asian settings points to the role of institutional support and variation in professional preparation, although those studies did not evaluate SPAH or disability services directly [14], [15], [16].

Existing scholarship therefore identifies individual, relational, and organizational dimensions of inclusion, but offers less detail on how they are integrated within locally developed secondary-school programs. This article examines how SPAH at Muhammadiyah 10 Senior High School organizes services for students with disabilities, the opportunities and constraints documented in the study, and the limits of inference from a single school. The unit of analysis is the program as a service arrangement rather than its treatment effectiveness. Research on inclusive school leadership provides a framework for interpreting school-level coordination [17].

METHODS

Research design and setting

This descriptive qualitative case study examines SPAH at Muhammadiyah 10 Senior High School (SMA Muhammadiyah 10 Surabaya), Indonesia. Interviews, observations, and school records were used to describe the program within its institutional setting. School documents covered 2023 and the 2025/2026 academic year. The study report did not specify the fieldwork dates, total number of interviewees, or duration of observation.

Participants, sources and data collection

Stakeholders directly involved in SPAH were selected purposively. Semi-structured interviews addressed program planning, services, challenges, and perceived contributions. Table 1 presents the data-source codes used in the study. Participants included the principal, SPAH coordinator, special education and regular teachers, and parents; the number interviewed in each category was not reported. School records identified students with codes S1-S105, but the study did not include direct student interviews. Observations covered classroom interactions and extracurricular activities. Documents comprised program profiles, student data, service guidelines, and achievement records.

Table 1. Data-source codes and analytical focus

Code	Source	Focus
W-KS	Principal interview	Inclusive policy and program direction
W-KSPAH	SPAH coordinator interview	Program design, implementation and evaluation
W-GPK	Special education teacher interview	Assessment and individual support
W-GR	Regular teacher interview	Instructional adaptation and interaction
W-OT	Parent interview	Child development and family involvement
O-KL	Classroom and service observation	Participation and modified instruction
O-EK	Extracurricular observation	Talent and social development
D-SPAH	School documents	Profiles, data, guidelines and activities
D-PRES	Achievement records	Arts, sports, careers and enterprise

Analysis, trustworthiness and ethics

Analysis involved iterative data reduction, organization in descriptive categories, and conclusion drawing with continuing verification. The nine themes are presented in Table 3. Interview accounts, observed practices, and documents were compared for triangulation. The study report did not specify the transcript corpus, coding-team procedures, treatment of discrepant cases, software, or respondent validation. It also did not provide an ethics approval identifier or describe the consent and assent procedures. Student names were replaced with source codes, although the school remained identifiable.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Program scale and needs-based grouping

School records showed that 99 of 948 students received disability-related services in 2023 and 105 of 1,000 students in 2025/2026. These counts represent two reported time points rather than an evaluated trend. In 2025/2026, the three service groupings totaled 105 students: 27 in clusters 1-2, 46 in cluster 3, and 32 in cluster 4 (Table 2). The principal described the school as inclusive since 2017 and reported that 70% of its curriculum structure focused on talent

development and 30% on academic potential enhancement. These percentages reflect the principal's account and were not independently audited as curriculum allocation or measured instructional time.

Table 2. Student grouping in the 2025/2026 school records

Service cluster	Student codes	n	Description of support needs
1–2	S1–S27	27	Mild to moderate support needs; examples include learning difficulties, mild autism, sensory disability, cerebral palsy and mild intellectual disability
3	S28–S73	46	Moderate needs; examples include intellectual disability, autism, cerebral palsy, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and combined developmental disability
4	S74–S105	32	High needs; examples include severe or profound intellectual disability, autism with severe intellectual disability and Down syndrome

Integrated service components

SPAH comprised five components. Religious-Emotional-Social-Health-Supporting (RESHES) combined relationships with teachers, the "Guardian Angel" peer community, and professional assessment and support. Sport-Art-Entrepreneur (SAE) directed identified interests toward extracurricular teachers and mentors and provided activities alongside other students. Career Class (CC) organized parent seminars, sign-language learning, workshops, higher-education pathways, and links with employers. Fun Academic (FA) involved flexible methods, adapted materials, and attention to comfort during learning. Parent-Society (PS) comprised parent consultation every three months, informal messages and groups, progress information through the school website and e-learning system, workshops, and community forums. These descriptions were synthesized from interviews, observations, and documents; dosage and coverage data were not reported.

Institutional partnerships and transition opportunities

Documented higher-education partners included Surabaya State University, Airlangga University, Brawijaya University, and 17 Agustus 1945 University. Employer and community partners included Kedai Kopi Rame, Yamaha Machine Shop Kenjeran Surabaya, local caterers, and the spah.catering platform. School records and informant accounts described internships and jobs in data entry, restaurants, groundskeeping, and other roles, as well as awards in music, poetry, visual art, dance, and woodball. The records did not report the number of distinct students associated with each outcome or comparable data from before SPAH. These examples therefore demonstrate opportunities available through the program rather than estimates of program impact.

Participation and implementation constraints

Observations documented joint showcases, festivals, and extracurricular participation by students with and without disabilities. Study participants also described difficulty matching individualized methods to diverse needs and limited business acceptance of students with intellectual disabilities in internships and employment. Table 3 presents the study's theme structure, distinguishing support processes, opportunities, and unresolved constraints.

Table 3. Themes identified through qualitative analysis

Theme	Finding
T1	Inclusive policy and school commitment
T2	Needs assessment and cluster grouping
T3	Religious, emotional, social and health support
T4	Arts, sports and entrepreneurship
T5	Career classes and transition
T6	Engaging and adapted academic learning
T7	Parent and community involvement
T8	Reported achievements and participation
T9	Individualization and work-transition challenges

Discussion

School-level coordination and inclusive leadership

This case shows how one school linked assessment and grouping with emotional support, teaching, talent development, family contact, and post-school options. The school's reported zero-rejection policy addressed admission, while comparative policy research cautions that admission rules require implementation to produce meaningful inclusion [18]. Studies of school principals [19] and transformative leadership [20] indicate that organizational coherence and staff learning matter. Evidence on instructional leadership and school climate [21] supports examining the conditions in which teachers implement the service model. The present data identify organizational components and perceived practices but do not support causal attribution of student outcomes.

Participation, belonging and psychological safety

The distinction between attendance and participation is central to interpreting the program. An Indonesian mixed-methods study found participation differences between students with special educational needs and their peers [22]. Classroom-network research connects belonging with peer relationships [23], while friendship-network research shows why teachers' and students' perspectives should be examined together [24]. A Malaysian study of peer-seating groups illustrates how immediate peer arrangements may affect participation [25]. Research on autistic students likewise distinguishes friendships, interaction, acceptance, and self-perception [26]. SPAH's joint performances and Guardian Angel arrangement created settings for participation, but the study did not measure student-reported belonging.

Psychological safety likewise requires cautious interpretation. A review of school-based anti-bullying approaches for pupils with disabilities shows that protective practices require deliberate design and evaluation [27]. School mental-health screening research

documents the institutional work required to implement support [28]. In the present case, informants described supportive relationships and no rigid segregation during observed activities; these observations do not demonstrate reductions in bullying or distress. Research on secondary-teacher attitudes [29] and disability-oriented teacher preparation [30] identifies relevant staff-development issues that were not evaluated in this study.

Instructional adaptation and staff capacity

Instructional adaptation was reported through flexible materials rather than a standardized intervention. Research on collaboration among teachers supporting learners with visual impairments illustrates why individual adjustments depend on communication and shared capacity [31]. Scholarship on differentiated instruction [32] and specially designed instruction [33] distinguishes general flexibility from documented individual goals. Work on teachers' self-efficacy and perceived school climate [34] further suggests that training should be examined alongside institutional conditions. Evaluation would require records of assessments, individual goals, adaptations delivered, and progress indicators for each cluster; the study did not provide these data.

Family participation and transition planning

The Parent-Society component combined scheduled consultations with informal communication. Research from Malawi shows that parent involvement in disability education is shaped by practical and relational barriers [35]. Parent perspectives on pre-employment services similarly underscore the value of asking families about transition priorities [36]. The study reported the frequency of formal consultation but did not measure the extent, accessibility, or perceived quality of family participation. Future evaluation should use accessible feedback channels and gather direct input from parents and students across clusters.

The career component connected school services with universities and employers, a welfare-relevant dimension of secondary inclusion. A systematic review of initiatives for people with intellectual disabilities identifies factors across individuals, schools, and workplaces [37]. Research on skills-development pathways cautions that nominal access does not resolve labor-market barriers [38]. A scoping review of higher-education access documents the need to examine aspirations and accommodations from students' perspectives [39]. The reported employment examples and named partners demonstrate existing connections, while difficulty securing placements for students with intellectual disabilities remains a priority for transition planning. Community-development research likewise emphasizes governance and coordination in sustaining participation [40].

CONCLUSION

SPAH at Muhammadiyah 10 Senior High School was organized as a five-component service model linking student grouping, psychosocial support, talent development, adapted learning, family engagement, and transition opportunities. School records identified 105 students across three service groupings in 2025/2026. Interviews, observations, and documents described participation opportunities as well as persistent difficulty with individualized instruction and employment access. The study contributes a context-specific account of an integrated school

arrangement. Evidence supports conclusions about service organization, but claims of improved academic, psychosocial, or employment outcomes require direct student evidence and longitudinal measurement.

LIMITATIONS

This single-school qualitative case cannot establish causality or statistical generalizability. The study report did not specify participant counts, observation duration, fieldwork dates, full instruments, independent coding checks, consent and ethics documentation, or comparable pre- and post-program outcomes. Because the school is named despite the use of student codes, the authors must review disclosure risks. Achievements were reported as examples without denominators. Student perspectives and gender-disaggregated information were absent, preventing analysis of whether participation and benefits differed by gender or disability profile. Future research should document accessible student and family perspectives, implementation fidelity, disaggregated access and participation, and post-school trajectories.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

Ali Fauzi – Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang (Indonesia);

 orcid.org/0009-0002-5419-4106

Email: alfafauzi80@gmail.com

Authors

Ali Fauzi – Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang (Indonesia);

 orcid.org/0009-0002-5419-4106

Atok Miftachul Hudha – Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang (Indonesia);

 orcid.org/0000-0002-5525-8178

Daroe Iswatiningsih – Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang (Indonesia);

 orcid.org/0000-0002-1982-4312

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

A.F. Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, data curation, formal analysis, and writing - original draft. A.T.H. Supervision, validation, and writing - review and editing. D.I. Interpretation, validation, and writing - review and editing. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript and accept responsibility for the published work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

DECLARATION OF USE OF AI IN SCIENTIFIC WRITING

ChatGPT (OpenAI) was used during manuscript revision for language editing, structural consistency checks, and reference-format review. The authors verified all scientific content, analyses, interpretations, and citations and accept full responsibility for the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. T. Dalgaard et al., “The effects of inclusion on academic achievement, socioemotional development and wellbeing of children with special educational needs,” *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1291>
- [2] P. Subban et al., “Student experiences of inclusive education in secondary schools: A systematic review of the literature,” *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103853>
- [3] T. Paul et al., “Perspectives of children and youth with disabilities and special needs regarding their experiences in inclusive education: A meta-aggregative review,” *Frontiers in Education*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.864752>
- [4] K. Bani Odeh and L. M. Lach, “Barriers to, and facilitators of, education for children with disabilities worldwide: A descriptive review,” *Frontiers in Public Health*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1294849>
- [5] M. M. Mendoza et al., “Implementation of inclusive education: A systematic review of studies of inclusive education interventions in low- and lower-middle-income countries,” *International Journal of Disability Development and Education*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2022.2095359>
- [6] S. V. N. Rante et al., “Far from expectation: A systematic literature review of inclusive education in Indonesia,” *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.082273>
- [7] F. Setiawan and T. Tohari, “Inclusive education management in Indonesia: A literature analysis of policies and implementation practices,” *Journal Corner of Education Linguistics and Literature*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v5i001.569>
- [8] H. Mansur et al., “Development of inclusive education learning design in the era of Society 5.0,” *Social Sciences*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12010035>
- [9] W. S. E. Chow, K. de Bruin, and U. Sharma, “A scoping review of perceived support needs of teachers for implementing inclusive education,” *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2023.2244956>
- [10] G. Koutsouris et al., “Do we have to rethink inclusive pedagogies for secondary schools? A critical systematic review of the international literature,” *British Educational Research Journal*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3926>
- [11] K.-T. Lindner and S. Schwab, “Differentiation and individualisation in inclusive education: A systematic review and narrative synthesis,” *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1813450>
- [12] J. W. McKenna, M. Solis, J. Garwood, and M. Parenti, “Characteristics of individualized education programs for students with learning disabilities: A systematic

- review,” *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07319487231182697>
- [13] M. Hyassat et al., “Special education teachers’ perceptions of parental involvement in inclusive education,” *Education Sciences*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030294>
- [14] R. Sari and M. N. I. Saleh, “Rasch model application: Instrument development of readiness to conduct inclusive learning,” *Psymphatic Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v9i2.10058>
- [15] M. Aridan et al., “Pre-service language teachers’ readiness for deep learning approaches: Insights from a cross-regional study in Asia,” *LLT Journal*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v28i2.12274>
- [16] Pahrudin et al., “Teacher readiness for deep learning in Islamic education: A Rasch model analysis of challenges and opportunities,” *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v19i4.9573>
- [17] D. E. DeMatthews, A. Serafini, and T. N. Watson, “Leading inclusive schools: Principal perceptions, practices, and challenges to meaningful change,” *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20913897>
- [18] M. Chin, “The Zero Reject policy: A way forward for inclusive education in Malaysia?,” *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1846800>
- [19] S. Sider et al., “Inclusive school leadership: Examining the experiences of Canadian school principals in supporting students with special education needs,” *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12515>
- [20] S. Carrington et al., “Evidence of transformative leadership for inclusive practice,” *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104466>
- [21] V. Dutta and S. Sahney, “Relation of principal instructional leadership, school climate, teacher job performance and student achievement,” *Journal of Educational Administration*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-01-2021-0010>
- [22] L. Wilson and W. S. S. Pandia, “Social participation differences between SEN and TD student in Indonesian inclusive primary school: A mixed method study,” *Journal of Education for Sustainability and Diversity*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.57142/jesd.v3i1.104>
- [23] S. Freire et al., “Classroom social networks, students’ peer-related social experiences and sense of belonging: The specific case of students with SEN,” *British Educational Research Journal*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3989>
- [24] S. Schwab et al., “Social participation in the context of inclusive education: Primary school students’ friendship networks from students’ and teachers’ perspectives,” *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1961194>
- [25] H. Hosshan et al., “Peer-seating groups and social participation by students with learning disabilities in full-inclusion in Malaysian secondary schools,” *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1973125>

- [26] C. Mamas et al., "Social participation of students with autism spectrum disorder in general education settings," *Learning Culture and Social Interaction*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2020.100467>
- [27] J. Badger, A. Nisar, and R. P. Hastings, "School-based anti-bullying approaches for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities: A systematic review and synthesis," *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12665>
- [28] E. H. Connors et al., "Advancing mental health screening in schools: Innovative field-tested practices and observed trends during a 15-month learning collaborative," *Psychology in the Schools*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22670>
- [29] M. Mouchritsa et al., "Teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education at Greek secondary education schools," *Education Sciences*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12060404>
- [30] L. Sollenberger, "Integrating disability into equity-focused general education teacher preparation," *Frontiers in Education*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1372380>
- [31] M. Manis et al., "Overcoming the challenges of including learners with visual impairments through teacher collaborations," *Education Sciences*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14111217>
- [32] D. S. Devi, "Differentiated instruction in special education: Meeting diverse needs in the classroom," *Global International Research Thoughts*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.36676/girt.2023-v1i11-11>
- [33] D. Rodgers et al., "Defining specially designed instruction: A systematic literature review," *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ldrp.12247>
- [34] H. Azevedo et al., "Exploring teachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: Role of self-efficacy and perceived school climate," *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.70025>
- [35] D. J. Musendo et al., "'It is my responsibility to escort my child to school': Factors influencing parental involvement in educating children with disabilities in Malawi," *Social Sciences*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13120654>
- [36] M. A. Schutz et al., "Parent perspectives on pre-employment transition services for youth with disabilities," *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034355221993542>
- [37] G. I. Coñoman et al., "Initiatives to support the school-to-work transition of people with intellectual disabilities: A systematic review," *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13668250.2024.2317799>
- [38] M. Botha et al., "In search of a landing place for persons with disabilities: A critique of South Africa's skills development programme," *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13582291231162315>
- [39] J. Vincent et al., "Aspirations and accommodations for students with disability to equitably access higher education: A systematic scoping review," *Frontiers in Education*, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1218120>

- [40] S. Kumar et al., “Through convergence and governance: Embedding empowerment in community development interventions,” *Community Development Journal*, 2022.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsaa055>