Primary Education Journal (2026)

Primary Education Journal

Journal homepage: e-journal.unimudasorong.ac.id/index.php/primadona

Analysis of Inhibiting Factors and Teacher Communication Patterns in Inclusive Learning in Grade VI at Sorong Elementary School

Novalina Bame[1], Muhammad Faizin[2], Ahmad Yulianto[3]

[1,2,3] Department of Elementary School Teacher Education, Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong, West Papua, Indonesia
*Correspondence: chlaranovalin@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 29 January 2026
Revised: 1 August 2026
Accepted: 15 September 2026
Published Online: 26 October 2026

Keywords:
Jigsaw Cooperative Learning; Reading Comprehension; Quasi-Experimental; N-Gain; Elementary School.

ABSTRACT

Communication constitutes the fundamental process by which messages and information are conveyed between parties so that the intended meaning is understood. Within the context of inclusive education, effective teacher communication is widely regarded as the most critical determinant of learning quality. This study aims to describe and analyse the communication patterns employed by teachers in inclusive learning environments, and to identify the inhibiting factors that impede effective teacher communication in Grade VI at SD Inpres 15, Sorong Regency, Southwest Papua Province. A qualitative case study design was employed. Data were gathered through direct observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation involving the classroom teacher and Grade VI students. Data were analysed using the interactive model comprising data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Findings indicate that the dominant communication pattern used by the Grade VI teacher is group communication, characterised by one-directional teacher-to-student information delivery with minimal interactive engagement. The teacher has not yet adequately accommodated

inclusive learning practices to address the diverse needs of all students. The principal inhibiting factors identified are insufficient teacher skills in managing inclusive classrooms and the exclusive reliance on lecture-based instructional methods, which limits student participation, reduces self-confidence, and fails to address the individualised needs of students with disabilities. The study recommends that teachers receive continuous professional development, motivational support, and targeted training in inclusive pedagogical strategies and differentiated communication approaches.

How to Cite: Bame, N., Faizin, M., & Yulianto, A. (2026). Analysis of Inhibiting Factors and Teacher Communication Patterns in Inclusive Learning in Grade VI at Sorong Elementary School. *Primary Education Journal,* 3(1), 65-81.

© The Author(s) 2026

INTRODUCTION

Communication constitutes the foundational process through which meaning is constructed and shared between individuals. In educational settings, the quality of teacher communication directly shapes the nature of student engagement, comprehension, and learning outcomes (Mulyasa, 2016; Soleh, 2016). Within the particular context of inclusive education, where classrooms accommodate students with diverse physical, cognitive, social, emotional, and linguistic characteristics, effective and adaptive teacher communication assumes an even more critical role. The Salamanca Statement (1994) established the international normative framework for inclusive education, affirming that all children, regardless of their condition, have the right to learn together in regular schools. In Indonesia, this principle is enshrined in Permendiknas No. 70 of 2009, which mandates the provision of inclusive education for students with disabilities and special giftedness.

Inclusive education, by definition, requires schools to accommodate all children without discrimination based on physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic, or other conditions (Ainscow & Miles, 2018; UNESCO,

2017). The realisation of inclusive education in practice, however, demands more than legislative compliance; it requires teachers to possess sophisticated competencies in differentiated instruction, adaptive communication, and individualised assessment (Friend & Bursuck, 2019; Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2017). Teacher communication in inclusive classrooms encompasses not only the verbal conveyance of instructional content, but also the responsive and relational dimensions of pedagogical interaction, including the capacity to recognise and address the distinct learning needs of students with disabilities alongside their non-disabled peers (Engelbrecht et al., 2015; Booth & Ainscow, 2016).

Research consistently identifies teacher communication skills as a key predictor of inclusive education quality (Haryono & Rahayu, 2019; Wulandari & Suparno, 2022). Inadequate communication patterns, characterised by one-directional instruction, limited student participation, and the absence of individualised attention, are associated with reduced learning motivation, diminished self-efficacy, and poor academic outcomes among students with special needs (Kustawan, 2016; Nind et al., 2016). Despite the growing policy emphasis on inclusive education in Indonesia, empirical studies examining the concrete communication practices and their limitations in inclusive elementary classrooms, particularly in the eastern Indonesian context, remain limited.

Preliminary observations conducted at SD Inpres 15, Sorong Regency, Southwest Papua Province, revealed that Grade VI classrooms included students with disabilities alongside regular students. The classroom teacher had not yet comprehensively implemented inclusive learning practices, and notable discrepancies were observed between stated instructional intentions and actual classroom conduct. These contextual conditions motivated the present study. This study therefore aims to: (1) describe and analyse the communication patterns employed by the Grade VI teacher in inclusive learning at SD Inpres 15, Sorong Regency; and (2) identify and analyse the inhibiting factors that

impede effective teacher communication in inclusive learning in the same context.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative research approach with a case study design. As articulated by Creswell and Creswell (2018), a case study design is appropriate when the researcher seeks to develop an in-depth understanding of a specific, bounded case within its real-life context. The case in this study is the inclusive learning environment of Grade VI at SD Inpres 15, Sorong Regency, Southwest Papua Province, selected on the basis of the presence of students with disabilities within a regular classroom setting and the observable complexity of teacher communication dynamics therein.

Research Participants and Setting

The research was conducted at SD Inpres 15, Sorong Regency, Southwest Papua Province. The study population comprised teachers and students at the school, with the sample consisting of the Grade VIA classroom teacher and Grade VI students. Participants were selected purposively, on the basis of their direct involvement in the inclusive learning process and their capacity to provide relevant and information-rich data pertaining to the research focus (Moleong, 2018).

Data Collection

Data were gathered through three complementary techniques: direct observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation. Observations were conducted using a structured observation guide to document the phases of classroom learning, including opening activities, learning planning, assessment, and closing activities, as enacted during actual instructional sessions. In-depth interviews were conducted separately with the classroom teacher and with students, guided by a semi-structured interview protocol. Documentation was employed to collect supplementary data from instructional plans, school records, and related artefacts. The integration of these three data sources

supported the triangulation of findings.

Data Analysis

Data were analysed using the interactive model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, as applied by Sugiyono (2021), comprising three iterative stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. In the data reduction stage, raw data from observations and interviews were condensed through selective coding and thematic identification. In the data display stage, the reduced data were organised into coherent descriptive narratives. In the conclusion drawing stage, interpretations were formulated and verified against the original data sources. Source triangulation was applied to ensure the credibility of the findings, cross-checking data from the teacher, students, and documentary sources.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Classroom Learning Activities

Observations of classroom learning at SD Inpres 15, Sorong Regency, were structured around the four principal phases of instruction: opening activities, learning planning, assessment, and closing activities. Data from observations and interviews were analysed and compared across sources. A notable discrepancy emerged between the teacher's stated practices during interviews and the actual instructional conduct observed by the researcher, indicating a gap between perceived and enacted pedagogy.

Opening Activities

Based on observations and interviews, the teacher's opening of learning sessions included elements such as greeting students, conducting roll call, and conducting apperception linking the current lesson to prior learning. However, interview data from students revealed significant inconsistencies in the actual enactment of these procedures. The following interview excerpts illustrate the teacher's and students' respective accounts.

Table 1. Interview Transcript: Teacher (Opening Activities)

Interviewer/Respondent	Statement
Researcher	*How do you open a learning session in class?*
Teacher	*When opening a lesson, the first thing I do is lead a prayer together, then take attendance, and students give a greeting. After that, I conduct apperception by connecting the current lesson to the previous one.*

Table 2. Interview Transcript: Students (Opening Activities)

Interviewer/Respondent	Statement
Researcher	*Does your teacher always greet and say hello when entering the classroom?*
Student	*Sometimes.*
Researcher	*Does your teacher give all students the opportunity to take turns leading the opening prayer?*
Student	*We usually pray together during the morning assembly. Inside the classroom, there is usually no prayer before lessons begin.*
Researcher	*Does the teacher ask about students' overall readiness to participate in the lesson?*
Student	*Usually the teacher goes straight into the lesson without asking about readiness.*
Researcher	*Does the teacher conduct apperception from the previous lesson, giving all students the opportunity to explain?*
Student	*No.*

Analysis of the opening activities reveals that the teacher's conduct of the preliminary phase of learning in the inclusive Grade VI classroom at SD Inpres 15 was not yet optimal. The discrepancy between the teacher's interview

responses and student accounts, corroborated by the researcher's direct observations, indicates that several key components of effective lesson opening, particularly prayer within the classroom, readiness checks, and inclusive apperception, were inconsistently implemented. This finding aligns with Mulyasa (2016), who emphasises that the opening phase of a lesson is a critical moment for establishing psychological safety and communicative connection with all learners, including those with special needs.

Learning Planning

Based on interview data, the Grade VIA teacher described a differentiated approach to learning planning: providing standard instruction for students who demonstrated rapid comprehension, while calling students with special needs individually to the front, positioning them in the front row, and repeating explanations up to three times. However, observational data revealed that learning planning did not systematically consider the full range of student needs. The following transcripts reflect the teacher's account of planning practice.

Table 3. Interview Transcript: Teacher (Learning Planning)

Interviewer/Respondent	Statement
Researcher	*How do you plan inclusive learning to meet all students' needs?*
Teacher	*For students who understand material quickly, I use one method. For students with special needs, I sometimes call them individually and seat them in the front row. I typically repeat explanations up to three times for them.*
Researcher	*How do you integrate technology into inclusive learning planning?*
Teacher	*In the classroom, I do not use technology such as a laptop or*

	projector for planning because there is no electricity installed in the classroom. I usually use my mobile phone. When connected to Wi-Fi and there is a QR code-based activity, I use the phone to continue the material. When the material is difficult to understand, I always find my own strategy to explain it in a way that is easy for students, separate from conventional teaching methods.

Observational findings confirm that the teacher's learning planning was largely reactive and situational, governed primarily by the existing textbook content and classroom conditions, rather than by a systematic plan that proactively addressed the diverse needs of all students, including the student with a disability present in the class. As Sabirin (2012) and Widiyanto and Wahyuni (2020) note, effective learning planning in inclusive contexts is a systematic process of guiding, supporting, and directing students toward learning objectives through the deliberate organisation of materials, media, approaches, methods, and assessment. The absence of such systematic planning at SD Inpres 15 represents a significant gap in inclusive practice.

Assessment

Interview data with students indicated that students generally perceived the teacher's grading to be fair and consistent. The teacher described a differentiated assessment approach in which students with special needs were assessed differently from regular students, with the teacher prioritising motivational scoring over strict criterion-referenced judgement. The following transcript presents the teacher's account of this approach.

Table 4. Interview Transcript: Teacher (Assessment)

Interviewer/Respondent	Statement
Researcher	*How do you assess student progress in inclusive learning?*

Teacher	*For regular students, I grade based on the correctness of their answers. For students with special needs, assessment is not based purely on correct or incorrect answers. I give scores that provide encouragement and motivation to develop. For example, if a student with special needs would technically receive a score of four or five based on their answer, I might give them a six so they feel motivated to continue.*
Researcher	*Is there a difference in how you assess regular students versus those with special needs?*
Teacher	*Yes, definitely. For regular students, I assess strictly according to the accuracy of their responses. For students with special needs, the score is not about right or wrong, but about encouraging them to keep trying and growing.*

The teacher's approach to differentiated assessment for students with disabilities reflects a well-intentioned but informally operationalised form of accommodated evaluation. While the motivational intent is commendable, the absence of a structured Individual Education Programme (IEP) or systematic differentiated assessment framework limits the rigour and consistency of inclusive assessment practice. Friend and Bursuck (2019) emphasise that assessment in inclusive classrooms should be guided by clear, documented accommodations that are transparent to all stakeholders and aligned with each student's learning goals.

Closing Activities

Based on observations and student interview data, the closing phase of lessons was inconsistently enacted. Students reported that opportunities to summarise learning were provided only occasionally, and that closing prayers were neither structured nor inclusive in their leadership. The following table presents relevant interview excerpts.

Table 5. Interview Transcript: Students (Closing Activities)

Interviewer/Respondent	Statement
Researcher	*Before closing the lesson, does the teacher give all students the opportunity to summarise the learning material?*
Student	*Sometimes.*
Researcher	*Does the teacher give other students the opportunity to take turns leading the closing prayer?*
Student	*For the prayer, we sometimes pray together and sometimes not. If there is a prayer, it is usually the students who are willing and ready who come forward to lead – usually the boys.*

The closing activities phase, based on observations and interview triangulation, indicated that the teacher's conduct of lesson closure did not systematically engage students in inclusive communicative practices. The irregular provision of opportunities for student summarisation and the non-inclusive management of prayer leadership are indicative of a broader pattern in which student participation in communicative classroom events is limited. This finding corroborates Wulandari and Suparno (2022), who identified the inconsistent conduct of lesson closure as a manifestation of inadequate inclusive communication practice in Indonesian elementary schools.

Communication Patterns in Inclusive Learning

The findings from observation and interview data converge in indicating that the dominant communication pattern employed in Grade VI inclusive learning at SD Inpres 15, Sorong Regency, is group communication. This pattern is characterised by the teacher addressing the class as a collective unit, delivering instructional content to all students simultaneously, and assessing comprehension primarily through brief question-and-answer exchanges or

written tasks. When a student answers correctly, the teacher concludes that comprehension has been achieved; when a student answers incorrectly, the teacher concludes that comprehension is lacking and provides additional explanation.

While group communication patterns may be efficient for managing large classes, they are widely recognised as insufficient for inclusive learning environments that require individualised communicative responsiveness (Ainscow & Miles, 2018; Armstrong et al., 2016). The Salamanca Statement (1994) explicitly calls for educational approaches that accommodate the individuality of all learners, which necessitates communication patterns that move beyond uniform group instruction towards differentiated, student-responsive interaction. The exclusive reliance on group communication in this context indicates that the teacher has not yet fully internalised or operationalised the communicative demands of inclusive pedagogy (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2017; Rieser, 2016).

Inhibiting Factors in Inclusive Learning Communication

Three principal inhibiting factors were identified through the triangulation of observational and interview data.

First, insufficient teacher skills in inclusive classroom management constituted the most pervasive inhibiting factor. The teacher's dominant reliance on lecture-based instruction, with minimal use of varied instructional media, collaborative learning structures, or differentiated communication strategies, resulted in limited student participation and reduced opportunities for meaningful inclusive engagement. Students reported that teachers seldom provided opportunities for group discussion or collaborative tasks, which in turn diminished student confidence and active participation. This finding is consistent with Kustawan (2016) and Friend and Bursuck (2019), who

emphasise that inclusive education demands teachers who possess specialised competencies in adaptive communication, differentiated instruction, and disability-responsive pedagogy.

Second, the exclusive use of lecture-based instructional methods served as a structural inhibiting factor. The absence of instructional media, such as educational videos, interactive simulations, or visual aids, constrained the teacher's ability to attract and sustain student attention, particularly for students with disabilities who may benefit from multi-sensory learning approaches (Nind et al., 2016; Booth & Ainscow, 2016). The teacher acknowledged the absence of electrical infrastructure in the classroom as a contextual constraint on technology integration, a systemic limitation that requires policy-level attention from school administrators and the local education authority.

Third, an ineffective teacher communication style, characterised by a lack of sensitivity to students' diverse learning and communication needs, was identified as an inhibiting factor. The teacher's communication style did not consistently reflect awareness of or responsiveness to the different ways in which students, particularly those with disabilities, learn, process information, and express understanding. UNESCO (2017) and Engelbrecht et al. (2015) emphasise that effective inclusive communication requires teachers to develop awareness of individual communicative profiles and to adapt their interactional style accordingly. The absence of this adaptive communicative orientation represents a significant gap in the inclusive practice observed at SD Inpres 15.

Collectively, these inhibiting factors reflect broader systemic challenges in the implementation of inclusive education in Indonesian elementary schools, including inadequate pre-service and in-service teacher preparation for inclusive contexts, insufficient physical infrastructure, and limited institutional support for individualised learning planning (Prasetyo et al., 2021; OECD, 2023). Addressing these challenges requires a concerted multi-stakeholder response encompassing professional development, resource allocation, and

policy reform.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the communication patterns and inhibiting factors in inclusive learning in Grade VI at SD Inpres 15, Sorong Regency, Southwest Papua Province. The findings indicate that the dominant communication pattern employed by the Grade VI teacher is group communication, characterised by one-directional instructional delivery to the whole class with minimal adaptive or individualised engagement. This pattern has not yet been effective in accommodating the diverse learning needs of all students, particularly those with disabilities.

Three principal inhibiting factors were identified: insufficient teacher skills in inclusive classroom management and differentiated communication; the exclusive reliance on lecture-based instructional methods without the use of varied media or collaborative structures; and an ineffective teacher communication style that lacks sensitivity to students' diverse learning and communicative needs. These factors collectively result in a learning environment that is inadequately responsive to the spirit and requirements of inclusive education as mandated by national policy and international frameworks.

To address these challenges, teachers require continuous professional motivation, targeted in-service training in inclusive pedagogical strategies, and regular coaching in differentiated communication approaches. Schools should also prioritise the development of supportive physical infrastructure, including reliable electricity supply and appropriate instructional media, to enable the use of diverse and multi-sensory teaching tools. Future research should employ longitudinal designs to examine the development of inclusive communication competencies following professional development interventions, and should extend inquiry to multiple classrooms and school contexts in eastern Indonesia.

Acknowledgments

The author expresses sincere gratitude to the teachers and students of Grade VI at SD Inpres 15, Sorong Regency, for their willingness to participate in this research and for their cooperation throughout the data collection process. The author also extends appreciation to all parties who provided support and contributed to the completion of this study.

Declarations

Author Contribution	:	Novalina Bame: Conceptualization, Writing - Original Draft, Editing and Visualization; Muhammad Faizin: Writing - Review & Editing, Formal analysis, and Methodology; Ahmad Yulianto: Validation and Supervision
Funding Statement	:	This research was funded by the director general of Strengthening Research and Development with the Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia for supporting and funding this research.
Conflict of Interest	:	The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Additional Information	:	Additional information is available for this paper.

REFERENCES

Ainscow, M., & Miles, S. (2018). Making education for all inclusive: Where next? Prospects, 38(1), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-008-9055-0

Alkhasanah, N., Darsinah, D., & Ernawati, E. (2023). Peran guru dalam membentuk karakter siswa SD [The role of teachers in forming elementary school student character]. Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Citra Bakti, 10(2), 355–365. https://doi.org/10.38048/jipcb.v10i2.1271

Armstrong, F., Armstrong, D., & Barton, L. (Eds.). (2016). Inclusive education: Policy, contexts and comparative perspectives. Routledge.

Asrul, A., & Rabia, S. F. (2023). Pengaruh pembelajaran kontekstual berbasis pratikum dalam menunjang motivasi belajar siswa kelas IV SD Inpres 18 Kabupaten Sorong [The effect of practicum-based contextual learning on Grade IV student motivation]. Trapsila: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar, 5(2), 25–33.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2016). Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools (4th ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Elita Genc, N., & Fatma Rabia, S. (2024). Augmented reality book-based "Nasretin Hoca" folklore to improve reading literacy for elementary school students. EduStream: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar, 8(2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.26740/eds.v8n2.p1-15

Engelbrecht, P., Nel, M., Nel, N., & Tlale, D. (2015). Enacting understanding of inclusion in complex contexts: Classroom practices of South African teachers. South African Journal of Education, 35(3), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v35n3a1074

Fatma Rabia, S., Abdul Nasir Zakaria, G., Istiq'faroh, N., Alfi Muhimmah, H., & Hadi Wibowo, A. (2024). Study on reading literacy in elementary schools: Bibliometric analysis 2013–2023. EduStream: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar, 8(1), 58–70. https://doi.org/10.26740/eds.v8n1.p58-70

Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. D. (2019). Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2017). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. British Educational Research Journal, 37(5), 813–828. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096

Garnida, D. (2015). Pengantar pendidikan inklusif [Introduction to inclusive education]. Refika Aditama.

Haryono, H., & Rahayu, T. S. (2019). Komunikasi guru dalam pembelajaran inklusi di sekolah dasar [Teacher communication in inclusive learning in elementary schools]. Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Nusantara, 5(1), 88–101. https://doi.org/10.29407/jpdn.v5i1.13006

Istiq'faroh, N., Rabia, S., Abidin, Z., Hendratno, H., Wibowo, A., & Hoang, M. (2024). Local wisdom-based Articulate Storyline application: A new way to improve reading literacy for elementary school students in the West Papua region. Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research, 5(2), 180–187. https://doi.org/10.46843/jiecr.v5i2.1114

Kustawan, D. (2016). Manajemen pendidikan inklusif [Management of inclusive education]. PT Luxima Metro Media.

Moleong, L. J. (2018). Metodologi penelitian kualitatif [Qualitative research methodology] (37th ed.). PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mulyasa, E. (2016). Menjadi guru profesional: Menciptakan pembelajaran kreatif dan menyenangkan [Becoming a professional teacher: Creating creative and enjoyable learning]. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Munirah, M. (2015). Sistem pendidikan di Indonesia: Antara keinginan dan realita [The education system in Indonesia: Between aspiration and reality]. Auladuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Islam, 2(2), 233–245.

Nind, M., Rix, J., Sheehy, K., & Simmons, K. (Eds.). (2016). Curriculum and pedagogy in inclusive education: Values into practice. Routledge.

OECD. (2023). Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en

Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Nomor 70 Tahun 2009 tentang Pendidikan Inklusif bagi Peserta Didik yang Memiliki Kelainan dan Memiliki Potensi Kecerdasan dan/atau Bakat Istimewa [Minister of National Education Regulation No. 70 of 2009 on Inclusive Education for Students with Disabilities and Gifted Potential]. (2009). Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia.

Prasetyo, A. R., Nurtjahjanti, H., & Ardhiani, L. N. (2021). Impact of changes in teaching methods during the COVID-19 pandemic: The effect of integrative e-learning on readiness for change and interest in learning among Indonesian university students. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 22(2), 87–101. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v22i2.5149

Rieser, R. (2016). Implementing inclusive education: A Commonwealth guide to implementing Article 24 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2nd ed.). Commonwealth Secretariat.

Sabirin, S. (2012). Perencanaan pembelajaran berbasis karakter [Character-based learning planning]. Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, 7(2), 1–22.

Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. (1994). UNESCO.

Soleh, A. (2016). Aksesibilitas penyandang disabilitas terhadap perguruan tinggi [Accessibility of persons with disabilities to higher education]. LKiS.

Sugiyono. (2021). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D [Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods] (3rd ed.). Alfabeta.

Ta'ba, Y., Rabia, S. F., & Yulianto, A. (2024). Turning a new page: Using pop-up books to motivate students with learning disabilities. Utamax: Journal of Ultimate Research and Trends in Education, 6(1), 33–43.

UNESCO. (2017). A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education. UNESCO Publishing.

Wafom, K., Yulianto, A., & Rabia, S. F. (2023). Pengaruh metode pemecahan masalah (problem solving) terhadap minat belajar PKn [The effect of the problem-solving method on Civic Education learning interest]. Trapsila: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar, 5(2), 34–44.

Widiyanto, M. A., & Wahyuni, S. (2020). Perencanaan pembelajaran yang efektif dalam pendidikan inklusi [Effective learning planning in inclusive education]. Jurnal Pendidikan Inklusi, 4(1), 45–58.

Wulandari, R., & Suparno, S. (2022). Hambatan komunikasi guru dalam pembelajaran inklusi di sekolah dasar [Barriers to teacher communication in inclusive learning in elementary schools]. Jurnal Basicedu, 6(3), 4102–4113. https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i3.2612