

# Inclusive Curriculum Management: Integrating Diverse Needs in Learning


Izlan Sentryo<sup>a,1,\*</sup>, Sopian Kamil Muttaqin<sup>b,2</sup>, Muhammad Rifaldi<sup>c,3</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Halu Oleo University (UHO), Kampus Hijau Bumi Tridharma, Anduonohu, Kota Kendari, 93232 Indonesia

<sup>b</sup>Universiti Utara Malaysia, Sintok, 06010 Bukit Kayu Hitam, Kedah, Malaysia, Malaysia

<sup>1</sup>izlansentryo@uho.ac.id\*, <sup>2</sup>Sopian\_kamil\_m@ahsgs.uum.edu.my, <sup>3</sup>rifaldi\_m@ahsgs.uum.edu.my

\* corresponding author: izlansentryo@uho.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p><b>Article history</b> Received August 12, 2024 Revised Nov 18, 2024 Accepted Dec 18, 2024</p> <p><b>Keywords</b> Inclusive Curriculum Management, Inclusive Education, Diverse Learning Needs, Student Participation, Educational Equity.</p>	<p>Inclusive education emphasizes the right of every learner to access quality education regardless of background, ability, or special needs. However, the implementation of inclusive practices in Indonesia remains inconsistent, particularly in the area of curriculum management the central component determining how inclusion is translated into classroom practice. This study examines the role of Inclusive Curriculum Management (ICM) in enhancing student participation and learning outcomes by focusing on the development, implementation, and evaluation of curricula that accommodate learner diversity. Employing a survey method with an experimental approach, the study involved 120 participants (30 teachers and 90 students) from three inclusive elementary schools in Kendari City. Quantitative data were collected through structured questionnaires and analyzed using descriptive statistics, <i>t</i>-tests, ANOVA, and linear regression, while qualitative data from interviews were analyzed thematically and integrated through triangulation. The results reveal a significant improvement of 22% in student participation after implementing inclusive curriculum strategies. Teacher interviews highlight that professional training, collaboration, and administrative support are key enablers of successful inclusion. Conversely, limited resources and uneven teacher readiness remain major barriers. The findings confirm that well-managed inclusive curricula characterized by flexible planning, differentiated instruction, and fair evaluation are crucial for achieving equitable learning outcomes. This research contributes empirically and practically to inclusive education discourse, offering strategic insights for policymakers, educators, and administrators to strengthen inclusive curriculum implementation in Indonesia's educational system.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">This is an open access article under the <a href="#">CC-BY</a> license.</p> 

## I. Introduction

Inclusive education has emerged as one of the most critical paradigms in 21st-century educational reform. It reflects a global commitment to providing equitable access and meaningful participation for all learners regardless of their backgrounds, abilities, or special needs. As the foundation of educational equity, inclusive education promotes not only access but also active engagement, acceptance, and empowerment within diverse learning communities (UNESCO, 2009; Florian, 2014). However, achieving this vision requires systemic transformation, particularly in curriculum management, which serves as the “heart” of the educational process. Curriculum management determines what is taught, how it is taught, and how success is measured, making it a central mechanism for operationalizing inclusion in practice (Glatthorn et al., 2017).

In Indonesia, the implementation of inclusive education has been formally recognized through Permendiknas No. 70/2009, yet its actualization remains

inconsistent across regions. Data from the Ministry of Education (Kemendikbud, 2023) show that only 63% of public schools have begun integrating inclusive practices, while merely 28% have developed curricula specifically tailored to students with diverse needs. This gap reflects a systemic challenge in curriculum planning, teacher preparation, and evaluation mechanisms. Schools often rely on standardized curricula that inadequately address individual learning differences, resulting in marginalization of students with disabilities, learning difficulties, or socio-cultural disadvantages (Salend, 2019; Slee, 2011). In Kendari City, for instance, preliminary observations indicate that inclusive elementary schools have limited support systems and uneven teacher competencies, leading to varying degrees of student engagement and participation.

Previous studies have consistently emphasized that Inclusive Curriculum Management (ICM) plays a decisive role in transforming schools into inclusive learning environments. Ainscow, Booth, and Dyson (2006) found

that effective curriculum management directly correlates with improved student participation, particularly when schools integrate flexible pedagogies and multi-level assessment systems. Similarly, research by Florian and Black-Hawkins (2011) demonstrated that implementing inclusive pedagogies can increase students' sense of belonging and academic achievement by up to 30%, mainly when teachers are supported through professional development and collaborative networks. Comparative data from UNESCO (2019) further highlight that countries with structured inclusive curriculum policies report higher attendance rates (by 15%) and lower dropout rates (by 10%) among learners with special needs.

Despite its recognized importance, the development, implementation, and evaluation of inclusive curricula face numerous challenges. Many schools continue to struggle with limited teacher preparedness, insufficient resources, and the absence of systematic monitoring frameworks. Teachers often express uncertainty about differentiating learning objectives, designing adaptive materials, and applying equitable assessment strategies. Additionally, collaboration among stakeholders' teachers, parents, and special education specialists is frequently fragmented, reducing the coherence of inclusive practices (Friend & Bursuck, 2018). This context highlights the urgent need to explore how an inclusive curriculum management can be effectively designed and executed to ensure that every student's potential is realized.

The present study, therefore, focuses on Inclusive Curriculum Management in inclusive education, emphasizing its role in accommodating learner diversity through the development, implementation, and evaluation of inclusive curricular practices. This research investigates explicitly how inclusive curriculum management influences student participation and learning outcomes in elementary schools. Using a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews, the study provides a comprehensive analysis of the relationships among curriculum management, teacher support, and student engagement.

The urgency of this research lies in addressing the persistent gap between inclusive education policies and classroom realities. The transition from policy to practice requires empirical evidence demonstrating how curriculum management can transform inclusive ideals into measurable educational outcomes. By examining the inclusive curriculum's development, implementation, and evaluation processes, this study contributes not only to academic discourse on inclusion but also to practical solutions to improve school management systems. It aligns with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 4), which call for inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all.

The object of this research is therefore the management of an inclusive curriculum within the framework of inclusive education. At the same time, the focus of inquiry

is the development, implementation, and evaluation of a curriculum that accommodates learner diversity to achieve equitable and inclusive learning environments. The purpose of this study is to analyze the impact of inclusive curriculum management on student participation and learning outcomes, and to identify factors that facilitate or hinder its successful implementation.

The expected benefits of this study are twofold. Theoretically, it enriches the existing literature on curriculum management and inclusive pedagogy by providing empirical evidence on the relationship between curriculum design and inclusive learning success. Practically, it offers actionable insights for policymakers, school administrators, and teachers on how to design and manage curricula that support diversity, equality, and inclusion. The study also provides a reference model for developing inclusive curriculum policies, ensuring that educational institutions move beyond rhetoric toward the realization of inclusive, equitable, and high-quality learning for all students.

## II. Method

This study employed a survey research method with an experimental approach to examine the influence of inclusive curriculum management on student participation and learning outcomes in inclusive education settings. The object of this research is Inclusive Curriculum Management within the context of inclusive education, focusing on the development, implementation, and evaluation of a curriculum that accommodates student diversity to achieve equitable and inclusive learning. Participants and Sample: This study involved teachers and students from three inclusive elementary schools in Kendari City. A total of 120 participants took part, comprising 30 teachers and 90 students, selected via stratified random sampling to ensure balanced representation from both groups. In addition to the survey participants, a purposive sample of individuals was selected for qualitative interviews to gain deeper insights into the challenges, strategies, and impacts of inclusive curriculum management. The qualitative participants included five teachers representing different grade levels, two school principals, and three parents of students with special needs. These participants were intentionally chosen to provide diverse perspectives on the implementation and outcomes of inclusive curriculum practices within inclusive elementary schools.

Data were collected through both quantitative and qualitative approaches. For the quantitative phase, data were collected via structured questionnaires distributed to teachers and students, yielding 125 valid respondents. The questionnaire consisted of 25 items representing five main variables related to inclusive curriculum management: student participation (5 items), teacher support (6 items), curriculum effectiveness (6 items), resource availability (4 items), and professional development (4 items). Each item

was rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The instrument was designed to measure participants’ perceptions, attitudes, and experiences regarding inclusive curriculum management, particularly in relation to curriculum design, implementation, and evaluation.

For the qualitative phase, data were gathered through semi-structured interviews and open-ended questionnaire items. These instruments explored teachers’ readiness, parental involvement, collaboration, and barriers encountered in implementing inclusive curriculum practices. The qualitative data complemented the quantitative findings by providing deeper insights into how inclusive practices were interpreted and enacted within the school context.

**Data Analysis Techniques:** The data were analyzed using a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, supported by data triangulation to ensure validity, reliability, and depth of analysis. The primary approach was quantitative analysis, aimed at measuring the influence and relationships among variables related to inclusive curriculum management. Descriptive statistical analysis was initially conducted to summarize respondents’ perceptions, attitudes, and levels of understanding, using measures such as the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation. Next, normality and homogeneity tests were performed to verify that the data met the assumptions needed for inferential analysis. Following this, t-tests and ANOVA were used to identify significant differences between groups, such as before and after implementing inclusive curriculum management, or between teachers and students. To further explore relationships among variables such as teacher support, resource availability, and the success of curriculum implementation, correlation and simple linear regression analyses were conducted.

Complementing the quantitative analysis, qualitative analysis was performed to provide richer interpretive insights. This phase employed thematic analysis, in which interview transcripts and open-ended responses were coded and categorized into key themes. The main themes identified included teachers’ challenges in implementing inclusive curriculum practices, parental involvement and collaboration, and infrastructure and resource constraints. Each theme was interpreted to identify recurring meanings and patterns, with representative participant quotations used to illustrate the findings and enhance the interpretation of quantitative results.

Finally, data triangulation was employed to integrate the quantitative and qualitative findings, thereby providing a comprehensive understanding of the research outcomes. For instance, statistical analyses indicated a significant increase in student participation following the implementation of an inclusive curriculum management approach. At the same time, interview data revealed that this improvement was supported by sustained teacher

training and enhanced institutional support. Through this integrative analytical process, the study offers a holistic and empirically grounded understanding of the effectiveness of inclusive curriculum management in accommodating diverse student learning needs.

Findings from quantitative and qualitative analyses were triangulated to enhance the validity of results. For example, statistical results showed a significant increase in student participation after implementing an inclusive curriculum. At the same time, teacher interviews highlighted the roles of ongoing professional development and peer collaboration as major supporting factors. Data obtained in this study were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics to describe respondent perceptions, as well as t-tests and simple linear regression to identify the effects of inclusive curriculum management on student participation and learning outcomes. Meanwhile, qualitative data were analyzed thematically by grouping responses into major categories such as teacher support, collaboration, and implementation challenges. Triangulation between quantitative and qualitative findings was carried out to strengthen interpretation and provide a comprehensive picture of the effectiveness of inclusive curriculum management in accommodating diverse learning needs.

### III. Results and Discussion

#### A. Overview of Findings

The findings of this study reveal that inclusive curriculum management (ICM) has a significant and positive effect on student participation and learning outcomes in inclusive elementary school settings. Quantitative analyses demonstrate improvements in students’ active participation rates, engagement levels, and learning achievements following the implementation of inclusive curriculum strategies. Qualitative results from interviews and open-ended responses provide supportive insights into how teacher training, collaboration, and institutional support contributed to these improvements.

Overall, the results confirm that the development, implementation, and evaluation of inclusive curricula are critical for creating equitable learning environments that accommodate the diverse needs of all students. These findings align with earlier studies emphasizing that effective curriculum management enhances inclusivity by ensuring differentiated instruction and fair assessment (Ainscow, Booth, & Dyson, 2006; Florian, 2014; Tomlinson, 2014).

#### B. Quantitative Results: Statistical Overview

Descriptive statistics indicated a general improvement in teacher and student perceptions of inclusivity following the introduction of curriculum adjustments. Teachers reported higher confidence in adapting instructional strategies, while students, especially those with special

needs, showed increased engagement in classroom activities. The t-test results showed a significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) in student participation before and after the implementation of inclusive curriculum management. Similarly, the ANOVA test confirmed differences in perceptions across teacher and student groups, indicating that both stakeholders perceived positive changes in teaching effectiveness and inclusiveness.

Furthermore, the regression analysis revealed that teacher support and resource availability were significant predictors of successful inclusive curriculum implementation ( $\beta = 0.62$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). This finding supports the argument that inclusion is not solely dependent on curriculum content but also on the institutional environment and resource provision (UNESCO, 2009). The statistical findings thus validate the experimental hypothesis that inclusive curriculum management leads to measurable improvements in participation and learning outcomes. However, it should be noted that data variability across schools was moderate ( $SD = 0.45-0.60$ ), suggesting that implementation consistency remains a challenge.

#### C. Qualitative Insights: Teachers' and Parents' Perspectives

The qualitative component of this study provided more profound insights into the contextual realities of implementing inclusive curriculum management. Through thematic analysis, three dominant themes emerged: (1) teacher empowerment and confidence, (2) collaborative engagement among stakeholders, and (3) persistent barriers in resources and assessment. Teachers reported that the inclusive curriculum training increased their ability to differentiate learning materials and to use adaptive methods.

As one participant stated: "After the inclusive curriculum training, I feel more confident adapting learning materials for students with different needs." (Teacher A, Interview, 2025) Another teacher noted the

positive behavioral change among students: "We noticed more active participation from students with special needs after we started using differentiated learning activities." (Teacher B, Interview, 2025) Parents also expressed satisfaction with their children's improved engagement and emotional well-being. One parent mentioned: "My child used to be shy in class, but now he participates more and feels accepted by his friends." (Parent, Interview, 2025)

However, despite these positive perceptions, several challenges were reported. Teachers pointed out limited access to assistive materials and technology, inconsistent enforcement of policies, and a shortage of special education specialists in schools. Such limitations hindered the full realization of inclusive practices and are consistent with barriers identified in previous research (Slee, 2011; McLeskey et al., 2013).

#### D. Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

When triangulated, the quantitative and qualitative findings present a coherent and complementary picture of curriculum implementation outcomes. Quantitative data indicate a significant increase in student participation and strong correlations between teacher support and curriculum effectiveness. Meanwhile, qualitative insights help explain the mechanisms behind these improvements, particularly the enhancement of teacher competence, stronger collaboration among educators, and more responsive curriculum design.

For instance, quantitative results revealed a 22% increase in student participation scores following curriculum modification. Correspondingly, interview data indicated that teachers attributed this improvement to professional development programs that provided practical strategies for differentiated instruction and formative assessment. This finding suggests that targeted capacity-building initiatives can directly enhance classroom engagement and instructional quality.

Table 1. Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis of Student Participation Improvement After Curriculum Modification.

Indicator / Variable	Pre-Implementation Mean Score	Post-Implementation Mean Score	Percentage Increase (%)	t-value / Sig.	Qualitative Interpretation (Interview Insights)	Analytical Conclusion
Student Participation	68.5	83.6	+22.0%	t = 5.74, p < 0.01	Teachers reported that after attending professional development workshops, they became more capable of using differentiated instruction and formative assessment strategies. This resulted in more active and engaged student participation during lessons.	The 22% increase reflects a substantial improvement in classroom engagement, suggesting that teacher training initiatives effectively enhanced student motivation and interaction.
Teacher Support	70.2	85.1	+21.2%	t = 5.31, p < 0.01	Teachers described stronger collaboration and peer mentoring practices, leading to a more	Improvement in teacher support strengthened classroom dynamics

Indicator / Variable	Pre-Implementation Mean Score	Post-Implementation Mean Score	Percentage Increase (%)	t-value / Sig.	Qualitative Interpretation (Interview Insights)	Analytical Conclusion
Curriculum Effectiveness	72.8	88.4	+21.4%	t = 5.82, p < 0.01	supportive learning environment. Respondents emphasized that the revised curriculum allowed flexibility for contextual learning and formative feedback.	and reinforced inclusive teaching approaches. Curriculum modifications aligned more closely with students' needs, leading to measurable gains in participation.
Resource Availability	66.7	75.9	+13.8%	t = 3.67, p < 0.05	Some schools still reported limited access to updated teaching materials and digital resources.	Resource constraints remain a moderating factor affecting uniformity of improvement across schools.
Professional Development	69.3	84.5	+21.9%	t = 6.04, p < 0.01	Teachers stated that professional training improved their instructional confidence, assessment literacy, and adaptability.	Professional development serves as a key determinant in sustaining long-term instructional quality.

As shown in Table 1, the mean student participation score rose from 68.5 to 83.6 after the implementation of the modified curriculum, representing a 22% increase. Statistical analysis ( $t = 5.74, p < 0.01$ ) confirmed that this improvement was significant at the 1% level, indicating a robust effect of the curriculum change on engagement levels. The triangulated qualitative findings further explained this numerical rise: teachers consistently attributed the improvement to targeted professional development programs, which enhanced their competence in differentiated instruction and formative assessment.

Such evidence shows that the increase was not merely a statistical anomaly but a genuine pedagogical

transformation. The parallel rise in teacher support and curriculum effectiveness reinforces the interpretation that institutional initiatives fostering teacher capacity are directly linked to classroom participation. Nonetheless, the relatively smaller gain in resource availability (13.8%) highlights persistent inequities that may constrain the sustainability of these gains across schools. Overall, the 22% improvement can be interpreted as a quantitative manifestation of qualitative growth, in which the convergence of teacher skill development, collaborative culture, and responsive curriculum design coalesced to create more inclusive and participatory learning environments.

Table 2. Triangulation Matrix of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings on Inclusive Curriculum Implementation

Research Variable / Theme	Quantitative Findings	Qualitative Evidence (Interview Excerpts / Themes)	Integrated Interpretation
Student Participation	Mean score increased from 68.5 to 83.6 (+22%) after curriculum modification; statistically significant at $p < 0.01$ .	"Students are now more eager to share ideas and respond in class because lessons are more engaging and varied." (Teacher A)	The significant increase in student participation is supported by teachers' narratives indicating improved engagement due to active learning and differentiated instruction.
Teacher Support	Mean score rose from 70.2 to 85.1 (+21.2%); $t = 5.31, p < 0.01$ .	"We started collaborating more often, exchanging lesson plans and observing each other's classes." (Teacher B)	Enhanced teacher collaboration and mutual support contributed to higher participation and overall classroom effectiveness.
Curriculum Effectiveness	Mean score increased from 72.8 to 88.4 (+21.4%); significant correlation with teacher support ( $r = 0.68, p < 0.01$ ).	"The new curriculum allows us to adjust materials to students' abilities and local context." (Teacher C)	The flexible and contextualized curriculum design directly improved classroom dynamics and participation outcomes.
Resource Availability	Mean score improved from 66.7 to 75.9 (+13.8%); lowest gain among variables.	"Some schools still lack adequate textbooks and digital tools, making it harder to apply interactive methods." (Principal)	Resource disparities remain a limiting factor, suggesting the need for equitable resource distribution to sustain improvement.

Research Variable / Theme	Quantitative Findings	Qualitative Evidence (Interview Excerpts / Themes)	Integrated Interpretation
Professional Development	Mean score increased from 69.3 to 84.5 (+21.9%); significant predictor of student participation ( $\beta = 0.47$ , $p < 0.01$ ).	“The training gave us confidence to modify lessons and use formative assessments effectively.” (Teacher D)	Professional development programs empowered teachers with the skills and confidence necessary to foster inclusive and engaging classrooms.

Table 2. illustrates a strong convergence between quantitative and qualitative findings. The 22% increase in student participation was consistently supported by interview data describing improved teacher competence, collaborative practice, and adaptive curriculum implementation. Teachers' testimonies confirm that professional development was a key driver of pedagogical innovation, directly influencing participation outcomes.

Conversely, the relatively modest improvement in resource availability aligns with participants' qualitative reports of unequal access to instructional materials, underscoring the importance of systemic support for long-term sustainability. The integration of both data types thus strengthens the conclusion that inclusive curriculum management is effective when reinforced by continuous teacher development and equitable institutional resources.

#### E. Interpretative Summary of Triangulated Findings

The triangulated results demonstrate that the improvement in student participation (22%) was not an isolated phenomenon but rather the outcome of interconnected institutional and instructional factors. Quantitative data confirmed significant relationships among the key variables: teacher support, professional development, curriculum effectiveness, and resource availability, while qualitative insights provided contextual explanations of how these dynamics operated within schools.

The analysis reveals the following key interrelations:

##### 1) Professional Development as a Catalyst

Targeted training programs significantly enhanced teachers' pedagogical competence, assessment literacy, and confidence in applying inclusive strategies. Teachers explicitly linked these trainings with their ability to create more engaging and adaptive learning environments.

##### 2) Teacher Support and Collaboration as Reinforcing Mechanisms

Increased collaboration among teachers fostered knowledge sharing, mentoring, and reflective practice, thereby improving curriculum delivery and student responsiveness.

##### 3) Curriculum Effectiveness as a Mediating Variable

The revised, flexible curriculum functioned as the operational link between teacher competence and student participation. Its responsiveness to diverse learning needs allowed teachers to apply differentiated instruction effectively.

##### 4) Resource Availability as a Moderating Factor

While significant progress was achieved, the data indicated that limited resource availability constrained the uniformity of success across schools. This suggests that systemic equity in resource distribution remains essential for sustainable improvement.

Collectively, these findings confirm that inclusive curriculum management succeeds when supported by continuous teacher development, collaborative culture, and adequate institutional resources.

Table 3. Integrated Conceptual Model of Factors Influencing Student Participation in Inclusive Curriculum Implementation.

Component	Description	Role in the Model	Empirical Evidence
Professional Development	Continuous teacher training on inclusive pedagogies, differentiated instruction, and formative assessment.	Independent Variable / Catalyst	Teachers' qualitative feedback highlighted PD as the main driver of improved instructional competence ( $\beta = 0.47$ , $p < 0.01$ ).
Teacher Support and Collaboration	Peer mentoring, joint lesson planning, and reflective teaching discussions.	Reinforcing Variable	Teachers reported stronger collaboration and mutual assistance; positively correlated with curriculum effectiveness ( $r = 0.68$ , $p < 0.01$ ).
Curriculum Effectiveness	Flexibility, contextual relevance, and alignment with student needs.	Mediating Variable	Mean score rose by 21.4%; qualitative data confirmed improved adaptability and contextualization.
Resource Availability	Access to learning materials, teaching aids, and digital tools.	Moderating Variable	13.8% increase; constraints noted in interviews (limited resources in some schools).
Student Participation	Active involvement, engagement, and responsiveness in learning activities.	Dependent Variable / Outcome	Mean score increased from 68.5 to 83.6 (+22%), indicating a significant positive outcome of inclusive curriculum implementation.

The integrated model derived from this study provides several practical implications for educational stakeholders. For school leaders, continuous investment in teacher professional development emerges as a critical factor in maintaining curriculum responsiveness and fostering classroom engagement. Strengthening teachers' pedagogical competence through systematic training ensures that inclusive practices remain adaptable to students' diverse needs and evolving learning contexts. For policymakers, the findings underscore the need to design and implement resource distribution policies grounded in equity. Ensuring that all schools have equal access to teaching materials, learning aids, and digital infrastructure will help standardize the effectiveness of inclusive curriculum implementation across different educational settings.

From the teachers' perspective, the study highlights the importance of establishing and sustaining collaborative professional learning communities (PLCs). Such communities serve as effective platforms for sharing best practices, exchanging innovative instructional strategies, and fostering a culture of reflective teaching that supports inclusive learning environments. Lastly, for future research, longitudinal investigations are recommended to examine the long-term sustainability of the observed 22% improvement in student participation and to explore the expanding role of digital resources in reinforcing inclusive teaching and learning. These implications collectively underscore that inclusive curriculum management is not merely a structural reform but an ongoing process that requires continuous professional growth, equitable support, and systemic commitment.

Conversely, the regression analysis revealed that resource availability remains a significant predictor of curriculum success, underscoring the critical role of material support in shaping educational outcomes. Yet, complementary qualitative findings illuminated persistent disparities in schools' access to adequate learning resources, ranging from textbooks and digital tools to laboratory equipment, thereby exposing structural inequities that hinder the full realization of curriculum goals. These disparities suggest that, although the inclusive curriculum model demonstrates clear potential to foster pedagogical improvement and enhance student engagement, its long-term sustainability cannot be guaranteed without systemic reinforcement. Ensuring equitable distribution of resources across diverse educational settings thus emerges as a pressing priority, requiring coordinated policy interventions, institutional commitment, and continuous monitoring to bridge gaps and secure the durability of curriculum reforms.

As highlighted by school stakeholders, professional development initiatives have played a pivotal role in enhancing teachers' pedagogical competencies and confidence in implementing the new curriculum. One primary school principal emphasized that "the

professional development initiatives have significantly improved our teachers' pedagogical skills and confidence in implementing the new curriculum. Nevertheless, maintaining these improvements requires ongoing institutional support and fair distribution of learning resources across all schools." This perspective underscores the importance of systemic reinforcement to sustain the gains achieved through training. Echoing this sentiment, a classroom teacher reflected on the transformative impact of the program, noting that "after attending the training, I felt more capable of adapting lessons to students' different learning needs. It helped me make the classroom more engaging, but we still need continuous mentoring and adequate materials to keep the momentum." Together, these voices illustrate that while professional development fosters immediate improvements in instructional quality and learner engagement, its long-term success is contingent upon continuous mentoring, equitable resource allocation, and institutional commitment to supporting teachers across diverse educational contexts."

These perspectives add depth to the interpretation of the quantitative findings by vividly demonstrating how policy implementation is experienced within classroom realities, thereby bridging the gap between statistical outcomes and lived educational practice. The integration of stakeholder voices with empirical data creates a triangulated body of evidence that reinforces the conclusion that inclusive curriculum management is not only feasible in practice but also transformative in its impact on teaching and learning. However, the sustainability of these gains depends on the continued presence of institutional and systemic support mechanisms, including equitable resource distribution, ongoing professional development, and consistent mentoring. Taken together, the findings highlight that inclusive curriculum reform can drive meaningful change, but its long-term success depends on embedding supportive structures that ensure resilience and equity across diverse educational contexts.

#### *F. Comparative Discussion with Previous Research*

The results of this study provide strong empirical support for the theoretical frameworks advanced by Ainscow (2016) and Florian (2014), underscoring that genuine inclusion flourishes when curriculum management is deliberately aligned with diversity-oriented pedagogies. By situating inclusive practices within structured curriculum design, the findings highlight how teachers who participated in targeted training were significantly better prepared to operationalize Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles in their classrooms. This enhanced capacity enabled them to create learning environments that are accessible, adaptable, and responsive to students' diverse needs, thereby promoting equity and engagement across the learner spectrum. In doing so, the study not only validates the theoretical

propositions of inclusion but also demonstrates their practical applicability, illustrating how professional development in inclusive curriculum management can translate into tangible pedagogical improvements that sustain inclusive education in everyday practice.

The emphasis on collaboration among teachers, parents, and administrators is consistent with the findings of Friend and Bursuck (2018), who identified teamwork as a cornerstone of successful inclusive education. In the present study, teacher collaboration led to increased confidence and innovation in the design of adaptive learning materials. Moreover, this research extends Tomlinson and Imbeau's (2010) work, demonstrating that differentiated instruction benefits students with disabilities and enriches the overall classroom experience for all learners. Students without special needs also reported greater empathy, cooperation, and respect for diversity, an indicator of positive social inclusion outcomes.

#### *G. Limitations of the Study*

While the findings are robust, several limitations must be acknowledged to provide a realistic interpretation of the results. First, the sample size, although adequate for exploratory analysis, was limited to three schools in Kendari City, which restricts the generalizability of the results to broader educational contexts. Future studies should include more diverse samples across regions to account for demographic and institutional variations. Second, the observation period was relatively short (one academic semester). Longitudinal research would be necessary to examine the long-term sustainability of inclusive curriculum practices and their impact on academic performance.

Third, although triangulation was conducted, the qualitative data primarily reflected teacher and parent perspectives, with student voices underrepresented. Including student self-reflections in future studies could yield more balanced insights into how inclusion is experienced at the learner level. Finally, the study did not incorporate detailed quantitative measurement of academic achievement differentials, focusing instead on participation and perception variables. Incorporating standardized academic metrics in subsequent studies would provide a more comprehensive understanding of learning outcomes.

#### *H. Implications for Policy and Practice*

Despite these limitations, the study provides valuable implications for educational policy and school practice. The findings emphasize that effective inclusive curriculum management requires sustained teacher training, institutional support, and the integration of inclusive education into school policies. Administrators should prioritize capacity-building programs and resource allocation to ensure that teachers are equipped to meet diverse learning needs. Moreover, collaboration between general and special education staff must be

institutionalized through structured professional learning communities. From a curriculum perspective, schools should adopt flexible frameworks that allow for localized adaptation based on student demographics and community needs. The development of inclusive assessment tools integrating formative and differentiated evaluation is also crucial for monitoring progress fairly and continuously.

#### *I. Theoretical and Practical Contributions*

Theoretically, this study reinforces the paradigm that inclusive curriculum management is both a pedagogical and organizational process that must be embedded in school culture. It contributes empirical evidence supporting the notion that curriculum inclusivity enhances not only academic engagement but also social-emotional growth and school belonging. Practically, the study offers a model for integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to assess inclusion effectiveness. The triangulated design serves as a replicable framework for future researchers seeking to evaluate similar educational interventions across contexts. The emphasis on combining teacher perceptions, parental feedback, and statistical outcomes provides a multidimensional view of inclusion in practice.

In conclusion, this study's findings demonstrate that inclusive curriculum management significantly enhances student participation and effectively supports diverse learning needs when accompanied by adequate teacher preparation, adequate resource provision, and collaborative engagement. The quantitative results, particularly the 22% increase in student participation, indicate measurable progress in classroom engagement. At the same time, qualitative insights reveal that such improvements are deeply rooted in strengthened teacher competence, responsive curriculum design, and school-level collaboration. However, the study also identifies ongoing challenges, most notably in terms of sustainability, equitable distribution of resources, and the absence of comprehensive evaluation mechanisms.”

## **IV. Conclusion**

This study demonstrates that Inclusive Curriculum Management (ICM) plays a fundamental role in shaping equitable, responsive, and sustainable learning environments within inclusive education settings. The findings from both quantitative and qualitative analyses consistently confirm that well-managed inclusive curricula, those that emphasize flexible planning, differentiated instruction, and equitable evaluation, significantly enhance student participation and learning outcomes. The results revealed a measurable 22% increase in student participation following the implementation of inclusive curriculum strategies, supported by teacher training, collaborative engagement, and the integration of adaptive learning materials.

From a managerial standpoint, the success of inclusive curriculum practices depends on three interconnected components: (1) curriculum development that reflects student diversity and supports differentiated learning approaches; (2) curriculum implementation that empowers teachers through professional training, collaboration, and resource availability; and (3) curriculum evaluation that ensures fairness and responsiveness to individual differences. When these three dimensions are aligned, inclusive education transcends policy rhetoric and becomes an actionable framework that nurtures academic success and social inclusion for all learners.

However, the research also identified persistent challenges that hinder full inclusion. Among the most prominent are limited teacher preparedness, unequal access to instructional resources, and the absence of specialized support personnel in schools. These barriers, consistent with global findings (Slee, 2011; UNESCO, 2019), indicate that achieving inclusive education is not merely a pedagogical effort but also a systemic and administrative undertaking. Furthermore, the study revealed moderate variability in implementation across schools ( $SD = 0.45\text{--}0.60$ ), underscoring the need for greater policy coherence and continuous institutional monitoring.

Considering these findings, several implications emerge. For educational policymakers, there is an urgent need to strengthen national and local frameworks that institutionalize inclusive curriculum management within the school accountability system. This includes ensuring adequate funding, equitable resource distribution, and structured monitoring of inclusive practices. For school administrators, fostering a culture of collaboration between general and special education teachers, as well as engaging parents and communities, is crucial to sustaining inclusive implementation. For teachers, ongoing professional development focused on inclusive pedagogy, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and differentiated instruction must become a standard component of teacher education programs.

Theoretically, this study reinforces the paradigm that inclusive curriculum management is both a pedagogical philosophy and an organizational process embedded within school culture. It provides empirical validation that inclusion, when operationalized through thoughtful curriculum management, enhances not only academic engagement but also students' social-emotional development, confidence, and sense of belonging. Practically, the study offers a replicable model that combines quantitative and qualitative analyses, enabling future researchers and educators to evaluate inclusive practices through a multidimensional framework of participation, collaboration, and outcomes.

In conclusion, inclusive curriculum management serves as the cornerstone of equitable education. Its

success relies on an integrated system where policy, pedagogy, and practice interact harmoniously to support diverse learners. To ensure continuity and sustainability, future efforts must focus on long-term strategies such as teacher mentoring systems, community-based partnerships, and research-driven innovation to strengthen the inclusive education ecosystem. By doing so, education can truly fulfill its mission of fostering equity, empathy, and excellence for every learner, regardless of their differences.

## References

- Ainscow, M. (2016). *Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences*. Routledge.
- Ainscow, M. (2020). *Promoting equity and inclusion: The role of inclusive school leadership*. *Journal of Educational Change*, 21(4), 555–573. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-019-09364-5>
- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2006). *Improving schools, developing inclusion*. Routledge.
- Babbie, E. (2016). *The Basics of Social Research*. Cengage Learning.
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for Inclusion: Developing Learning and Participation in Schools* (3rd ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE).
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (2015). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Ravenio Books.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- Florian, L. (2014). *The SAGE handbook of special education* (2nd ed.). Buku referensi ini membahas berbagai aspek pendidikan inklusif, termasuk manajemen kurikulum.
- Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British educational research journal*, 37(5), 813–828.
- Florian, L., & Spratt, J. (2013). *Enacting inclusion: A framework for interrogating inclusive practice*. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 28(2), 119–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2013.778111>
- Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. D. (2012). *Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers*. Pearson.
- Friend, M., & Bursuck, W. D. (2018). *Including Students with Special Needs: A Practical Guide for Classroom Teachers*. Pearson.
- Glatthorn, A. A., Boschee, F., Whitehead, B. M., & Boschee, B. F. (2017). *Curriculum Leadership: Strategies for Development and Implementation* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Göransson, K., & Nilholm, C. (2014). *Conceptual diversities and empirical shortcomings – A critical analysis of research on inclusive education*. *European Journal of*

- Special Needs Education, 29(3), 265–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2014.933545>
- Hall, T. E., Meyer, A., & Rose, D. H. (2012). *Universal Design for Learning in the Classroom: Practical Applications*. Guilford Press.
- Hall, T. E., Strangman, N., & Meyer, A. (2003). *Differentiated instruction and implications for UDL implementation*. CAST Professional Publishing.
- Johnson, B. (2015). *A Framework for Designing the Curriculum*. Routledge.
- Marsh, C. J. (2009). *Key Concepts for Understanding Curriculum (5th ed.)*. Routledge.
- McLeskey, J., Rosenberg, M. S., & Westling, D. L. (2013). *Inclusion: Effective Practices for All Students*. Pearson.
- McLeskey, J., Waldron, N. L., Spooner, F., & Algozzine, B. (2014). *Handbook of Effective Inclusive Schools: Research and Practice*. Routledge.
- Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud). (2023). *National Inclusive Education Report 2023*. Jakarta: Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia.
- Mitchell, D. (2015). *Inclusive Education is a Multi-faceted Concept*. Center for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD.
- Oliva, P. F. (2009). *Developing the Curriculum (7th ed.)*. Pearson.
- Posner, G. J., & Rudnitsky, A. N. (2006). *Course Design: A Guide to Curriculum Development for Teachers (7th ed.)*. Addison-Wesley.
- Salend, S. J. (2019). *Creating Inclusive Classrooms: Effective, Differentiated and Reflective Practices*. Pearson.
- Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling, and inclusive education*. Routledge.
- Slee, R., & Allan, J. (2001). *Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education*. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 11(2), 173–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210100200073>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. ASCD.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Allan, S. D. (2000). *Leadership for differentiating schools and classrooms*. ASCD.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Imbeau, M. B. (2010). *Leading and managing a differentiated classroom*. ASCD.
- Trochim, W. M., & Donnelly, J. P. (2008). *Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Atomic Dog Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2005). *Guidelines for inclusion: Ensuring access to education for all*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2009). *Policy guidelines on inclusion in education*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2019). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2019: Migration, displacement and education – Building bridges, not walls*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Goal 4: Quality Education)*. New York: United Nations.