

The Analysis of the Existence of Special Education Teacher in Inclusive School in Indonesia

Munawir Yusuf, Erma Kumala Sari and Priyono Priyono
University of Sebelas Maret, Jl. Ir. Sutami no 36A, Surakarta, Indonesia
munawiryusuf@staff.uns.ac.id

Keywords: Employment Status, Inclusive School, Recruitment, Regulation, Special Education Teacher, Work Guideline.

Abstract: The aim of this study is to map the special education teachers' (SET) problems in inclusive school. This study used a mixed method research involving 265 SETs as respondents. The variables examined included: (1) SET regulation, (2) SET recruitment process, (3) SET employment status, (4) SET work guidelines, and (5) SET competence. Data were collected using a semi-open questionnaire and a competence scale. The data was analyzed by quantitative and qualitative technique. The results of the study concluded that the existence of SET in inclusive schools still faced problems in terms of regulation, recruitment, employment status, and work guidelines. In addition, the ministerial regulation No. 70 / 2009 about inclusive education has not been implemented optimally in inclusive schools. However, the teachers' competence (pedagogy, professional, personality, social, and special education competence) of SETs in inclusive schools in Indonesia are mostly in good and adequate category. This study suggests that the government immediately organize the regulation of SET to guarantee the existence of SET in the future.

1 INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education is now becoming an important topic in education research's in various countries (India, Nepal, Pacific region, Canada, South Africa, Arab, Madrid) around the world (Tilak, 2015; Maudslay, 2014; Miles and Merumeru, 2014; McCrimmon, 2014; Ntombela, 2011; Crabtree and Williams, 2011; Bermejo et al., 2009). Inclusive education also become the topic of education researchs in all levels of education (Yusuf et al., 2017; Mackey, 2014; Sucuoğlu et al., 2013). Many studies show that implementation of inclusive education in schools has a positive effect on students, both students in general and those with special needs (Waldron and McLesky, 2009; Salend and Duhaney, 1999). Thus, inclusive education is believed to be one of the solutions in expanding the access and improving the quality of education in schools (Waldron and McLesky, 2009; Salend and Duhaney, 1999). Many previous researches above about inclusive education show the importance of inclusive education and inclusive school as the topics of education researches.

One important aspect of the inclusive school is the existence of special education teachers (SET).

Many researches have been done by previous researchers associated with special education teachers (Douglas et al., 2016; Vernon-Dotson et al., 2014; Gehrke and Cocchiarella, 2013; Sindelar, Brownell, and Billingsley, 2010; Takala et al., 2009; Waldron, McLeskey, and Pacciano, 2009; Van Laarhoven et al., 2007). Several studies have focused on the preparation as SET in inclusive school (Walker, 2016; McCrimmon, 2014; Vernon-Dotson et al., 2014; Oyler, 2011; Van Laarhoven et al., 2009), the role of SET in inclusive school (Takala et al., 2009), the evaluation of SET in inclusive school (Woolf, 2014), and the knowledge of SET in inclusive education (Gehrke and Cocchiarella, 2013). There is also a research that discusses the status and future direction of the SET (Sindelar et al., 2010). This study also discusses the future direction of the SET. However, this research is more focused on the analysis of the problems of SETs (regulation, recruitment process, employment status, and work guideline) and the competence of SETs in inclusive schools in Indonesia.

The existence of SETs in regular schools is one key to make the inclusive education better success. Legislation in Indonesia explained that each of the inclusive school is required to have at least one SET

(Ministry of Education Act No. 70/ 2009). However, the existence of SETs in inclusive schools has not been completely protected, both in the employment status and the career development. There is no specific regulation governing the existence of SET clearly. The existing regulation only explains about the existence of class teachers, subject teachers, and counseling teachers (Ministry of Empowerment and Bureacratc Reformation No. 16/2009). In short, the SET employment status in Indonesia has not been protected.

Thus, it is necessary to do the assessment and analysis relating to the existence of the SET in inclusive schools in Indonesia in terms of the problems faced and the competence of SET, so the best solution could be found. Therefore, the study aims to map the problems of SETs in Indonesia in five perspectives, namely (1) SET regulations in inclusive school, (2) SET recruitment process in inclusive school, (3) SET employment status in inclusive school, (4) SET work guidelines in performing their duties in inclusive school, and (5) SET competence.

2 METHODS

This study employed a mixed methods research (Creswell, 2009) conducted in May until October 2016. The subjects were 265 SET in inclusive schools in four districts/cities in Central Java Indonesia (Surakarta, Boyolali, Salatiga, and Wonogiri) obtained by purposive random sampling technique. The research variables examined included (1) SET regulations; (2) SET recruitment process; (3) SET employment status; (4) SET work guideline, and (5) SET competence.

The data were collected by a semi-open questionnaire (9 quantitative and qualitative questions) to measure the SET problems in inclusive schools (regulation, recruitment process, employment status, and work guideline) and a competence scale (95 statements) to measure the SET competencies in inclusive schools (professional, pedagogic, social, personality, and special education competence). Validity test results (range from 0,422 – 0,765) indicated that the scale was valid, while the reliability test results with internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha formulation = 0,751) indicated that the scale was reliable. Furthermore, the collected data were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative analysis using trend analysis and percentage of each of the variables

studied. Qualitative data was used to complete and explain the quantitative data.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Regulation of Inclusive Education and SET in Inclusive School

The result showed that there are still 36.1% inclusive schools which have not had a regulation of inclusive education, while 63.9% inclusive schools have had it. However, the legislation in Indonesia regulation stated that each of the inclusive school is required to have at least one SET (Ministry of Education Act No. 70/ 2009). It can be concluded that the existence of inclusive education in inclusive schools has not had a strong legislation. Thus, not all of the inclusive schools get the same service fostering from government.

Furthermore, 66.0% inclusive schools have not had a regulation of SET, while only 34.0% inclusive schools have had the regulation. It can be concluded that the legislation of inclusive education in Indonesia which explained that each of the inclusive school is required to have at least one SET (Ministry of Education Act No. 70/ 2009) has not been implemented by all-inclusive schools in Indonesia. Without a regulation of SET, the existence of SET will become unclear.

3.2 SET Recruitment Process in Inclusive School

Table 1 showed that most of the SETs (64.9%) stated that the recruitment process was through the formation by school (honorary teacher). Meanwhile, some other SETs stated that the recruitment process was through the formation by district/city/province government (9.4%) and through aide-teacher from special school (2.3%). Some teachers (23.4%) also added that the recruitment process was through the additional teaching hours and additional task as SET (class teacher with additional task). These results show that the numbers of SET in inclusive schools who have government employee status are very few. These findings indicate that the Ministerial Regulation No 70/ 2009, particularly article 10 which obligates the district/city government to provide at least one SET in every inclusive school, has not been implemented optimally.

Table 1: SET Recruitment Process.

SET Recruitment Process	Sum	Percent
Formation by district/city/province government	25	9.4%
Formation by school (apprentice/part-time teacher)	172	64.9%
Aide-teacher from other schools	6	2.3%
Class teacher with additional task	62	23.4%

In terms of the requirement of SET, the results show that 78.5% SETs reported had no requirements demanded to be a SET, while only 21.5% SETs stated there were some requirements to be a SET. The requirements as a SET include: (1) graduating from Special Education Department, (2) having comprehension and experience of special education, (3) having a professional background (Occupational Therapist, Speech Therapy, Physical Therapy, and Psychology), (4) having experience and being able to handle children with special needs. In terms of the SET selection process, the results showed that most of the SETs (94.0%) stated there was not any a certain selection process to be a SET, while 6.0% SETs stated that there was a certain selection process to be a SET. Thus, most of the SETs in inclusive schools do not have the qualifications and competency standards required. This condition is certainly contrary to the legislation which states that each teacher is required to have a minimum qualification of undergraduate degree to meet the pedagogical, personality, social and professional competence (Act No. 14 of 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers).

To be a SET requires specialized professional education and skills. In the states of the USA like in Arlington, a bachelor is a minimal qualification of SET, with specialized skills and sufficient field experience in dealing with disabilities. License as SET obtained only from the special education program accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). In developing countries like Vietnam, there are two categories for the preparation of SET, (1) minimal undergraduate (S1) or third diploma (D3) of specialized professional education, or (2) taking inclusive education program courses with a special material. Today most of the teacher training colleges in Vietnam have been offering inclusive education curriculum at all levels (Nguyet and Thu, 2010).

3.3 SET Employment Status in Inclusive School

Table 2 shows that the majority of SETs (44.2%) are civil servant teachers with additional duties as SET; 50.1% SETs are apprentice/part-time teachers; and 5.7% SETs are permanent foundation employees.

Table 2: SET Employment Status.

SET Employment Status	Sum	Percent
Civil servants (with additional duties as SET)	117	44.2%
Permanent foundation employees	15	5.7%
Apprentice/part-time teachers	134	50.1%

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the SET employment status is largely the apprentice/part-time teachers, so they do not get an adequate salary standards and clear guidance career as teachers in general. This condition is not appropriate because the SET has important tasks and jobs in dealing with special needs children in inclusive schools (Takala et al., 2009; Pierangelo, 2004; The NCPSE, 2002).

3.4 SET Work Guidelines in Inclusive School

SET is a special profession which requires certain qualifications and competence (Act No. 14 of 2005). As professional, SETs should run their duties based on standard operating procedure (SOP) according to the legislation of process standard (Ministry of Education Act No.22/2016). The results showed that most of the SETs (51.7%) work with a written guideline, while 48.3% SETs work without a written guideline. Most of the SETs who claim to have a written guideline (81.5%) stated that the guideline does not meet the requirement of work standard of SET.

According to Takala et al (2009), SET work includes three things (1) teaching, (2) consulting services, and (3) the background work. It is also explained by Pierangelo (2004) that SET is not only a direct teaching, but also as paper working and performing collaboration and consultation. It can be concluded that SETs have various tasks (Pierangelo, 2004; NCPSE, 2002). Thus, the SET working guideline in inclusive schools in Indonesia needs to be clarified with a written guideline, so the SETs can do their tasks professionally.

3.5 SET Competence in Inclusive School

Table 3 showed the descriptive statistic of the SET competence in inclusive schools. The mean score of SET competence is 293.95, with minimum score 149.00 and maximum score 419.00. Based on analysis of categorization refers to the normal curve, the score can be divided into five categories, excellent, good, adequate, less and very less.

Table 3: The Descriptive Statistic of SET Competence.

	N	Minimum score	Maximum score	Mean
Competence	265	149.00	419.00	293.95

Table 4: SET Competence Category.

SET Competence Category	Range Score	Sum	Percent (%)
Least	95 – 114	0	0.0
Less	115 – 200	7	2.6
Adequate	201 – 275	85	32.1
Good	276 – 351	143	54.0
Excellent	352 – 475	30	11.3

Table 4 showed that most of the SETs (54%) had good competence; 32.1% SETs had adequate competence, 11.3% respondents had excellent competence, and only 2.6% respondents had less competence. It can be concluded that the competence SET (professional competence, pedagogy, personality, social, and special education competence) in inclusive schools in Indonesia are mostly in good categories. The result of this research has progressed slightly as compared to previous studies (Martika et al., 2016; Gunarhadi et al., 2016; Gunarhadi et al., 2012). Gunarhadi et al. (2016) found that the level of knowledge and pedagogical skills of SETs in 3 districts of Central Java are in average and good category. The SET competence in this study is still better than the regular teacher competence, especially in special education competence (Martika et al., 2016).

According to the act (Teacher Act No. 14/ 2005), teacher should have 4 kinds of basic competencies (pedagogical, personality, social and professional competence). These results indicated that although the employment status of SETs was still unclear, but they still showed professional performances. Therefore, their status must be recognized and

protected. They hope that their career in the future will be recognized as well as teachers in general.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The results of the study concluded that (1) the existence of SET in inclusive schools still faced with problems in terms of regulation, recruitment, employment status, and work guideline, (2) the ministerial regulation No. 70/2009 about inclusive education has not been implemented optimally in inclusive schools, (3) the competence (pedagogy, professional, personality, social, and special education competence) of SETs in inclusive schools in Indonesia are mostly in good and adequate category. Therefore, special regulations of SET in Indonesia must be drafted, so the existence and the future of SET in inclusive schools in Indonesia can be more protected as well as teachers in general and the SET are able to work more professionally in inclusive schools.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors acknowledge Program Unggulan Perguruan Tinggi Negeri (PUPT) from RISTEK DIKTI.

REFERENCES

- Bermejo, V. S., Castro, F. V., Martínez, F. M., Góngora, D. P., 2009. Inclusive education in Spain: Developing characteristics in Madrid, Extremadura and Andalusia. *Research in Comparative and International Education*. 4(3), 321-333.
- Crabtree, S. A., Williams, R., 2013. Ethical implications for research into inclusive education in Arab societies: Reflections on the politicization of the personalized research experience. *International Social Work*. 56(2), 148-161.
- Creswell, J. W., 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*, Sage Publication. USA, 3rd edition.
- Douglas, S. N., Chapin, S. E., Nolan, J. F., 2016. Special Education Teachers, Experiences Supporting and Supervising Paraeducators, Implication for Special and General Education Settings. *The Journal of Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*. 39(1), 60 – 70.
- Gehrke, R. S., Cocchiarella, M., 2013. Preservice special and general educators’ knowledge of inclusion. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The*

- Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*. 36(3), 204-216.
- Gunarhadi, Sugini, Andayani, T. R., 2012. Teachers' Performance in Inclusive Education. *Procedia-Asean Academic Community International Conference*. HS-36-PF, 48-51.
- Gunarhadi, Sunardi, Andayani, T. R., Anwar, M., 2016. Pedagogic mapping of teacher competence in inclusive schools. *Procedia International Conference of Teacher Training Education*. 1(1), 389-394.
- Mackey, M., 2014. Inclusive Education in the United States: Middle School General Education Teachers' Approaches to Inclusion. *International Journal of Instruction*. 7(2), 5-21.
- Martika, T., Salim, A., Yusuf, M., 2016. Understanding Level of Regular Teachers' Competency Understanding to Children with Special Needs in Inclusive School. *European Journal of Special Education Research*. 1(3), 30-38.
- Maudslay, L., 2014. Inclusive education in Nepal: Assumptions and reality. *Childhood*. 21(3), 418-424.
- McCrimmon, A. W., 2014. Inclusive Education in Canada: Issues in Teacher Preparation. *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 50(4), 234-237.
- Miles, S., Lene, D., Merumeru, L., 2014. Making sense of inclusive education in the Pacific region: Networking as a way forward. *Childhood*. 21(3). 339-353.
- Nguyet, D. T., Thu, H. L., 2010. *How to Guide Preparing Teachers for Inclusive Education*, Chatolic Relief Services. Vietnam.
- Ntombela, S., 2011. The progress of inclusive education in South Africa: Teachers' experiences in a selected district, KwaZulu-Natal. *Improving Schools*. 14(1), 5-14.
- Oyler, C., 2011. Teacher preparation for inclusive and critical (special) education. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*. 34(3), 201-218.
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional (Permendiknas) Nomor 70, 2009. *tentang Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif*.
- Permenpan dan Reformasi Birokrasi Republik Indonesia Nomor 16, 2009. *tentang Jabatan Fungsional Guru dan Angka Kreditnya*.
- Pierangelo, R., 2004. *The Special Educator's Survival Guide*, Jossey-Bass. San Fransisco.
- Salend, S. J., Dunhaney, L. M. G., 1999. The Impact of Inclusion on Students With and Without Disabilities and Their Educator. *Journal of Remedial and Special Education*. 20(2), 114 – 126.
- Sindelar, P. T., Brownell, M. T., Billingsley, B., 2010. Special education teacher education research: Current status and future directions. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*. 33(1), 8-24.
- Sucuoğlu, B., Bakkaloğlu, H., Karasu, F. İ., Demir, Ş., Akalın, S., 2013. Inclusive preschool teachers: Their attitudes and knowledge about inclusion. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*. 5(2), 107-128.
- Takala, M., Pirttimaa, R., Törmänen, M., 2009. RESEARCH SECTION: Inclusive special education: the role of special education teachers in Finland. *British Journal of Special Education*. 36(3), 162-173.
- The NCPSE (National Clearinghouse for Professions Sspecial Education), 2002. *Special Education Teacher, Making a Difference in the Lives of Students with Special Needs*, Council for Exceptional Children. Arlington.
- Tilak, J. B., 2015. How Inclusive Is Higher Education in India? *Social Change*. 45(2), 185-223.
- Undang – Undang Nomor 14, 2005. *tentang Guru dan Dosen*.
- Van Laarhoven, T. R., Munk, D. D., Lynch, K., Bosma, J., Rouse, J., 2007. A model for preparing special and general education preservice teachers for inclusive education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 58(5), 440-455.
- Vernon-Dotson, L. J., Floyd, L. O., Dukes, C., Darling, S. M., 2014. Course delivery: Keystones of effective special education teacher preparation. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*. 37(1), 34-50.
- Waldron, N. L., McLeskey, J., Pacchiano, D., 2009. Giving teachers a voice: Teachers' perspectives regarding elementary inclusive school programs (ISP). *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*. 22(3), 141-153.
- Walker, Z., 2016. Special Education Teacher Preparation in Singapore's Dual Education System. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*. 39(3), 178-190.
- Wolf, S. B., 2014. Special Education Professional Standards How Important Are They in the Context of Teacher Performance Evaluation?. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*. 38(4), 276-290.
- Yusuf, M., Sugini, Choiri, S., Rejeki, D. S., 2017. Development of inclusive education course at the faculty of teacher training and education Universitas Sebelas Maret. *International Journal for Studies on Children, Women, Elderly, and Disabled*. 1, 121-126.