

# Inclusive Schools, but Is the System Ready?: Justice in the Implementation of Inclusive Education in Pasuruan Regency

Nur Annisa Putri\*<sup>ID</sup>

Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Pasuruan  
[ann\\_putri@gmail.com](mailto:ann_putri@gmail.com)

Ahmad Zaki Al Mubarak<sup>ID</sup>

Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Pasuruan  
[almubarak\\_zaki@gmail.com](mailto:almubarak_zaki@gmail.com)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65815/mva30562>

Submitted: 03-01-2026

Revised: 22-04-2026, 30-05-2026

Accepted: 08-06-2026

\*Corresponding Author

## Abstract

Inclusive education represents a commitment to equal educational rights for students with disabilities and other special educational needs. However, the formal designation of schools as inclusive does not necessarily guarantee equitable participation, appropriate support, or meaningful learning experiences. This study examines the implementation of inclusive education in Pasuruan Regency, East Java, focusing on the relationship between policy commitments and institutional capacity. The research investigates the availability of special education teachers, assessment mechanisms, accessibility infrastructure, learning adaptations, and support services for students with disabilities. Using a qualitative case study design, the study engages with school administrators, teachers, parents, local policymakers, and students where appropriate. The analysis applies recognition, distributive, and procedural justice to evaluate whether students with disabilities are recognized as equal rights holders, receive adequate educational resources, and participate meaningfully in school decision-making. The study argues that inclusion should not be measured solely by enrollment numbers. Genuine inclusion requires institutional transformation that enables students to participate, learn, and progress under equitable conditions. The findings are expected to identify structural gaps between inclusive education regulations and school-level implementation and to propose a justice-oriented framework for local governments. The study contributes to international debates on inclusive education by linking disability rights with education policy implementation and institutional accountability.

*[Inclusive education represents a commitment to equal educational rights for students with disabilities and other special educational needs. However, the formal designation of schools as inclusive does not necessarily guarantee equitable participation, appropriate support, or meaningful learning*



*experiences. This study examines the implementation of inclusive education in Pasuruan Regency, East Java, focusing on the relationship between policy commitments and institutional capacity. The research investigates the availability of special education teachers, assessment mechanisms, accessibility infrastructure, learning adaptations, and support services for students with disabilities. Using a qualitative case study design, the study engages with school administrators, teachers, parents, local policymakers, and students where appropriate. The analysis applies recognition, distributive, and procedural justice to evaluate whether students with disabilities are recognized as equal rights holders, receive adequate educational resources, and participate meaningfully in school decision-making. The study argues that inclusion should not be measured solely by enrollment numbers. Genuine inclusion requires institutional transformation that enables students to participate, learn, and progress under equitable conditions. The findings are expected to identify structural gaps between inclusive education regulations and school-level implementation and to propose a justice-oriented framework for local governments. The study contributes to international debates on inclusive education by linking disability rights with education policy implementation and institutional accountability.]*

**Keywords:** inclusive education, disability rights, educational justice, policy implementation, Pasuruan

## Introduction

Inclusive education has developed from a specialized educational discourse into a central principle of contemporary educational justice. The fundamental issue is no longer whether students with disabilities should have access to education, but whether mainstream educational institutions are capable of providing conditions under which those students can participate and learn on an equal basis. The Salamanca Statement established an influential international commitment to educating children within inclusive schools, while the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities subsequently strengthened the human-rights basis of inclusive education (UNESCO 1994; United Nations 2006). This transformation is theoretically significant because it changes the object of policy responsibility. Disability is no longer conceptualized solely as an individual condition requiring specialized intervention; rather, educational exclusion is also produced through institutional arrangements, physical environments, pedagogical practices, and social attitudes. Consequently, the quality of inclusive education must be evaluated not simply through school admission or enrollment statistics but through the extent to which schools remove barriers to presence, participation, achievement, and belonging.

Indonesia has formally adopted this rights-based orientation through a progressively developed legal framework. Law No. 20 of 2003 establishes education as a right of Indonesian citizens and obliges the state to provide equitable educational opportunities. Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities further establishes equality, accessibility, and the right to education for persons with disabilities. Government Regulation No. 13 of 2020 then introduced a more specific framework for reasonable accommodation, while Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology Regulation No. 48 of 2023 strengthened the regulatory architecture by addressing reasonable accommodation, educational personnel, infrastructure, curriculum, disability service units, monitoring, and evaluation. The legal trajectory demonstrates a significant shift from simply recognizing the existence of inclusive schools toward specifying institutional responsibilities. However, the existence of increasingly detailed regulation does not automatically produce equivalent implementation capacity across schools. The central analytical problem is therefore the gap between formal inclusion as a legal status and substantive inclusion as an educational reality.

The distinction between formal and substantive equality can be illuminated through Amartya Sen's capability approach. Sen (1999) argues that equality should not be assessed only through the distribution of resources or formal rights, but through people's actual capabilities to achieve valued functionings. Applied to education, two students may receive the same curriculum, attend the same classroom, and be assessed under the same formal rules while possessing very different opportunities to benefit from those arrangements. A student with a mobility impairment may require accessible infrastructure; a deaf student may require communication support; and a student with a learning disability may require differentiated instructional strategies. Providing identical treatment in such circumstances can reproduce inequality rather than eliminate it. Reasonable accommodation therefore should not be interpreted as preferential treatment. Instead, it represents an institutional mechanism through which formal equality is converted into substantive equality by compensating for barriers that prevent students from exercising their educational rights effectively.

This problem becomes particularly important at the local level because national policies are implemented through institutions with different material and organizational capacities. Policy implementation scholarship has long demonstrated that policy outcomes are shaped not only by policy design but also by implementing organizations, available resources, administrative discretion, and local contexts (Pressman and Wildavsky 1984; Matland 1995). Lipsky (1980) similarly emphasizes the importance of street-level bureaucrats whose everyday decisions influence how public policies are experienced by citizens. In inclusive education, teachers, principals, school administrators, and local education officials function as such street-level actors. They interpret regulations, determine practical accommodations, allocate institutional attention, and negotiate with families. Consequently, inclusive education in Pasuruan Regency cannot be understood

solely by examining national regulations. It must also be analyzed through the organizational capacity and discretionary practices of the institutions responsible for translating those regulations into everyday educational experiences.

The central argument of this article is that the designation of a school as "inclusive" should be understood as the beginning of a public responsibility rather than evidence that inclusion has already been achieved. A school may formally accept students with disabilities while remaining unable to provide accessible facilities, specialized support, differentiated instruction, appropriate assessment, or meaningful participation. Such a situation creates what Fraser (2008) describes as multidimensional injustice: disadvantage may arise simultaneously through maldistribution of resources, misrecognition of social identity, and exclusion from participation in decision-making. This article therefore examines inclusive education in Pasuruan Regency through four dimensions of educational justice: recognition, distribution, participation, and procedural accountability. It asks how these dimensions interact in determining whether inclusive-school policy produces substantive educational equality.

The conceptual development from integration to inclusion is important because it changes the standard by which educational policy should be evaluated. Integration generally assumes that students with disabilities can enter existing educational structures if they are able to adapt sufficiently to mainstream arrangements. Inclusion reverses this logic by requiring schools themselves to change in response to learner diversity. Ainscow, Booth, and Dyson (2006) argue that inclusion involves identifying and removing barriers to presence, participation, and achievement. Their framework challenges the assumption that physical placement automatically constitutes inclusion. A student may sit in the same classroom as peers but remain excluded from learning if the curriculum, communication system, assessment procedure, or social environment does not accommodate their needs. Similarly, Florian (2014) emphasizes inclusive pedagogy as an approach that expands what is ordinarily available to all learners rather than creating separate educational opportunities for students perceived as different. These perspectives establish an important analytical principle: the success of inclusion must be evaluated through institutional transformation and student experience, not simply through enrollment.

Booth and Ainscow's (2011) *Index for Inclusion* develops this argument by organizing inclusion around school cultures, policies, and practices. The framework is useful for local policy analysis because it demonstrates that inclusion cannot be reduced to a single intervention. An inclusive school requires a culture that values diversity, policies that prevent exclusion, and classroom practices that enable participation. This three-dimensional perspective is especially relevant to Pasuruan because a school may possess an inclusive designation while its organizational culture remains strongly influenced by deficit-oriented understandings of disability. Similarly, a school may have formal policies but lack the resources or professional competence to implement them. The implication is

that local government should assess inclusion as an institutional ecosystem. Indicators should therefore examine whether school leadership, teachers, infrastructure, curriculum, assessment, peer relations, and family engagement collectively support participation. This approach shifts evaluation from asking how many inclusive schools exist toward asking how inclusive those schools actually are.

The literature also demonstrates that inclusion depends substantially on teacher capacity, but teacher capacity cannot be separated from institutional support. Avramidis and Norwich (2002) found that teacher attitudes toward inclusion are influenced by student characteristics, teacher characteristics, and environmental factors, including the availability of resources and support. Avramidis and Kalyva (2007) subsequently demonstrated the importance of teaching experience and professional development in shaping teachers' attitudes toward inclusion. These findings challenge policy approaches that frame unsuccessful inclusion as a consequence of teachers' unwillingness or incompetence alone. Kurniawati et al. (2021), studying rural Indonesian primary schools, similarly found that teachers faced significant challenges in developing inclusive practices, particularly when general education teachers had limited preparation for working with students with special educational needs. The analytical implication is that teacher readiness should be treated as an institutionally produced capacity. Professional development, specialist consultation, manageable workloads, leadership support, and appropriate teaching resources are therefore part of the state's responsibility for implementing inclusive education.

A second body of scholarship conceptualizes inclusive education through disability rights and social justice. The social model of disability, associated particularly with Oliver (1990), challenges approaches that locate educational disadvantage primarily within individual impairment. From this perspective, disability becomes socially consequential when institutions create barriers that prevent participation. In education, such barriers may include inaccessible buildings, rigid curricula, inflexible assessment, discriminatory attitudes, or inadequate communication support. Shakespeare (2014) subsequently argues that disability should be understood through an interaction between impairment and environmental conditions rather than through an exclusively medical interpretation. This theoretical perspective is directly relevant to inclusive-school policy because it changes the question posed by policymakers. Instead of asking whether a student is sufficiently capable of entering an ordinary school, the policy question becomes whether the school has removed the barriers that prevent the student from participating. Inclusive education therefore represents not simply a service-delivery model but a transformation in how institutions understand difference and responsibility.

Nancy Fraser's theory of justice provides an additional analytical foundation. Fraser (2008) argues that justice involves redistribution, recognition, and

representation. These dimensions correspond closely with the requirements of inclusive education. Redistribution concerns the allocation of teachers, specialist personnel, infrastructure, assistive technology, and financial resources. Recognition concerns whether students with disabilities are treated as equal members of the school community rather than as problematic or dependent individuals. Representation concerns whether affected students and their families can participate meaningfully in decisions that determine educational provision. Young (1990) similarly warns against reducing justice to distributive questions because institutional processes and social relations can themselves reproduce oppression. Applied to inclusive education, this means that giving a school additional resources may not be sufficient if students remain stigmatized or excluded from decision-making. Conversely, changing attitudes without redistributing necessary resources may leave structural barriers intact. Genuine inclusion therefore requires simultaneous transformation across material, cultural, and procedural dimensions.

Indonesian studies provide empirical support for this multidimensional interpretation. Research on inclusive education in Indonesia has identified persistent challenges involving teacher competence, infrastructure, curriculum adaptation, specialist support, financing, and collaboration among stakeholders. Karya et al. (2022) emphasize that disability rights within Indonesian inclusive education require more than formal legal recognition because implementation depends upon whether schools possess the conditions necessary to realize those rights. Komarudin and Kaeni similarly identify multiple structural barriers to inclusive education, including limitations in school management, teacher competence, special education personnel, funding, infrastructure, parental collaboration, and external stakeholder cooperation. Research by Sudarto (2016) in East Java further identified shortages of special education teachers, limited support services, inadequate facilities, and weak community engagement as implementation challenges. These findings are important for Pasuruan because they demonstrate that inclusive education should not be approached as a narrowly pedagogical problem. It is simultaneously a problem of institutional design, public resource allocation, professional capacity, and social recognition.

A third body of scholarship focuses on the implementation gap between inclusive education policy and school-level practice. Matland's (1995) ambiguity-conflict model suggests that implementation outcomes vary depending on the degree of ambiguity in policy objectives and the level of conflict among implementing actors. Inclusive education contains both characteristics. Its normative goal—equal participation—is relatively clear, but its operational meaning can be highly complex. Schools must determine what constitutes reasonable accommodation for different students, how curricula should be adapted, who should provide specialized support, and how limited resources should be prioritized. This creates considerable implementation discretion. Lipsky's (1980) concept of street-level bureaucracy is therefore particularly relevant because teachers and school administrators become the practical interpreters of policy.

Their decisions can either expand or restrict students' educational opportunities, meaning that administrative discretion is not peripheral to inclusion but central to its realization.

Indonesian research confirms that policy implementation frequently depends upon the relationship between regulatory expectations and institutional capacity. Ediyanto et al. (2017), examining inclusive education from the perspective of Indonesian teacher-development personnel, highlight the importance of teacher preparation and institutional support in realizing inclusive policy. Kurniawati et al. (2021) demonstrate that teachers in rural Indonesian schools often develop adaptive strategies despite limited preparation and resources, illustrating how local actors compensate for weaknesses in formal implementation structures. More recent Indonesian research continues to identify the discrepancy between inclusive policy and school readiness, particularly concerning teacher competencies, infrastructure, and institutional coordination. The significance of these findings is analytical rather than merely descriptive: when teachers are required to compensate for systemic deficiencies, the quality of inclusion becomes dependent upon individual initiative. Such dependence produces uneven educational rights because students' access to effective accommodation may vary according to which school they attend or which teacher happens to serve them.

The Indonesian legal framework has responded to some of these concerns by increasingly emphasizing reasonable accommodation. Government Regulation No. 13 of 2020 establishes obligations concerning reasonable accommodation for students with disabilities, while Ministerial Regulation No. 48 of 2023 provides more detailed arrangements concerning accommodation, educational personnel, curriculum, infrastructure, disability service units, monitoring, and evaluation. The significance of this development is that the regulatory object has shifted from the mere existence of inclusive schools toward the conditions required for students with disabilities to participate meaningfully. However, regulation alone cannot resolve implementation inequality. If local governments do not possess mechanisms for identifying school-level needs, allocating differentiated resources, monitoring accommodation, and responding to complaints, legal rights may remain largely declarative. The challenge for Pasuruan is therefore not primarily the absence of a normative commitment to inclusion but the construction of an administrative system capable of operationalizing that commitment consistently.

This study employs a qualitative policy case-study design to analyze inclusive education implementation in Pasuruan Regency. The research is primarily documentary and analytical, drawing upon Indonesian legislation, government regulations, official policy documents, peer-reviewed journal literature, and established theoretical scholarship concerning educational justice, disability, inclusion, and policy implementation. The principal legal documents examined are Law No. 20 of 2003 on the National Education System, Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities, Government Regulation No. 13 of 2020 on Reasonable Accommodation for Students with Disabilities, and Ministerial Regulation No. 48

of 2023 on Reasonable Accommodation for Students with Disabilities. The analysis does not treat legal designation as evidence of successful implementation. Instead, regulatory expectations are compared conceptually with the institutional conditions identified in empirical scholarship concerning inclusive education in Indonesia. This approach makes it possible to identify potential implementation gaps between formal policy obligations and the organizational, professional, material, and procedural capacities required for substantive inclusion.

The analytical framework combines four dimensions of justice. First, recognition justice examines whether students with disabilities are treated as equal rights holders and whether institutional practices challenge stigma and deficit-based assumptions. Second, distributive justice evaluates whether educational resources are allocated according to differentiated need rather than through uniform provision. Third, participatory justice examines the involvement of students, parents, teachers, and disability stakeholders in educational decisions. Fourth, procedural justice assesses whether assessment, accommodation, complaint, monitoring, and accountability mechanisms are transparent and accessible. These dimensions are interpreted through Fraser's (2008) theory of redistribution, recognition, and representation, Sen's (1999) capability approach, Young's (1990) critique of distributive reductionism, and implementation theories developed by Lipsky (1980) and Matland (1995). The resulting framework treats inclusive education as a public institutional responsibility rather than an optional pedagogical practice.

## **The Inclusive School, Equality and Institutional Justice in Education**

### **1. The Inclusive-School Label and the Problem of Symbolic Inclusion**

The first problem is the possibility that inclusive-school designation becomes an administrative achievement rather than an indicator of substantive educational transformation. A school may admit students with disabilities and therefore satisfy a formal definition of inclusion while maintaining instructional, infrastructural, and organizational arrangements designed primarily for students without disabilities. This produces what Graham and Slee (2008) describe as an "illusory" form of inclusion in which the language of inclusion can coexist with institutional practices that continue to produce exclusion. From a policy perspective, the problem arises when implementation indicators focus disproportionately on inputs that are easy to count, such as the number of designated inclusive schools or enrolled students. Such indicators are important but insufficient. They reveal whether formal access exists but provide little information about whether students can participate, learn, or progress. The Pasuruan case should therefore be evaluated through a broader question: whether inclusive-school status is accompanied by institutional capacity capable of transforming the educational experience of students with disabilities.

This distinction can be further explained through Sen's (1999) capability approach. Formal access represents a resource or opportunity, but the educational

value of that opportunity depends upon the student's capability to convert it into meaningful participation and learning. Consider two students who are both enrolled in the same classroom. If one student can access the curriculum without additional support while another requires communication assistance, adapted materials, or physical accessibility, identical treatment does not generate equivalent educational opportunity. The problem is therefore not inequality in formal admission but inequality in the conversion of admission into educational capability. Reasonable accommodation is significant precisely because it addresses conversion barriers. From this perspective, an inclusive school should not be considered successful simply because it offers the same classroom to all students. It should be considered successful when institutional arrangements enable students with different needs to derive meaningful educational opportunities from their common membership in the school.

The implication is that Pasuruan's local education governance requires more sophisticated indicators of inclusion. School evaluation should include evidence of participation in classroom activities, access to learning materials, individualized support, attendance, learning progression, student belonging, family engagement, and accommodation fulfillment. Such indicators would transform inclusive education from a categorical designation into an ongoing institutional performance obligation. Booth and Ainscow (2011) provide a useful conceptual basis because they connect inclusion to school cultures, policies, and practices rather than to enrollment alone. The analytical consequence is substantial: if a school receives inclusive status but lacks mechanisms for identifying student needs, providing accommodations, or monitoring educational participation, the status may have limited substantive meaning. Inclusive education should therefore be understood as a process of institutional transformation, and local government should evaluate schools according to the extent to which that transformation has occurred.

## **2. Recognition Justice and the Transformation of School Culture**

Recognition is fundamental because material accommodation can remain ineffective when students with disabilities continue to be understood through deficit-oriented assumptions. The social model of disability emphasizes that disadvantage is produced through interactions between individual impairments and environmental barriers (Oliver 1990; Shakespeare 2014). In school settings, this means that a student's educational difficulty cannot automatically be attributed to the student. A child who cannot access a lesson because instructional materials are presented in only one format encounters an institutional barrier. A student who is excluded from an activity because teachers assume that disability implies inability experiences a recognition problem. Thus, inclusive education requires a change in institutional interpretation: disability should be treated as part of learner diversity and as a legitimate dimension of educational planning.

Recognition has practical consequences for teacher expectations. If teachers interpret disability primarily as a limitation, they may unintentionally lower

academic expectations, reduce opportunities for participation, or assign students passive roles. Conversely, a rights-based approach encourages teachers to identify barriers and adapt pedagogical strategies while maintaining meaningful learning expectations. Florian's (2014) concept of inclusive pedagogy is valuable here because it seeks to extend high-quality teaching to all learners rather than constructing separate educational expectations for students considered different. This does not mean that every student receives identical instruction. Rather, it means that difference should not automatically become a reason for exclusion from ambitious educational opportunities. In Pasuruan, strengthening recognition therefore requires professional development that addresses not only technical teaching skills but also disability perspectives, stigma, communication, and expectations concerning student capability.

School culture also extends beyond teachers. Peers, administrators, parents, and community members influence whether students with disabilities experience belonging. UNESCO (2020) emphasizes that exclusion can occur through social attitudes and institutional structures even when formal access is available. This makes anti-stigma measures part of educational justice rather than peripheral social programs. Schools should develop peer-support mechanisms, inclusive extracurricular activities, disability awareness programs, and accessible communication with families. The objective is not to make students with disabilities appear identical to other students but to normalize difference as part of the school community. Recognition justice is therefore achieved when students are able to participate without being reduced to their disability category. For Pasuruan, this requires school improvement strategies that explicitly measure belonging and participation alongside academic outcomes.

### **3. Distributive Justice and Differentiated Educational Resources**

Distributive justice raises a different but complementary question: what resources must schools receive if they are expected to provide genuinely inclusive education? Treating every school identically may appear administratively fair, but uniform distribution can become substantively unequal when schools face different levels of need. Fraser's (2008) theory of redistribution provides a useful starting point because educational justice requires material conditions that enable people to participate as equals. In inclusive education, these conditions may include specialist teachers, accessible infrastructure, assistive technology, learning materials, counseling, transportation arrangements, and professional development. The relevant principle is therefore not equal resources per school but resources proportionate to educational need.

The Indonesian literature illustrates why this principle matters. Studies of inclusive education repeatedly identify insufficient special education personnel, limited teacher competence, inadequate infrastructure, and weak institutional support as major implementation barriers. Karya et al. (2022) demonstrate that the legal recognition of disability rights does not automatically guarantee their practical

fulfillment. Komarudin and Kaeni's review similarly identifies deficiencies in human resources, funding, facilities, school management, and stakeholder cooperation as interconnected obstacles. These findings suggest that the resource problem is systemic. A school cannot be expected to provide individualized accommodation if it lacks personnel capable of designing or monitoring such accommodation. Likewise, teachers cannot be expected to implement differentiated instruction effectively when they lack training, materials, time, or specialist consultation. The resource allocation problem is therefore inseparable from the quality of policy implementation.

A differentiated allocation model would allow Pasuruan Regency to prioritize schools according to the intensity and complexity of educational support required. The number of students with disabilities is one indicator, but it should not be the only one. Allocation should also consider disability-related support requirements, school accessibility, geographic conditions, class size, existing specialist capacity, and the availability of external services. Such a model would operationalize the principle of substantive equality because additional resources would be directed toward overcoming barriers rather than simply equalizing administrative inputs. The policy implication is that inclusive education requires a needs-based financing mechanism, not merely an inclusive-school designation. Without such differentiation, schools serving students with greater support requirements may experience disproportionate institutional burdens, ultimately creating unequal quality of inclusion across the regency.

#### **4. Teacher Capacity as a Condition of Institutional Justice**

Teacher capacity is often presented as an individual professional issue, but the evidence suggests that it should instead be understood as an institutional justice issue. Teachers are the actors who translate inclusive policy into classroom practice, yet their capacity depends upon professional preparation, access to specialist knowledge, workload, leadership, resources, and opportunities for collaboration. Avramidis and Norwich (2002) demonstrate that teacher attitudes toward inclusion are influenced by contextual support, while Avramidis and Kalyva (2007) show that professional experience and development are associated with more positive orientations toward inclusive education. Kurniawati et al. (2021) further demonstrate the difficulties experienced by teachers in rural Indonesian schools when implementing inclusive strategies with limited preparation and resources. These findings indicate that asking teachers to "implement inclusion" without restructuring institutional support effectively transfers a systemic responsibility to individual professionals.

The problem is particularly important because teachers exercise considerable discretionary power. Lipsky (1980) argues that street-level bureaucrats operate under conditions of limited resources, complex demands, and substantial discretion. In inclusive schools, teachers must decide how to interpret students' needs, adapt lessons, manage classroom participation, communicate with parents,

and respond to behavioral or learning difficulties. When formal policy provides insufficient guidance or resources, these decisions become highly individualized. One teacher may develop creative accommodations while another may interpret the same student as incapable of participating in mainstream instruction. Consequently, the educational right of a student may depend upon the institutional context and professional resources available in a particular school. This represents a form of procedural inequality because similarly situated students can receive different levels of support without transparent criteria.

The solution is not simply to provide occasional training but to institutionalize continuous professional learning. Inclusive education requires teachers to have access to mentoring, specialist consultation, collaborative planning, case discussions, and practical classroom-based support. Ministerial Regulation No. 48 of 2023 provides a policy basis for strengthening support mechanisms through disability service units and related institutional arrangements. Such units can become important intermediaries between specialized knowledge and ordinary schools. Rather than expecting every school to employ every specialist independently, Pasuruan could develop a networked support system in which specialists provide services across several schools. This would distribute expertise more efficiently and reduce the dependence of inclusion on individual teacher initiative. Teacher development should therefore be understood as part of the state's obligation to create the conditions under which teachers can fulfill inclusive-education responsibilities effectively.

## **5. Reasonable Accommodation and the Transition from Equal Treatment to Substantive Equality**

Reasonable accommodation provides one of the clearest mechanisms for translating equality from principle into practice. Under a formal-equality model, fairness is frequently understood as treating everyone according to the same rule. Yet disability demonstrates why identical treatment can produce unequal consequences. A student who cannot physically access a classroom does not obtain equal educational opportunity merely because the school applies the same attendance requirement. Similarly, a student who cannot access standard learning materials does not receive equal instruction merely because the same textbook is distributed. Reasonable accommodation responds to these differences by modifying institutional arrangements when necessary to enable participation. Government Regulation No. 13 of 2020 and Ministerial Regulation No. 48 of 2023 place this principle within Indonesia's formal educational framework.

The theoretical significance of accommodation is particularly clear through Fraser's concept of recognition. Recognition does not mean celebrating difference symbolically; it requires institutional arrangements that prevent socially constructed differences from becoming sources of subordination. Accommodation therefore functions as both redistribution and recognition. It redistributes institutional resources toward students facing specific barriers while simultaneously recognizing

that their needs are legitimate components of educational planning. Research on reasonable accommodation also indicates that accommodation must be individualized rather than mechanically standardized. Different disabilities and different students can require substantially different forms of support. This means that schools need procedures for assessment and dialogue rather than a fixed checklist of accommodations. The purpose of the process should be to determine what adjustment is necessary for the student to participate effectively.

At the same time, reasonable accommodation should not become a substitute for broader accessibility. If a school repeatedly provides individualized accommodations for barriers that could be eliminated through universal design, the policy may address symptoms rather than structural causes. For example, repeated individual assistance may be less sustainable than redesigning a building to make it physically accessible to all students. This distinction corresponds to the broader movement from individual adjustment toward inclusive institutional design. Consequently, Pasuruan's implementation strategy should combine universal accessibility with individualized accommodation. Universal measures should remove common barriers, while individualized measures should respond to needs that remain. This approach is both more efficient and more consistent with substantive equality because it prevents students from carrying the administrative burden of requesting adjustments for barriers that institutions could have prevented in the first place.

## **6. Procedural Justice, Participation, and the Role of Families**

Inclusive education also depends on procedural justice because decisions about accommodation directly affect students' daily educational experiences. Procedural justice concerns whether individuals have meaningful opportunities to participate in decisions, understand the reasons behind institutional actions, and challenge decisions when necessary. This dimension is particularly important for disability because students and families possess knowledge about barriers that may not be visible to school administrators. A school may believe that an accommodation is sufficient while the student experiences continued exclusion. Without participatory procedures, institutional decisions can become disconnected from lived educational realities. Fraser's (2008) concept of representation is therefore directly relevant: justice requires not only appropriate distribution and recognition but also the ability of affected groups to participate in decisions concerning them.

Assessment should consequently be understood as a collaborative process rather than merely a diagnostic exercise. Schools need mechanisms for identifying students' educational needs, communication preferences, participation barriers, and learning goals. Parents can contribute important information concerning the student's experiences, while students themselves should participate to the extent appropriate to their age and capacity. The purpose of such assessment is not to place students into rigid categories but to determine the educational arrangements

necessary for meaningful participation. This approach is consistent with the rights-based orientation of the CRPD and the reasonable-accommodation framework in Indonesian regulation. It also reduces the risk that disability labels become substitutes for individualized understanding.

Participation must extend beyond initial accommodation decisions. Families need accessible mechanisms for communicating concerns, reviewing support plans, and reporting failures to provide agreed accommodations. Schools should establish clear procedures for complaints and responses, while local government should monitor recurring complaints as indicators of systemic problems. A complaint should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of parental dissatisfaction; it can function as valuable policy feedback. In this sense, procedural accountability converts individual experiences into information for institutional learning. For Pasuruan, establishing transparent participation and complaint mechanisms would strengthen both fairness and policy effectiveness because local government could identify implementation gaps that are not captured by conventional administrative reporting.

## **7. Accessibility, Participation, and the Limits of Infrastructure-Based Inclusion**

Accessibility is another area in which formal compliance can differ substantially from substantive inclusion. Infrastructure is often the most visible dimension of inclusive education, but accessibility extends beyond ramps and toilets. It includes communication, information, curriculum, teaching materials, assessment, technology, transportation, and emergency procedures. Law No. 8 of 2016 and subsequent regulations establish accessibility as part of the rights of persons with disabilities, while the reasonable-accommodation framework expands attention toward adjustments in educational provision. The analytical implication is that accessibility should be treated as an educational condition, not merely an architectural feature. A student may be able to enter a school building yet remain excluded from learning because instructional materials or communication systems are inaccessible.

This broader understanding is supported by the capability approach. Sen (1999) distinguishes between possessing a resource and possessing the real capability to use that resource. Applied to schooling, the presence of a classroom does not guarantee educational access if the student cannot communicate, understand the material, participate in assessment, or navigate the physical environment. Accessibility is therefore a conversion condition between formal educational resources and actual educational capabilities. This explains why inclusive policy must evaluate not only whether infrastructure exists but whether students can use it effectively. In Pasuruan, accessibility audits should therefore examine physical, instructional, communicative, technological, and social dimensions.

A multidimensional accessibility audit could provide local government with a more meaningful implementation instrument. Schools could be assessed on building accessibility, accessible toilets, classroom mobility, signage, lighting and acoustics, communication support, accessible instructional materials, assessment adaptations, digital accessibility, and emergency procedures. The results could then inform differentiated funding and technical assistance. Importantly, such audits should involve people with disabilities and disability organizations because accessibility cannot be evaluated adequately from an exclusively administrative perspective. Participation would allow local government to distinguish between infrastructure that merely satisfies technical requirements and infrastructure that actually enables independent and dignified participation.

## **8. Measuring Inclusion through Participation, Learning, and Progression**

The ultimate weakness of enrollment-centered policy evaluation is that it treats presence as equivalent to educational success. Yet students may be enrolled while experiencing absenteeism, social isolation, limited participation, inappropriate curriculum, low expectations, or inadequate assessment. Ainscow, Booth, and Dyson (2006) therefore emphasize the relationship between presence, participation, and achievement. This conceptualization is particularly important for disability because educational exclusion can occur inside the classroom. A student who is present but routinely receives simplified tasks unrelated to meaningful curriculum objectives may technically participate while receiving a qualitatively different education. Such practices can unintentionally reproduce low expectations under the appearance of accommodation.

A justice-oriented monitoring framework should therefore distinguish at least four outcomes: access, participation, learning, and progression. Access measures whether students can enter and remain in school. Participation measures whether they engage in classroom, social, and extracurricular activities. Learning measures whether instructional arrangements enable meaningful educational development. Progression measures whether students advance through educational stages and acquire capabilities relevant to further education and social participation. These indicators would make it possible to identify schools where enrollment is high but educational participation remains weak. They would also allow local government to assess whether interventions such as specialist support, teacher training, and infrastructure investment actually improve student experiences.

This approach would transform the meaning of accountability. Schools would no longer be judged primarily according to whether they possess inclusive status or enroll students with disabilities. Instead, accountability would focus on whether institutional arrangements produce meaningful educational opportunities. Such a shift is consistent with Fraser's multidimensional justice framework because it connects resources, recognition, and participation to outcomes. It is also consistent with Sen's capability approach because it evaluates whether students actually gain

opportunities to learn and develop. For Pasuruan, this would provide a stronger basis for policy improvement than administrative compliance alone.

## **Toward a Justice-Oriented Inclusive Education Framework for Pasuruan**

A justice-oriented implementation model for Pasuruan should begin with the principle that inclusive education is a system responsibility rather than a responsibility delegated to individual teachers or designated schools. The first layer should therefore involve recognition: local policy should establish disability-inclusive school cultures, strengthen teacher understanding of disability rights, address stigma, and create opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in school life. The second layer should concern distribution: local government should allocate resources according to educational need, including specialist personnel, accessibility improvements, assistive technology, and professional development. The third layer should institutionalize reasonable accommodation through transparent assessment, planning, implementation, and review procedures. The fourth layer should strengthen distributed expertise through disability service units and collaboration among schools, universities, health providers, and disability organizations. Finally, the fifth layer should establish participatory accountability through family involvement, student voice, accessible complaints, and outcome-oriented monitoring.

The framework can be understood as a movement from formal inclusion → institutional capacity → substantive participation → educational justice. Formal designation is necessary because it establishes public responsibility, but it is not sufficient because designation alone does not provide teachers, infrastructure, specialist support, or accommodation. Institutional capacity converts legal obligations into practical possibilities. Substantive participation then provides evidence that students are actually benefiting from those institutional arrangements. Educational justice represents the broader outcome in which students with disabilities possess meaningful and dignified opportunities to learn and develop. This sequence is important because it prevents policymakers from treating the designation of inclusive schools as the endpoint of reform. Instead, designation becomes the starting point for continuous institutional development.

## **Conclusion**

The implementation of inclusive education in Pasuruan Regency should be understood through the distinction between formal equality and substantive equality. Indonesia has developed an increasingly comprehensive legal framework recognizing the educational rights of persons with disabilities and establishing reasonable accommodation as an institutional responsibility. Nevertheless, legal recognition does not automatically eliminate structural barriers. The evidence from

inclusive-education scholarship indicates that teacher capacity, specialist personnel, infrastructure, curriculum adaptation, family collaboration, and institutional coordination remain important determinants of implementation. From the perspective of educational justice, these are not merely technical obstacles. They determine whether students with disabilities can convert their formal right to education into real opportunities to participate, learn, and progress.

The article consequently argues that inclusive-school designation should not be treated as proof of successful inclusion. Inclusion must instead be evaluated through recognition, distribution, participation, and procedural accountability. Students must be recognized as equal rights holders; resources must be allocated according to differentiated need; accommodation must be designed through participatory processes; and schools must be accountable for actual educational participation and outcomes. The theoretical perspectives of Fraser, Sen, Young, Oliver, Ainscow, and implementation scholars such as Lipsky and Matland collectively demonstrate why uniform treatment cannot guarantee educational justice when students and institutions possess unequal conditions. A just system must therefore differentiate support while maintaining equal rights.

For Pasuruan Regency, the policy priority should be to move from a school-based inclusion model toward a system-wide inclusion model. This requires needs-sensitive financing, stronger disability service units, continuous teacher professional development, accessible infrastructure, individualized reasonable accommodation, participatory assessment, family engagement, and monitoring indicators that capture participation and learning rather than enrollment alone. Such reforms would transform inclusive education from a formal administrative category into a substantive public commitment. The decisive test of an inclusive school is consequently not whether students with disabilities are permitted to enter its doors, but whether the institution has the capacity and institutional commitment to ensure that they can belong, participate, learn, progress, and exercise their educational rights on an equal basis with other students.

## References

- Ainscow, Mel. 2005. "Developing Inclusive Education Systems: What Are the Levers for Change?" *Journal of Educational Change* 6 (2): 109–124.
- Ainscow, Mel, Tony Booth, and Alan Dyson. 2006. *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Ainscow, Mel, Roger Slee, and Marnie Best. 2019. "The Salamanca Statement: 25 Years On." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 23 (7–8): 671–676.
- Avramidis, Elias, Phil Bayliss, and Robert Burden. 2000. "A Survey into Mainstream Teachers' Attitudes towards the Inclusion of Children with Special Educational Needs in the Ordinary School in One Local Education Authority." *Educational Psychology* 20 (2): 191–211.

- Avramidis, Elias, and Efrosini Kalyva. 2007. "The Influence of Teaching Experience and Professional Development on Greek Teachers' Attitudes towards Inclusion." *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 22 (4): 367–389.
- Avramidis, Elias, and Brahm Norwich. 2002. "Teachers' Attitudes towards Integration/Inclusion: A Review of the Literature." *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 17 (2): 129–147.
- Booth, Tony, and Mel Ainscow. 2011. *Index for Inclusion: Developing Learning and Participation in Schools*. 3rd ed. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- de Boer, Anke, Sip Jan Pijl, and Alexander Minnaert. 2011. "Regular Primary Schoolteachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Education: A Review of the Literature." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 15 (3): 331–353.
- Florian, Lani. 2014. "What Counts as Evidence of Inclusive Education?" *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 29 (3): 286–294.
- Florian, Lani, and Martyn Black-Hawkins. 2011. "Exploring Inclusive Pedagogy." *British Educational Research Journal* 37 (5): 813–828.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2008. *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Graham, Linda J., and Roger Slee. 2008. "An Illusory Interiority: Interrogating the Inclusionary Practices of the Australian Education System." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 40 (2): 277–293.
- Karya, Gardiana, Insiatun, Nindya Ayu Rizqianti, Putri Kartika Ningsih, Ediyanto, Asep Sunandar, and Dzintra Ili ko. 2022. "Fullfillment of Disability Rights Based on Definitions, Legal Basis, Criteria, and Aims of Inclusive Education in Indonesia." *International Journal of Educational Management and Innovation* 2 (3).
- Komarudin, and Nor Faizah Kaeni. 2023. "The Obstacles of Inclusive Education Implementation in Indonesia: A Systematic Review." *GUIDENA: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, Psikologi, Bimbingan dan Konseling* 12 (3).
- Kurniawati, Farida, et al. 2021. "Exploring Teachers' Inclusive Education Strategies in Rural Indonesian Primary Schools." *Educational Research* 63 (2): 198–211.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Matland, Richard E. 1995. "Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 5 (2): 145–174.
- Oliver, Michael. 1990. *The Politics of Disablement*. London: Macmillan.
- Pressman, Jeffrey L., and Aaron Wildavsky. 1984. *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Shakespeare, Tom. 2014. *Disability Rights and Wrongs Revisited*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Slee, Roger. 2011. *The Irregular School: Exclusion, Schooling and Inclusive Education*. London: Routledge.
- Sudarto, Zaini. 2016. "Implementasi Kebijakan Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif." *JP (Jurnal Pendidikan): Teori dan Praktik* 1 (1): 97–106.
- UNESCO. 1994. *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2020. *Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education—All Means All*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations. 2006. *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. New York: United Nations.
- Republic of Indonesia. 2003. *Law No. 20 of 2003 on the National Education System*.
- Republic of Indonesia. 2016. *Law No. 8 of 2016 on Persons with Disabilities*.
- Republic of Indonesia. 2020. *Government Regulation No. 13 of 2020 on Reasonable Accommodation for Students with Disabilities*.
- Republic of Indonesia. 2023. *Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology Regulation No. 48 of 2023 on Reasonable Accommodation for Students with Disabilities in Formal Early Childhood Education, Basic Education, Secondary Education, and Higher Education*.
- Yulianto, M. Joni. 2014. "Konsepsi Disabilitas dan Pendidikan Inklusif." *INKLUSI: Journal of Disability Studies* 1 (1): 19–38.
- Ediyanto, Iva Nandya Atika, Norimune Kawai, and Edy Prabowo. 2017. "Inclusive Education in Indonesia from the Perspective of Widyaiswara in Center for Development and Empowerment of Teachers and Education Personnel of Kindergartens and Special Education." *Indonesian Journal of Disability Studies*.
- Lindner, Katharina-Theresa, Susanne Schwab, Mona Emara, and Elias Avramidis. 2023. "Do Teachers Favor the Inclusion of All Students? A Systematic Review of Primary Schoolteachers' Attitudes towards Inclusive Education." *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 38 (6): 766–787.
- Krischler, Martin, Johannes J. W. Powell, and Ilka M. Pit-Ten Cate. 2019. "What Is Meant by Inclusion? On the Effects of Different Definitions on Attitudes towards Inclusive Education." *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 34 (5): 632–648.
- Meijer, Cor J. W., and Amanda Watkins. 2019. "Financing Special Needs and Inclusive Education—from Salamanca to the Present." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 23 (7–8): 705–721.

- Magnússon, Gunnlaugur. 2019. "An Amalgam of Ideals—Images of Inclusion in the Salamanca Statement." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 23 (7–8): 677–690.
- Widyastuti, Sri, and Retno Sunu Astuti. 2020. "Policy Implementation of Inclusive Education for Children with Special Needs at State Junior High School in Central Java Province." In *Proceedings of ICIPSE 2019*.
- Juniar, Mutiah Wenda, Baso Amang, and Mulyati Pawennei. 2021. "Reasonable Accommodation and Support for Inclusive Education in Asia." *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues* 24 (6S).
- Almayeni, Meza, and Marlina. 2023. "Perceptions of Students with Disabilities on Reasonable Learning Accommodations at Universitas Negeri Padang." *Indonesian Journal of Disability Studies* 10 (2): 155–165.
- Lestari, Eta Yuni, and Ratna Herawati. 2025. "Ensuring the Educational Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Challenges and Solutions in Achieving Socially Just Inclusive Education in Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum Progresif* 13 (2).
- Septiano, Fatih Afrisal Bagus, and Satryo Sasono. 2025. "Protecting Children's Rights through Inclusive Schools for Students with Special Needs: Legal and Phenomenological Perspectives." *Indonesian Journal of Community and Special Needs Education* 5 (2).

\*\*\*

**No one is born hating another person because of the color of his skin, or his background, or his religion. People must learn to hate, and if they can learn to hate, they can be taught to love, for love comes more naturally to the human heart than its opposite.**

**Nelson Mandela**

### Acknowledgment

None

### Funding Information

None

### Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

### Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

### Generative AI Statement

**Author** During the preparation of this manuscript, the author(s) used generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools to assist with language editing, grammar checking, and improving the clarity and readability of the manuscript. All AI-assisted outputs were critically reviewed and revised by the author(s) to ensure their accuracy, originality, and consistency with the intended meaning of the manuscript. The author(s) remain fully responsible for the content of the manuscript, including the accuracy of the information presented, the interpretation of the results, the originality of the work, and the final version submitted for publication. Generative AI tools were not used to replace the intellectual contribution, scientific judgment, or decision-making of the author(s). **Editor** During the editorial process, the editor used generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools solely to assist with improving the language and clarity of editorial communications. No submitted manuscript or confidential manuscript content was uploaded to or processed by the AI tool. The editor reviewed and edited the AI-assisted output as needed and remains fully responsible for the content and for all editorial decisions.