"*You are the only disabled student here; you must conform to us!*"

A Foucauldian discourse analysis of inclusive education and disability in Indonesia

By Diva Arulita

Abstract

It has been almost 20 years since inclusive education was first implemented in Indonesia; however, based on the previous studies, the realities surrounding inclusive education strategies remain disappointing as disabled students continue to face discrimination and segregation in school. By taking into account how inclusive education discourse is constituted within national documents and affects the reality of disabled students in their school environment, the thesis attempts to reveal why inclusive education has not been supporting the well-being of disabled students. Using Foucault's understanding of biopower and discourse interlinking the concept of ableism, this thesis employs the Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) arguing that inclusive education does not operate to transform the national educational system taking into account human diversification and capabilities; Instead, the discourse underlying the understanding of the medical and social discourse aimed to conform disabled students into the mainstream educational system. By reflecting on the experiences of eleven interview participants who have been labeled disabled in society, this study further reveals the ableist discourse and the problematic notion of 'special accommodation' embedded in inclusive education practices. These practices further affect how they perceive themselves as separated from the mainstream students and needing 'special support'. Unconsciously, the dominant discourse also triggers the emergence of resistance from those who acknowledge the problematic ideas within the discourse. This study reveals how inclusion is understood from the perspective of the resisting disabled persons who refuse to be regulated into the inclusive system that is set out by the government. Their discourse reveals a different perspective and approach to the idea of inclusion and well-being.

Keywords: Critical disability studies, inclusive education in Indonesia, Foucauldian discourse analysis, biopower, discourse, ableism

Words: 17,495

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Lund, August 2022

Diva Arulita

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Contextual background

It is a well-known fact that education is a fundamental human right that every human being must be given and own. This is further supported by the notion of 'education for all', which has long been echoed by numerous global organizations such as the United Nations. By universal means, the term 'for all' recognizes the urgency and necessity for all states to ensure equal education for their citizens, including the vulnerable and marginalized (UN, 2020). In other words, no one should be segregated based on differences, including but not limited to body/mind characteristics, thereby providing room for disabled persons. To support this notion, the United Nations adopted the *Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities* on December 20, 1993, which further regulates the process of integrating special education systems for disabled persons into the national education system of each member state (UN General Assembly, 1993).

A year after the adoption of the Standard Rules, in 1994 to be exact, world leaders met at the *World Conference on Special Needs Education* held in Salamanca, Spain to develop a clearer approach to the notion of integrating education for disabled persons as well as the implementation of the Standard Rules. In this conference, a regulation and Framework for Action were formulated under the name of the Salamanca Statement, which stipulates rules on inclusion as the central and most crucial aspect to be implemented in the education system and national curriculum (CSIE, 2020). The term 'inclusion', in this case, means 'all' children have the right not to experience segregation in their learning activities and barriers to accessing education, and also have the right to be equally included in the regular education system (UNESCO, 1994). In short, the Statement emphasizes the following needs: (1) equal chance for 'all' children to study in the same school environment; (2) education based on children's needs; (3) provision of adequate accommodation for disabled children (Saputra, 2016:3). Thus, the Salamanca Statement becomes a pillar of the national regulation on inclusive education in Indonesia.

1.2. Research problems, objectives, and questions

1.2.1. Research problems

In response to the global rules and regulations on inclusive education, in the early 2000s, Indonesia commissioned several schools in a pilot project to implement the initial strategy of an inclusive school system (Irvan & Jauhari, 2018:176; PKLK, 2011). I first heard about inclusive education in 2012 when my high school was appointed as one of the few inclusive schools in West Jakarta. My school admitted three disabled students to my class and I had the opportunity to become acquainted with them. Throughout my high school years, I often saw them being left out and restricted in P.E. and science classes, or being pulled out from class during exams, leaving me slightly wondering if this really was what being inclusive was all about. At that time, however, I did not really think much about this matter because I thought it was natural to experience a setback as it was Indonesia's one of the first attempts to implement inclusive education. 10 years later, I happened to make contact with one of them in an online seminar hosted by a certain organization in Indonesia. We talked and reminisced about our high school days, and at one point, he started talking about how the children in his organization still experience similar conditions as he did at their inclusive school. This conversation reminded me of my perception of inclusive education and I began to think that the issue is probably not rooted in its implementation.

Many have assumed that the problem of inclusive education arises due to its complicated implementation, while the existing regulations have more or less offered a grand strategic plan to achieve inclusion. However, this does not answer why, after more than 15 years since the pilot project was carried out, we still see discrimination and segregation (and even bullying) of disabled students in the school environment. To take an example, a video that went viral in 2020 shows a disabled student being bullied by her non-disabled peers at her school (they hit her on the head, kicked her in the stomach, and then took turns hitting her with a broom handle). In fact, when reprimanding the bullies, the school principal still managed to say, "*You [non-disabled students] are normal people, you should be better than her [the disabled kid], why do you do such uncommendable acts [toward her]?*" (Liputan6, 2020).

These reflections become the background of this study in examining the problem of inclusive education in Indonesia. My central argument is that the problem of inclusive education lies not in

its implementation, but rather in the discourse that has been problematic from the start. The inclusive education discourse in Indonesia presumably reflects the ableist idea of able-bodied normativity which underlies the belief in abled-body superiority; Hence, instead of transforming the whole education system to be more 'inclusive', the strategy has specifically introduced 'special accommodation' aimed to sort disabled students within ableist normativity in education.

1.2.2. Research objectives

This study reflects Foucault's idea of biopower by focusing on the discourse and practices of inclusive education to understand how disabled students are regulated within the inclusive education agenda (Srinivasan, Kasturirangan, & Driessen, 2020:341). On that account, this study has several objectives as follows: (1) to reveal how inclusive education is constituted as a discourse, specifically how disabled persons (students) are understood and discussed in inclusive education regulations; and (2) to contemplate the experiences of disabled students in their inclusive school so as to further investigate how inclusive education discourse is actually applied. These issues were explored by taking into account the practices of ableism experienced by disabled students at school. This study is not limited to understanding how disabled students become the controlled subjects in the discourse; it also covers those who attempt to refuse and traverse the discourse, or what Foucault calls 'resistance' (Foucault, 1978:95-96). In other words, both sides are highlighted as the effects of the discourse.

1.2.3. Research questions

To approach the problematization of inclusive education, this study begins with the overarching question of:

"*Why has inclusive education not been able to support the well-being of disabled students?*"

Since this question may have a broad and extensive answer, sub-questions were formulated to limit the analysis. As mentioned previously above, this study specifically discusses inclusive education discourse and the effects of existing inclusive education strategies on disabled students. Therefore, the sub-questions of this study include:

1. *How is inclusive education discourse constituted in national documents?*

2. *To what extent does the inclusive education discourse regulate and affect disabled students?*

1.3. Originality and relevance of the study

In recent years, there have been various paradigm shifts in the social, political, and governmental contexts in an effort to build a more inclusive system that upholds human rights principles for sustainable development. Movements and actions such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are mapped out to ensure such sustainability. As a fundamental human right, education is considered one of the vital aspects of the SDGs, in that inclusive education is specifically discussed in SDG 4: Quality Education, which aims to "*ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*." (OHCHR, 2020). Despite the fact that numerous studies have investigated the intricacies of inclusive education, a large number of issues remain to be discussed further, especially in the context of the Global South. For this reason, inclusive education in Indonesia still becomes a relevant topic to be studied within the scopes of political science and development studies.

While various studies have examined the inclusive education regulations and their implementation in Indonesia, these issues remain understudied. Most of the studies that have been conducted on this topic only discussed inclusive education problems in terms of access and facilities in inclusive schools, teachers' attitudes and understanding of inclusive education, and the experiences of disabled students (Adioetomo, 2014; Mulyadi, 2017; Anomsari & Mursalim, 2020; Murdianto & Jayadi, 2020). In this regard, the literature on inclusive education in Indonesia is dominated by pedagogical studies. Such limitation provides space for this study to explore the root causes of the issues addressed in these previous studies. As mentioned in the previous section, inclusive education is considered a product of biopower as well as a dominant discourse as proposed by Foucault, and power is an abstract concept that cannot be proven without consideration of theories and contexts. Within this framework, the research problems were explored based on theories.

In this study, a different approach was taken to reflect on the problems encountered by disabled persons at school. Since many of those previous relevant studies took a positivist stance to explain the phenomenon of disability in education, this present study adopted a post-structuralist

approach to uncovering the 'truth' about disability in the society by arguing that disability is a discourse-generated social construct which further explains the oppressive practices directed at disabled persons in a real-life situation. Overall, this study is expected to provide a new perspective on the issue of disability and inclusive education in Indonesia, and in turn contribute to the literature on human development.

1.4. Thesis structure

This thesis consists of six chapters. Chapter 1 discusses the research problem, formulates research questions and objectives, states the relevance and originality of the study, and describes the structure of the thesis. Meanwhile, Chapter 2 reviews several previous studies relevant to the topic under study, which is divided into two categories, namely: (1) disability in Indonesia and (2) inclusive education in Indonesia. The first category deals with the history of disability terminology in Indonesia, the discrimination and stigmatization experienced by disabled persons, and the disability inclusion programs by the Indonesian government, whereas the second category discusses the development of inclusive education in Indonesia and the challenges in implementing inclusive education in this country. Furthermore, research gaps are addressed in the last part of this chapter.

Chapter 3 presents the theoretical framework of this study, which is part of the critical disability studies that takes into account Foucault's conceptions of biopower and discourse. Ableism is at the core of the discussion, thus being conceptualized in this chapter by specifically considering its elements and internalization processes. Chapter 4 discusses the methods used in this study as well as how relevant theories were operationalized into the analysis. This study applied the Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis (also known as the Foucauldian Discourse Analysis or FDA), with qualitative data collected from interviews and documents. Furthermore, research limitations and my positionality as a researcher, as well as the ethical considerations are mentioned in the last part of Chapter 4.

Chapter 5 is the analysis. This chapter is divided into three parts. The first part talks about the discursive construction in the existing inclusive education regulations and attempts to reveal the positions of the subjects, objects, and relations of certain discourses that make up the dominant discourse of inclusive education. The inclusion practices and subjectivity are discussed in the

second part of the analysis. In this part, the experiences of disabled students become the center of the analysis which uncovers the ableist and 'special education' practices in the implementation of inclusive education. Meanwhile, subjectivity is elaborated to reveal how disabled students become the subjects of the discourse and begin to relate to the discourse. The third part of the analysis focuses on the resistance. This part further investigates how certain students refuse to be regulated into the inclusion agenda; in an effort to resist against power, they develop a new discourse which they believe is the right vehicle for 'inclusion'.

The whole analysis is then reviewed and concluded in Chapter 6, in which the answers to the research questions formulated in Chapter 1 are revealed.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Academic research on inclusive education and disability has been explored within various areas and disciplines; Yet, pedagogical and other humanities disciplines still dominate the field. This chapter discusses the previous studies relating to inclusive education in Indonesia. The first part discusses research on disability taking into account the development of the terminology, stigma, and mainstreaming efforts. The second part discusses research on inclusive education taking into account the definitions and challenges in the implementation. The last part presents the research gap.

2.1. Research on disability in Indonesia

The development of disability terminology

The terminology of disability in Indonesia has gone through many transformations. Maftuhin's (2016) research reveals that the earliest terminology of disability used by the general public and the government can be traced back to the beginning of Indonesia's independence in 1945. Accordingly, there are various terminologies of disability (and disabled persons) (Adioetomo et al., 2014:21; Suharto et al., 2016:697-698; Maftuhin, 2016:143-145; Widinarsih, 2019:129). The first terminology adopted by the Indonesian government was *cacat* (defect/deficit) and *bercacat* (defective), used in several laws and regulations in the 1940s. According to the official Indonesian dictionary (2016), *cacat* is defined as a "deficiency (or damage) that causes a reduction in value or imperfections (found in a body, objects, mind, and morals)," whereas *bercacat* is defined as "the existence of imperfections" (the Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language, 2016). Indeed, there have been further transformations of disability terminology until the 1990s, yet, to some extent, they maintained such medicalized discourse: The 1954 law specifically described disabled persons as "persons in a state of physical and/or mental deficiency"; In 1974, several versions of the terms include "disturbed persons," "person who has lost the ability to sustain life," and *tuna* (damaged, lacking something); In 1980 to 1990, the term changed back to *cacat* (Widinarsih, 2019:130-131). In the late 1990s, there was a rise in the use of "*differently-abled persons*" within the international community. During this transition period, the Indonesian government, scholars, and other disability activists formulated a new terminology for disability in Indonesia, following the terms adopted by the international community. The

term *difabel*, thus, emerged as a vernacularized form of the global term *differently able* and was then applied to several regional regulations in the 2000s (ibid, p. 133). The term was used until the 2010s when the government inaugurated a new term, *disabilitas* (disability). Such change, again, was encouraged by the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD) in 2011 (ibid, p. 134).

Disability stigma and stigmatization

Disabled persons continue to be stigmatized throughout their lives and this has impacted further exclusion in the system, both on their opportunities to get decent education and work, social participation in the society, to decision-making (Hamidi, 2016; Jauhari, 2017; Anomsari & Mursalim, 2020; Barida et al., 2020; Widjaja et al., 2020; Kristiandy, 2021). Stigma, in this case, has an essential role in justifying acts of segregation for the disabled community, where it has constructed a disability discourse as someone who has physical and mental limitations. Such construction has then socialized and integrated into the social and cultural system. For instance, research from Karuniasih et al. (2016) shows how labeling is usually constructed within the local language, as many cities and regions in Indonesia have their own nicknames for deaf persons. Such nicknames, however, have a similar meaning that implies stereotypes of deaf persons as "lacking intelligence" or "dumb" (Karuniasih, 2016:5-6).

Stigma regarding the intelligence of disabled persons is very often encountered in school environments. In this case, stigma in forms of labeling is often an issue that is overlooked in classrooms. Teachers and school principals play a crucial role in building disability stigma in schools. Murdianto and Jayadi's (2020) research shows how schools and teachers often limit the participation of disabled students in class, refusing to provide necessary subjects with the assumption that disabled students are not capable of following through with the learning process (Murdianto & Jayadi, 2020:619). According to disabled students, attitudinal problems such as discrimination due to stigma by teachers and students persist in classrooms. A study from Purbani (2013) shows the experiences of disabled students of being ridiculed and ignored in classrooms, particularly when they are having an 'episode'. Pratiwi & Wahyudi's (2019) study identified the stigmatization of disabled students in classrooms and further divided them into two categories of labeling and ill-treatment. According to disabled students, labeling is considered one of the barriers that hinder their effort to be included in class (Pratiwi & Wahyudi, 2019:2). In

addition, disabled students further compared their feelings about receiving ill-treatment as those being exiled and rejected (ibid, p.3).

Labeling has affected how disabled persons (and students) perceive themselves, both direct and indirectly (Lusli et al., 2015; Karuniasih et al., 2016; Handoyo, 2019). In research conducted in Cirebon District, Lusli et al. (2015) investigate how stigma impacts how disabled persons understand their situation as a disease that must be cured. Some think of themselves as a burden to their family, while others see themselves as flaws that should be hidden (Lusli et al., 2015:4). Accordingly, their own beliefs that they are not normal (or, in other words, sick) further influence their justification of why they are marginalized by believing that a "sick person" cannot work and do activities like "normal, able-bodied people" (ibid).

Mainstreaming disability

Until now, the rights and needs of disabled persons have not been appropriately considered in Indonesia. Within a sense that "disabled persons should accommodate themselves" to conform to the "normal" system, accessibilities and facilities for disabled persons have not been adequate. Adioetomo et al. (2014) stated that unmet needs might hinder their ability to participate in social lives, particularly in getting proper education and decent work (Adioetomo et al., 2014). One can assume that structural limitations become the reason why disabled persons cannot achieve their well-being (Adioetomo, 2014:24; Anomsari & Mursalim, 2020:3). Many have argued that mainstreaming disability becomes crucial to be considered within regulation and policy-making. The idea of mainstreaming disability is taken from further certainty that disabled persons "*are recognized as rights-holding, equal members of society who must be actively engaged in the development process irrespective of their impairment or another status*" (Albert et al., 2005:104). Thus, the context of mainstreaming is based upon the understanding of equality of opportunity for disabled persons. In this case, various research has been carried out to investigate the effort to mainstream disability by exploring the strategies and implementations of programs at the national and local levels (Napsiyah, 2018; Larasati et al., 2019; Anomsari & Mursalim, 2020). Anomsari & Mursalim (2020), in particular, criticize how "mainstreaming" strategies in Indonesia implies a simple, narrow understanding of "accepting" disabled persons yet, lacks further consideration to provide opportunities for them to actively participate within the system (Anomsari & Mursalim, 2020:6). They emphasized that mainstreaming should not be limited to

the development of laws and regulations that recognize disability rights but more so about transforming the system that will enable disabled persons to exercise their rights in their own daily lives (ibid, p.7).

To some extent, "mainstreaming" has become a concept that is often associated with inclusive education. Indeed, in a general sense, inclusive education emphasizes the notion of how everyone, regardless of their differences, has the right to learn in the same classrooms and schools (UNESCO, 1994). Napsiyah (2017) discusses how inclusive education is crucial, not only as an embodiment of disability mainstreaming in the educational sphere but also in realizing mainstreaming in a broader context. Schools and higher education systems have an essential role in increasing public understanding of disability and supporting disabled students in their participation in society (Napsiyah, 2018:35). Mainstreaming disability in inclusive education, according to Napsiyah, may also refer to gender mainstreaming procedures that emphasize the important role and the experiences of women in their participation in decision and policy-making. In this case, mainstreaming disability can be achieved by involving disabled persons and students in the development of inclusive education strategies (ibid, p. 34).

2.2. Research on inclusive education in Indonesia

Based on the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, social and disability activists from the Global North, particularly the Nordic countries in the 1960s (Dyson & Forlin, 1999, see Walton, 2018), began stressing the problematic idea of segregation of disabled children and students in the education system. The assumption that every human being has the equal right to education establishes the first idea of "integration" that disabled persons are also human beings and thus possess the same rights to education, more so to be accepted in the same space (school and classrooms) as others (Walton, 2018:32). The idea further constructed the term we know today as "inclusive education". As the development progresses, the rights to education for disabled persons are emphasized, following the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities by the UN in 2006, particularly in article 24 of the UN CRPD (UNCRPD, 2007); and implemented accordingly as part of sustainable development goals, where inclusive education is further recognized within the notion of education for all in SDG 4 on quality of education (United Nations, 2015). In current years, inclusive education has shifted its paradigm to emphasize the competence of actors in

implementing inclusive strategies in educational systems as well as curriculum reforms in schools, focusing more on the structure of inclusive education, not as an idea but as a learning framework or an approach that "responds to the needs of diverse students," further enabling full participation by eliminating barriers and exclusion from all aspects and levels (UNESCO, 2005; UNESCO, 2013).

In the context of Indonesia, inclusive education is defined and conceptualized per the basic notion of inclusive education that "*all children should receive the same education and be a part of the same learning environment, regardless of their differences*" (Special Education Directorate, 2004). Many have argued that this basic definition is problematic as it limits its focus on the acceptance of disabled students rather than emphasizing the transformation of the school's system. Handayani & Rahadian (2013) explain how there is still confusion about understanding the idea of inclusive education as opposed to special education. In this case, Indonesia's regulations on inclusive education specifically focus on "*learners who have abnormalities in their physical conditions, intelligence, and talents*," in contrast to special education, which focuses on "*learners in underdeveloped areas, remote indigenous children, victims of natural disasters, and/or children living in poverty*" (Handayani & Rahadian, 2013:32).

Another study further mentions this problematic definition of inclusive education. In a particular policy assessment conducted by Mulyadi (2017), he criticizes the narrow understanding of the government that defines inclusive education within the aspects of inclusion for disabled students, where in fact, "special needs" should be further emphasized towards the notion of *all* marginalized groups, such as children living in poverty as well as indigenous children (Mulyadi, 2017:203). Mulyadi also elaborated how national policies have continuously categorized students based on the idea of "labeling" and "othering," where the discussion of inclusion is very often followed by identifications of the characteristics of disabled students as opposed to the "general," "normal" students (ibid). The use of the word "*tuna*" (lacking) to clarify the type of disability is emphasized in such regulations and laws on inclusive education (ibid, p. 204). Indeed, achieving a successful implementation of inclusive education requires participation from actors on all levels, particularly the government. However, in the case of Indonesia, segregation is further exercised by the government as inclusive education is handled explicitly by the

directorate of special education, more so being separated from the national directorate of education that handles formal mainstream education (ibid, p. 206).

The challenges to realizing inclusive education

Previous research has elaborated on how inclusive education strategies remain challenging to be implemented. For example, quantitative research conducted by Sunardi et al. (2011) in 186 schools shows the different capacities and competence of schools to implement inclusive education strategies, albeit the equal resources provided by the regional government. The research further shows how only 50% of schools had managed to adjust their curricula and teaching materials for teachers to accommodate disabled students (Sunardi et al., 2011:8). In a more recent study conducted by Junaidi (2019), he discussed a different example of the implementation in East Java by highlighting the poor bureaucratic process and the lack of communication between inclusive education actors. In particular, he highlighted the impacts of the issue, ranging from poor policy management, incomplete data on disabled children, and data on inclusive schools to the lack of competence from the teachers (Junaidi, 2019:545-546). This further implies that a well-formulated national strategy does not always guarantee a successful implementation and effectiveness of inclusive education.

As such, the implementation of inclusive education in schools and classrooms continues to face various obstacles and barriers; Both in terms of resources and funds, inadequate access and facilities, to the narrow understanding of inclusion from school personnels (Amka, 2017; Ajisukmo, 2017; Napsiyah, 2017; Efendi, 2018; Oktadiana & Wardana, 2019; Astuti & Sudrajat, 2019; Nurjanah et al., 2020; Abdin & Tetelepta, 2021). Several authors argue that the unavailability of special teachers in inclusive education remains the most significant problem (Sunaryo, 2009, Kristiyanti, 2013; Handayani & Rahadian, 2013). Indeed, as the government regulation has specifically mentioned that "*every education unit that implements inclusive education strategy must have competent education personnel to accommodate the learning process of students that require special teachings*," some research has revealed that teachers in most inclusive schools do not yet have sufficient competence to accommodate disabled students, more so that most special teachers in inclusive schools do not receive training from special education institutions (Sunaryo, 2009:11;Handayani & Rahadian, 2013:38-39)

In terms of schools and teachers' understanding of inclusive values, Purbani (2013) has encountered different values and understanding of inclusion from various private and public schools during her research in Yogyakarta. She argues how the lack of understanding of inclusive values as well as disability from teachers and other students has caused disabled students to feel isolated and neglected. She further elaborates that the understanding of inclusion in most public inclusive schools tends to be relatively low, which can further be identified based on the experiences of disabled students who stated that they continue to be segregated and discriminated against in their learning process (Purbani, 2013:515-516). In contrast, private inclusive schools show a better understanding of which such values have been implemented at every level within their school system and further affect the effective collaboration of school actors to ensure the realization of inclusive spaces within the school and classrooms. Furthermore, some private schools have taken a step further to transform their school curricula that take into account the different needs of every student (ibid, p. 513). It is necessary to keep in mind that while Purbani's research, to some extent, shows further disparities between public and private schools, her purpose was to reveal that no matter the resources, full inclusion can still be realized if schools have the will and desire to transform their system.

2.3. Research gap

As I have mentioned in the previous chapter, much research on inclusive education and disability in Indonesia specifically focuses on the implementation and other pedagogical issues of inclusive education. Accordingly, many of them adopted a positivist perspective in which they understand 'inclusive education' as stated by the national policies and regulation, justifying the acts of special accommodations among other things (Sunardi et al., 2011; Junaidi, 2019). National policies, in their understanding, are considered the 'truth' and good guidelines to how inclusive education should be implemented. Hence, they particularly emphasize and problematize the implementation of the policies. Indeed, there are few authors such as Mulyadi (2017) who investigate the meanings and understanding of inclusive education strategies in Indonesia, however, not much has been said in regards to what causes the government to adopt such meanings when discussing the topic of disability and inclusion. Within this context, more research is needed to reveal how disability is shaped and given meanings within the inclusive education strategies.

In addition, though the experiences of disabled students in inclusive schools have been reflected in various studies, they remain understudied. Their experiences were often highlighted as the additional data to justify arguments and research on the implementation of inclusive education. In other words, research on inclusive education remains to uncover the problems within the implementation, and not to understand the suffering of and the effect of the regulation to disabled students. I believe that their experiences may reveal the hidden and silent discourse, or subjugated knowledge (see Foucault, 2003:7-8), that are crucial to the discussion; Especially when they are the main targets of the regulation. Furthermore, though many have explored the issues of ableism within inclusive education strategies elsewhere, this issue has not been properly explored in Indonesia. Indeed, few have attempted to step into the discussion of ableism when they explore the issue of stigma and stigmatization, as stigma often stems and is rooted in the ableist system (Purbani, 2013; Pratiwi & Wahyudi, 2019; Murdianto & Jayadi, 2020). However, such problems have not been properly elaborated within the context of ableism itself. In particular, they do not further problematize what causes stigma to emerge in the educational system and why disabled persons continue to be stigmatized. I believe it is also interlinked to the context of normality of able-bodiedness. Therefore, ableism also needed to be taken into account when one investigates the issue of inclusive education.

Overall, most studies adopted a particularly narrow perspective of how inclusive education has been implemented without further exploring the whole discourse. However, they also reveal that the implementation has particularly reflected on the strategies set out by the government. In other words, they operate based upon what they have been ordered by the policies. I have stated in the first chapter that this study is conducted to investigate the inclusive education discourse. Hence, I believe that by revealing the problematic discourse that has justified the development of inclusive education policies and strategies, we can more clearly address the existing issues of the implementation and the social realities surrounding inclusive education.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, I present the theoretical framework of this thesis. This thesis stands as a part of the critical disability studies questioning the power relations within the inclusive education agenda in Indonesia. Thus, I begin by explaining the elements of Foucault's "Biopower" and "Discourse"; and how they can be understood and interlinked with critical disability studies. Next, I focus on conceptualizing ableism, taking into account Campbell's (2009) element of ableism and internalization of ableism. Conceptualizing this concept is necessary as ableism is one of the central ideas of this analysis.

3.1. Foucault and critical disability studies

Many scholars have employed Foucault's theories and concepts as the theoretical approach to disability. Tremain (2001, 2005, 2015, 2017), for instance, has been exploring the issue and problematization of disability within Foucault's conception of governmentality and biopower. Most of her work, particularly in "*Foucault and feminist philosophy of disability*" further showcases Foucault's notion of 'archaelogy' and 'genealogy' to discuss how disability has traverse as a culturally and historically specific phenomenon; Consequently, discusses how the existence of the 'disability' constituting phenomenon depends on the power apparatuses within the social realities of human beings (see Tremain, 2017). Accordingly, "*Foucault and the Government of Disability*" (2005) particularly echoes Foucault's works and ideas as this book further explores the governing of disabled bodies within various contexts and phenomena. By taking into specific account of Foucault's ideas of governmentality and his conceptions such as productive power, discourse, and disciplinary power, this book stands as a part of the critical disability studies to question and challenge the politics of disability, in particular how disabled bodies are politicized and governed within institutional practices as well as within the level of the population (see Tremain (ed.), 2005).

These are some of the examples of academic works and literature within the critical disability studies that combine Foucault's ideas and conception to explore the disability phenomenon. Foucault's concepts and the CDS particularly complement each other, as both approaches aim to deconstruct, challenge, interrogate, and delegitimize the world system which, according to Foucault, has been built within networks and apparatus of power. Rooted from the critical theory that aims to challenge and critique the social realities that we currently a part of, critical

disability studies are understood not as a theory per se; instead, they are an interdisciplinary set of approaches that is developed to explore how 'disability' came to be (Hall, 2019:1). CDS motivates scholars and researchers to discuss and further explore the problematization of phenomena that construct 'disability'. They further challenge the traditional understanding of disability as an individual issue, instead, to view disability as a problem in a society within a network of power relations (ibid). Power over bodies is a central element that is explored by many researchers of the CDS (see for instance, Tremain 2017; Garland-Thomsons 2002). Though they specifically do not limit their arguments of the hierarchy of binaries that makes up the normative, 'able body/minds' characteristics, as opposed to the 'disabled'; more so to identify the rationale of such practices of binary imperatives of normal/abnormal, able/disabled, normative standards/deviants. These practices are employed not only by the modern State as they establish policies and laws, but also by institutions such as the school that further mold individuals as subjects to be regulated based upon these binary imperatives. It is within this case that Foucault's works are impactful within the CDS.

3.1.1. Biopower

> *"Biopower is … [a] set of mechanisms that, for the government and those*
> *who govern, attach pertinence to quite specific phenomena that are not*
> *exactly individual phenomena, even if individuals do appear in a way, and*
> *there are specific processes of individualization."* (Foucault, 2009:22)

Foucault discusses biopower in regards to two forms of power over human bodies. First, he regards biopower in a form of '*anatomo-politics*', that is, how power is operated through disciplinary practices towards individuals (subjected human bodies) in order to render them as docile, ideal subjects whose aim to be integrated within the normalized system of society (Foucault, 1978:139). Discipline, as Foucault describes in *Discipline and Punish* (1977), consists of hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and examination; which, to a certain degree, can be identified within the institutional practices in schools. This process is better understood as 'normalization' (ibid, p. 20-21). In this case, disciplinary practices are conducted in conjunction with the standardized normalcy, or norms that have been constructed by the State or by the institution. Hierarchical observation is a disciplinary technique conducted by institutional agents, such as teachers, school guardians, and school committees as they observe these individual

subjects (students) (Foucault, 1977:175-176). Observation induces power, which accordingly produces knowledge that is judged according to the normalizing gaze to conclude whether one has succeeded or failed to reach the required standards of normalcy. Those who failed to reach the required standards are rendered as 'deviants', thus leading to institutions deploying normalizing judgment to 'correct' their behaviors (ibid, 178-179). It is necessary to point out that, the key idea and aim of this normalizing judgment is not to 'discipline' deviants in a way that is understood by the traditional narrative of power, such as by subjugation or physical punishment; instead, by 'correcting' these individuals labeled deviants and reconform them into normalcy (ibid). They operate by designing certain rules and standards to how individuals should act and live in the homogenizing society (ibid, p. 182-183); further molding and motivating individuals to reach these standards. Lastly, examination applies both other techniques of observation and normalization. Examination is conducted to, again, produce knowledge as subjects are examined within the normalizing gaze to further regulate them based upon the examination result.

In short, this understanding of anatomo-politics and disciplinary techniques can be understood within the CDS as how power works to measure and surveil certain individuals according to their body/mind characteristics. According to Sullivan (2005), disciplinary practice works to "*examines, judges, roots out the abnormal, and prescribes appropriate means with which to rehabilitate individuals who deviate from the norms*" (Sullivan, 2005:28). During the late nineteenth century, medical discourses (or consciousness) have dominated the definition of 'normal' and 'ideal', as they define what abnormality means in regards to illness and 'unreasonable' behaviors of patients (Foucault, 2006:116). This has further impacted the anatomo-politics as individuals began to be judged and examined. In this case, institutions began to deploy the medicalized discourse of normality, and further identify their students in regards to their body/mind deviations; thus, students began to be labeled in accordance with their 'disability'. This notion of 'norm', in the sense, has justified the exercises of normalization towards disabled students, as they are understood as an effort to mold these students to be "ideal, participating, active" subjects of the society.

Society is thus, the central element of the second form of biopower, or in Foucault's term, "biopolitics of the population" (see Foucault, The Birth of Biopolitics, 2008). In contrast to the

anatomo-politics, biopolitics focuses on regulating human bodies at the level of the population. In this case, the State began to formulate certain standards and management of, for instance, birth and mortality rates, reproduction (i.e., national family planning programs), poverty rates, and so on. The key idea and aim of biopolitics is none other than to regulate, control, and intervene the population (the civil society) to conduct themselves within the rationale of the State (Foucault, 2008:317). Similar to the disciplinary techniques of anatomo-politics, biopolitics began with observation that is conducted by statistics and demography or regions or certain populations within a certain territory. Normalizing judgment works to produce knowledge on deviance and normality in the population, to which examination operates by assigning for instance annual programs, plannings, and strategies that aim to reach those presumed standards (ibid, p. 318). Looking back on the problematization of inclusive education, one can assume that biopolitics emerge within an inclusive education agenda as they operate to regulate and intervene deviance, that is disabled persons; by assigning 'inclusion' programs intended for disabled persons to be included within the pre-established normalized society.

3.1.2. Discourse

Foucault is very critical towards how the world comes to be and how human beings make meaning of this world. He argues that everything that we know now is governed and regulated by discourse[1]. For Foucault, discourse is not only a structure of language and text, or in other way a linguistic form (see Hall, 2001). Rather, in general sense, he describes discourse more as a 'system of thought and knowledge' which constitutes rules that approves and disapprove ways in which certain things can be talked about and acted upon (see Foucault, 1972). In this case, one can assume that a discourse gives meaning to things. Discourse influenced and shaped how human beings can conduct themselves in regards to certain things in the same way that practices have informed a discourse. Hence, the Foucauldian term of discourse is both language and practice (Hall, 2001:72).

---

[1] For instance, Foucault in his work on "The History of Madness" particularly argues that our knowledge on 'Madness' stems from the construction of meanings throughout history. Certain power (religious beliefs, philosophical phenomena, and medical establishments) has governed the meaning of 'Madness', in turn, they became the 'truth' which regulates the society to relate and position themselves within the discourse of 'madness' (see Foucault, "The History of Madness", 2006).

Foucault further argues that discourse is a social construct, that is, as discourse was shaped by certain authority to produce statements (Foucault, 1972:75-76). Thus, studying a discourse requires us to look further into the discursive formation: the statements that produce certain knowledge about a certain subject and object; the rules which govern what is 'sayable', 'thinkable', and 'can be acted upon' about the subject/object; the attributes assigned to the subjects and objects; how these statements become knowledge or 'a truth', who has the authority to talk about it, or to construct it; as well as how are these discourse practiced by institutions (Foucault, 1972; Hall, 2001:73).

In this case, one can assume that discourse gives meaning to our reality (Hall, 2001:73). They produce knowledge which dictate and govern how we see, for instance, other human beings. In this case, if we think about the context of disability, one can assume that 'disability' exists meaningfully within the discourse that talks about them. For Foucault, this requires the historical tracing of how 'disability' is further understood within the realm of 'the Other'[2]. Some have argued that certain discourse may subjugate certain individuals and make them the "Other" which existence is disapproved of by the discourse (Bajada, Callus, & Borg, 2021:7). For instance, the medical discourse has governed the way in which we see these individuals according to the medical knowledge on how a human being should look and act in certain ways. Hence, the 'unhealthy', the 'sick', the 'madman' were ruled out as those whose behavior or action is disapproved of by the medical discourse (Foucault, 2006:8). As this discourse dominates the field, they further become the 'truth' that is adopted by society, justifying the acts of labeling (or classification), confinement, exclusion, and so on (ibid, p. 79). The discourse is, then, practiced by other institutions such as schools or within the State; establishing more certain rules on how these deviants can be talked and thought about, as well as acted upon.

'Disability' exists meaningfully and further defined by the medical discourse. They are not only informed institutional practices in regards to how persons labeled 'disabled' should be understood, they also inform subjects to judge and position themselves in relation to the discourse. Foucault further described it as 'subjectivity' (Foucault, 1972:60). Human beings began to relate themselves within the 'truth' justified by the discourse, not only to identify

---

[2] Foucault's work in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972) particularly emphasizes how 'the analysis of statements (discourse), is a historical analysis' (123), to which it encompasses and questions how certain knowledge or discourse came into existence and left a trace in our social realities.

themselves into the normative binary realm of 'normal/abnormal' and 'healthy/disabled' bodies, but further judge others by it. For Foucault, discourse formations can consist of interrelated discourses that make up and justify other discourse within a single dominant discourse (ibid, p. 25-26). In this case, the dominant discourse of disability encompasses many other discourses such as the bio-medical discourse emphasizing normalized body/mind characteristics (see for instance Baker, 2002), neoliberal discourse emphasizing market standards, productive labor, and individual competition (see for instance Runswick-Cole, 2011), and ableism emphasizing favoritism towards 'able-bodiedness' (see for instance Dolmage, 2017), and so on. In this particular context of inclusive education, as my thesis particularly focuses on the practices of ableism in inclusive education, I shall discuss how ableism can be conceptualized.

3.2. Conceptualizing ableism

To better understand the logic of ableism, it is necessary for us to define and describe disablism. According to Campbell (2009), disablism is "*a set of assumptions (conscious or unconscious) and practices that promote the differential or unequal treatment of people because of actual or presumed disabilities*" (Campbell, 2009:4). In short, they see disability according to the negative connotations of 'disability', to which they should be seen as undesirable. As such, exclusionary and discriminatory practices towards disabled persons are justified by these values. On the other hand, ableism understood disability not according to their 'negative connotations'; instead, they focus on favoring 'able-bodiedness'. According to Campbell (2001), ableism is "*a network of beliefs, processes and practices that produces a particular kind of self and body (the corporeal standard) that is projected as the perfect, species-typical and therefore essential and fully human. Disability then is cast as a diminished state of being human.*" (2001:44). In this case, ableism views disability in accordance with the standardized norms in favor of able-body/minds. Indeed, ableism and disablism work together to keep disabled persons as a separate identity from what is considered normal, or in Campbell's word "normate individual". Disablism and ableism are present everywhere in society. However, disablism can be understood as an element that is operated within ableism, for ableism operates within the practices and structures of institutions, such as school as they further promote able-bodiedness as the standard to how schooling should be conducted, as Campbell stated that ableism "*locates itself clearly in the arena of genealogies of knowledge*" (Campbell, 2009:5).

3.2.1. 'Ableist relations': The elements of ableism

There are two central elements of ableism according to Campbell. The first element of ableism is "*the constitutional divide*" which emphasizes the binary 'able/disable' imperatives, that is between abled "normate individual", and disabled "aberrant" (ibid, pp. 6-7). Within the constitutional divide, these binary imperatives are translated as 'normate', which encompasses the natural state that is in order, as opposed to 'out-of-control disabled bodies'. Humanism, thus, is understood as being the orderly 'abled body', further positioning 'disabled body' as a conundrum, a problem that induces fear of 'the foreign' disrupting the order (ibid, p. 8). As such, the typical move of ableism is to separate human beings according to their body/mind characteristics, exclude certain types of people rendered 'disabled' to maintain the normalized ableist society.

The second element of ableism is "*ableist normativity*". According to Campbell, 'the normate' has certain criteria as opposed to just being the average 'able-bodied' characteristics. Instead, ableism relies more towards the idea of disabled bodies as those who can be understood or '*narrated as outside the norm*' (Mitchell, 2002:17, in Campbell, 2009:10). To a certain degree, we can identify the context of Othering in this element. As disabled bodies begin to be marked and judged by their differences in bodily/mind characteristics, disabled bodies are molded as 'the Other' which in turn justifies the position of the 'normate individuals' as superior. Within this context, one cannot talk or speak about disability without bringing the negative aspects that it has been constructed, as 'disabled' identity itself since the very beginning is constructed in a negative way to support the superiority of 'the normate'. As such, to be 'normate' is desirable, while the existence of 'disabled Others' is disapproved of.

3.2.2. Internalized ableism

As I have stated previously, ableist discourse has marked up disability as a non-desirable state; Thus, subjectivity works to mold disabled persons to relate to these regimes of truth of able-bodiedness. Ableism becomes internalized that causes disabled persons to start viewing themselves within the ableist lens, and accordingly attempt to 'hide' and 'purify' (or, cure) their disability so they can look in a way 'normal'. Campbell discusses the two strategies of internalization of ableism. First is "*tactics of dispersal*" (2009:22), that is when disability is categorized and individualized from each other. Individualisation, then, followed by attaching

certain histories, medical identities, as well as negative ontologies which aimed to hinder disabled persons from establishing their own identity (ibid, p. 23). As such, they are forced to adopt and embrace an identity that is dictated by other (superior) groups. For instance, certain individuals are forced to adopt 'blind' as their identity as based on medical knowledge and practices, they fit the category and identity of 'the blind'. This forced identity has resulted in these individuals being expected to settle within their new identity, being othered and seen as 'oddities', devalued and judged in a normalizing way that is intended to 'normalize' them according to the ableist normativity (ibid).

The second strategy is '*emulating the norm'* (ibid, p. 24). In simple terms, it is when individuals do not accept the identity they are being assigned to. However, instead of delegitimizing and/or deconstructing such 'negative' identities, these individuals chose to 'distance' themselves from those identities. Campbell puts an example of how 'person-first' language was established as disabled persons wanting to mirror the 'naturalness' and 'human-nesses' of able-bodied individuals (ibid). Within this case, ableism still persists as what these individuals attempt is to 'erase' their 'disability', mirroring the behaviors of the normate, in order for them to become 'normal' (ibid, p. 26). In a way, internalization further legitimizes the position of the normate as the dominant, 'ideal' group.

4. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Understanding the issue of disability requires us to listen to the narratives of people who have been labeled as disabled in society. Thus, this paper uses a qualitative approach that places the views and experiences of disabled communities as the central aspect of the study. Referring back to the research problem and hypotheses, this study employs Foucauldian discourse analysis to investigate how 'disabled persons' are given meaning within inclusive education discourse and further affect them in real-life settings.

4.1. Foucauldian discourse analysis

This thesis aims to investigate inclusive education discourse that further affects the livelihood of disabled students in their school environment. Hence, employing a discourse analysis is helpful and relevant as the method of my analysis. In a more specific sense, I employ a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis, or best known as Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA). Before we delve deeper into how FDA can operate as a method of analysis, I should mention that, first and foremost, Foucault emphasized that analyzing one's discourse cannot be constricted by investigating the use of text and language, more so that it should reveal the problem and situation within the system where one's discourse has been constructed and shaped (Foucault, 2002:28). "Power" is the vital aspect to be explored in discourse analysis according to Foucault, which "power" has also been central in the majority of his work. In *Power/Knowledge* (1980), Foucault explains how power not only justifies control, punishment, and repression, but that power has produced some kind of "knowledge" and reality which more or less privileged those in authority (Foucault, 1980:203). Such knowledge arose from what we call "dominant discourse" that is constructed as a strategy to maintain a certain group to keep dominating and ruling the society (ibid). Power and discourse are well-connected with the existence of "institutions" that further solidifies and operates the discourse into the system that governs and assigns roles to every subject in the social context (ibid, p. 205-206).

The FDA specifically does not try to 'debunk', 'delegitimize', or in a way 'replace' one's discourse; Rather, the core aim of the FDA, as Foucault implies, is to 'question' the establishment of a discourse, the 'truth' they have constructed, the structures they uphold, and the effect they have inflicted towards the subjects (Graham, 2010:665-666). It is also important to note that the FDA, to a certain degree, will produce researcher's subjectivity as it heavily

relies on how one's language and practice can be interpreted. Nonetheless, the FDA's ability to identify how certain individuals are empowered/disempowered by certain discourse, and its ability to look beyond the 'visible' form of discourse are, therefore, necessary to be adopted within my thesis to reveal how inclusive education discourse is 'disabling'.

As such, many have constructed different ways in which FDA can be conducted, however, I adopt Carla Willig (2008)'s FDA as it gives clear instructions on how to map out a discourse and what to look for during the analysis. In addition, Willig's FDA specifically takes into account how discourse operates in practice, which is central to my discussion. For Willig, the FDA constitutes of six stages:

Discursive formation

The first stage of Willig's FDA is to look for discursive objects (Willig, 2008:115). As my analysis focuses on how disabled persons are constituted within an inclusive education agenda; therefore, the discursive object is 'disabled persons'. In this case, the aim of the first stage is not to look for the structures of words and/or language; instead, to look for how an object is constructed and inflicted meaning behind its linguistic form and practices (ibid). Bear in mind that discourse works to approve and disapprove how we can talk about a certain topic (Hall, 2001:72); Thus, it is also necessary to look for the 'unspeakable' or 'silencing' elements when the State talks about 'disabled persons' within national inclusive education documents.

Relations of discourse

The second stage of Willig's FDA is to look for the relations of discourses (Willig, 2008:115). The construction of a certain discourse does not only contain one type of statement, text, practices, and so on; Instead, there may be certain other discourses that shape and justify other meanings within the same topic (ibid, Hall, 2001:73-74). Within the topic of inclusive education, 'disabled persons' as a discursive object is talked about in regards to two different discourses, that is the medical discourse and the social discourse. Here, the medical discourse reveals how 'disabled persons' should be given meaning and viewed according to the medical and anatomy contexts. On the other hand, social discourse provides a new meaning for 'disabled persons' in relation to the wider social system that takes into account elements of 'equality' and 'citizenship'.

Action orientation

The third stage seeks to investigate how objects are employed into a wider context of functions and attribution of responsibilities. In this case, it explores the implication of discursive formation and objects within a text into a larger context of 'action' (Willig, 2008:116). The medical discourse emphasizes the traditional imperatives of disability and impairments, as such they depend on the medical diagnosis, treatments, and the role of medical professionals to 'help' disabled persons. On the other hand, social discourse allocates the responsibility to the State and agents to 'eliminate barriers' for disabled persons. Both discourses reveal a different method of actions, yet they complement each other; That is, how the role of medical diagnosis and professionals is relevant in deciding how one's 'barriers to inclusion' should be eliminated.

Positioning

As Foucault stated, discourse shapes subjects and objects of knowledge (Foucault, 1980:204). In the fourth stage, the analysis focuses on how subjects within a discourse are positioned and situated in accordance with the action orientation (Willig, 2008:116). In general sense, 'positioning' aims to reveal how certain individuals, institutions, and the State have obligations within a discourse, to which their action and behavior is regulated. Here, the discourse also positioned 'disabled persons' as the subject target of the regulation, further implying the 'passive' role of disabled persons within the inclusive education agenda. On the other hand, agents of governmentalization consisting of schools and other educational units are positioned with obligations to provide 'adequate accommodations', further implying the active role of a subject.

Practices

The fifth stage aims to explore the relations of discourse and practice. That is, how 'action orientation' and 'positioning' is structured within practice (ibid, p. 117). I investigate the institutional practices of 'inclusion' by reflecting on the experiences of disabled subjects. It reveals how practices of schooling are bound up with ableist discourse that construct what disabled subjects should or should not do within the 'inclusive' school environment. In addition, 'adequate accommodation' statements within the inclusive education agenda further opens up the possibility of opportunities and restrictions toward disabled subjects.

Subjectivity

As stated by Foucault, discourse constructs our understanding of the world and the realities around us (Foucault, 1980:216). In the last stage of the analysis, subjectivity is explored to reveal the consequences of a discourse according to the positioning of subjects (Willig, 2008:117). In this case, I reflected on the experiences of disabled persons as the subject and object of the inclusive education discourse. I seek to understand how disabled subjects began to relate and positioned themselves within the discourse, claiming or disclaiming responsibility as a disabled subject, further 'normalizing' the role of agents and institutional practices which govern them.

4.2. Data collection and sampling

This study uses data from interviews and national documents regarding inclusive education. Data sampling is done using a purposive sampling method in which participants are chosen based on their relevance to the phenomenon or issue under study (Yin, 2016:93-94). Though, my decision to choose the interview participants for my research is rather pragmatic as I have very limited time and resources to conduct further interviews with, for instance, government officials. Thus, in this case, the population of this study consists of high school students, university students, and graduates who have been labeled as disabled in society. During the time I talked to one of the university students, they offered their assistance in reaching out to their friends to be interviewed, therefore a snowball sampling method is also employed in my research (ibid, p. 95).

4.2.1. Interview

According to Yin (2016), a qualitative interview is conducted to understand the perceptions and views of every interview participant regarding the social phenomena discussed (ibid, p. 3). Using a purposive and snowball sampling, I managed to be in contact and conduct interviews with a total of eleven participants, consisting of high school and university students, as well as fresh graduates from different regions in Indonesia, though majority of them now live in Jakarta, Yogyakarta, Semarang, and Malang. All interview participants are labeled disabled in society, and considered as a part of the disabled community. In this case, I use the labels which they use to identify themselves: four of them are labeled blind, two are deaf, three are physically impaired, one is within Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), and one is a deaf wheelchair user. I found that their characteristics and experiences influence how they make meanings of the world

and thus each person has different perceptions and opinions regarding inclusive education. For instance, though everyone has very bad experiences at school/university, some reveal more hardships and suffering in society due to their specific impairment.

I also found out later on that having more specific, open-ended questions are more useful to generate more information and understanding of their experiences (ibid, p. 142-143). During the first interview, I was struggling to conclude the answer from each question as the interview participant kept getting off track from the question asked, to some extent that they always try to explain their friend's experiences who are not a part of the population under study. Afterwards, I restructured the questions to be more specific and limited to how it should only be answered based on their experiences and perceptions and not others.

In addition, one crucial aspect to be considered of this type of method is the capacity of the researcher and the interview participants to build a conversation. It is due to the basic element of qualitative interviews that is grounded within the conversational mode that is not restricted by structured, close-ended questions (ibid, p. 144). The success of this method also depends on the ability of the researcher to ask follow-up questions that will keep the conversation going, which at the same time also produce relevant information about the issue that is being discussed (ibid). Based on my experience conducting this research, I concluded that building trust prior to the interview appears to be the hardest step when you are considered as "outside" their community. Before the interview, some interview participants asked me whether I am disabled, and they at first appeared to be quite reluctant to participate. Thankfully, after I explained the purpose and aim of my research, they were happy to be included and provide me with detailed and meaningful information about their situation.

Overall, each interview is conducted in Indonesian language as, despite the fact that I am native Indonesian, I am aware that not many Indonesians are well-versed in the English language. I concluded that using Indonesian language during the interview enables the interview participants to explain their experiences in detail and true manner; And allows us to engage deeper into the conversation. I also notice that speaking in Indonesian when talking to them builds more trust as it creates a sense of connection and belonging of the same nationality.

4.2.2. Documents

Experts have explained that documents have provided "raw" information on the reality and social phenomenon during the period in which the document is arranged, and that documents are "witness of a historical phenomenon" (see Bowen, 2009). Foucault (1972), however, argues for a different perspective in which history in itself has arrange, sort, and separate certain documents to show those that are relevant or "true":

> "*History now organizes the document, divides it up, distributes it, orders it, arranges it in levels, establishes series, distinguishes between what is relevant and what is not, discovers elements, defines unities, describes relations. The document is no longer for history an inert material through which it tries to reconstitute what men have done or said, the events of which only the trace remains; history is now trying to define within the documentary material itself unities, totalities, series, relations*" (Foucault, 1972:7).

According to Foucault, the document itself is a part of a discourse that has been further constructed and shaped based on the perspectives of those in authority to arrange the documents. This also assumes that the discourse that has been adopted and embedded within national documents is a part of what we call dominant discourse, as there is a certain dominating institution and politics behind the development of the documents. Thus, I adopt Foucault's understanding of documents not as a way to explain the historical processes of a development of documents, rather to trace how disabled subjects are situated and arranged within the inclusive education documents, and in what ways 'disability' knowledge is maintained. To put into context, I analyze three national documents consisting of "the 2009 ministerial regulation on inclusive education", "the 2016 law regarding persons with disabilities", and "the 2020 law regarding adequate accommodation for students with disabilities". I specifically chose these documents as they are crucial within the inclusive education agenda. The 2009 regulation as well as the 2016 law are continuously being mentioned by most of my interview participants, on the other hand the 2020 law regulates the 'special accommodations' which I specifically problematize in my analysis.

4.3. Positionality and limitations

Just like many researchers conducting research on disability, my main concern in doing a study about disability phenomena is that, to some extent, my position as a non-disabled person could make my research to be interpreted as ableist, and viewed as "a non-disabled person trying to make sense of disability" (see Goodley, 2014). Despite how readers will interpret my research, it is crucial to note that the purpose of this research is not to impose nor disregard the struggle and suffering of disabled persons, but to focus on such experiences based on the perspectives of disabled persons and reveal the issue of ableism and the problematic notions of 'special accommodations' in inclusive education regulations and implementations. In particular, my academic background in political science and development studies significantly help in revealing the dynamics of power (both biopower and disciplinary power) within inclusive education that is exercised by the State and institutions.

In regards to the limitations of conducting this research; Due to the very limited time and resources when conducting this research, I am unable to be in Indonesia for the interviews and further field research. Instead, I conduct the interviews using video conferencing platforms such as Zoom and Google Meet which produced various kinds of concerns. Remote interviews made the interviewing process more difficult due to different time zones, poor internet connections, and interview participants having difficulties accessing the assigned virtual conference room. One of the most prominent problems in conducting virtual interviews is that poor connection hinders the flow of the conversation. For instance, I also conduct interviews with deaf participants, therefore a sign language interpreter is needed; Poor internet connection has hindered the flow of the conversation as the sign language interpreter could not grasp the questions that I have asked to be interpreted into sign language. Subsequently, interview participants also had difficulties reading the sign language on screen. This makes the interview process inefficient as we have to ask and answer the questions repeatedly. Overall, I acknowledge that this research has many shortcomings and further research is needed to fully understand the situation of disabled persons in Indonesia.

4.4. Ethical consideration

The research follows the general ethical guidelines and procedures set by Lund University. Prior to the interview, I have ensured that consent forms were sent out and that every interview

participant acknowledged their role and participation in the research. Accordingly, I also took appropriate measures regarding the involvement of underage interview participants. I made sure that their guardians are well informed regarding the research purposes, gave out their consent prior to the interview, and they are present during the interview process. In regards to this, due to safety reasons and to ensure confidentiality, this research will not use their actual names. In turn, pseudonyms are used. In addition, due to the different time zones between Sweden and Indonesia, the interview is done during the agreeable time between 13:00 to 17:00 Western Indonesian Time.

I understand that conducting interviews with vulnerable and marginalized groups also requires further knowledge on the ethical procedures during the interview process. Overall, I try to be open in explaining the content and specificity of the research and answering every question related to the research. In particular, I also understand that there might be sensitive topics that are difficult for the interview participants to engage in, such as topics on discrimination and bullying that may cause trauma, and thus I explicitly explain that they can choose not to answer the questions and back out from participating in this research if they want to. Conducting research with vulnerable groups, particularly disabled persons, I must familiarize and understand the context and terms used to refer to disability. Before the interview, I asked each interview participant whether they wanted to be referred to as a 'person with a disability' (person-first) or as a 'disabled person' (identity-first). In addition, as I do not have enough knowledge in using sign language, it is agreed in advance to use interpreters during the interview process. Though this also raises concerns about biases and misinterpretation of the sign language, interpreters are still needed as a communication bridge between me and the interview participants.

5. ANALYSIS

As mentioned previously in the introduction, this study aims to answer the overarching question of "*why has inclusive education not been able to support the well-being of students with disabilities?*" and to seek further understanding of how power operates as a discourse that affects the well-being of students labeled 'disabled' within the inclusive education agenda. The analysis is divided into three parts. In the first part, the national policy discourse on inclusive education was examined by applying Foucauldian discourse analysis (FDA) as stated in the fourth chapter. The second part of the analysis discussed the continuation and application of discourse in the practice of inclusive education; as well as how subjectivity is present in the practice. Lastly, the third part of the analysis investigated how resistance is put up as a form of rejection towards the idea of inclusion.

5.1. National policy discourse of inclusive education

The six stages of FDA were taken to analyze the following national documents on inclusive education: "Regulation of the Minister of National Education number 70 of 2009", "Law number 8 of 2016", and "Government Regulation number 13 of 2020". The three documents are studied with the aim of observing the general discursive construction that shapes the practices of 'inclusion' in the Indonesian educational system.

Discursive formation

In a general sense, Foucault defines objects as those who are the target of a discourse, which they are given meaning within it (Foucault, 1972:35). To a large extent, it can be identified in the three national documents that 'disabled persons', who are highlighted in most sections and articles of the documents, constituted a discursive object within the inclusive education discourse. In fact, the three national documents analyzed in this study are related to disabled persons, namely: (1) Regulation of the Minister of National Education number 70 of 2009 on Inclusive Education for <u>Students with Disabilities</u> who Have Potential Intelligence and/or Special Talents; (2) Law number 8 of 2016 on <u>Persons with Disabilities</u>; and (3) Government Regulation number 13 of 2020 on Adequate Accommodation for <u>Students with Disabilities</u>. This has further positioned disabled persons as the main target of inclusive education strategies.

The government discusses disability and disabled persons with a social understanding that underlies how they are considered as a subgroup in the society: "*Persons with disabilities have so far experienced a lot of discrimination which result in the unfulfillment of the rights of persons with disabilities*" (The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2016:71). Furthermore, it is also stated that: "*Therefore, the government is obliged to realize the rights contained in the convention, through adjustments to laws and regulations, including to ensure the fulfillment of the rights of persons with disabilities in all aspects of life such as education, health, employment, politics and government, culture and tourism, as well as the use of technology, information, and communication.*" (ibid. p. 72). This implies that there is an attempt to shift the ideological understanding from the one that considers disabled persons as a discriminated subgroup towards an understanding of their rights and freedoms as part of the social system. The position of disabled persons as fully citizens, therefore, contains their rights being included in "all aspects of life", particularly in the field of education.

As the government emphasizes its obligation to provide and fulfill the rights of all citizens, the rights of disabled persons become objects of interest that should be regulated and maintained by the government. This is as stated in Law number 8 of 2016 that: "*Respect, protection, and fulfillment of the rights of persons with disabilities is the obligation of the state. This is also asserted in Law number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, so that the society has the responsibility to respect the rights of persons with disabilities.*" (ibid. p. 71), meaning that it is the responsibility and obligation of not only the state but also all citizens in general to address and acknowledge the marginalized position of disabled persons as well as the difficulties they face.

Relation of discourses

In the three documents, 'disability' is defined in two different ways. First, disability (and disabled persons) is constructed according to the medical discourse. This is clearly shown in the Regulation of the Minister of National Education number 70 of 2009 which states that "*Students with disabilities are those who have physical, emotional, mental, and social disorders or have the potential intelligence and/or special talents, consisting of: blind; deaf; mute; intellectual disability; quadriplegic; unsociable; learning difficulties; slow learner; autism; having motoric impairments; a victim of drug abuse, illegal drugs, and other addictive substances; having other disorders; multiple handicaps.*" (Art. 3). Second, disability can be interpreted according to the

social understanding and discourse, which highlights it as a 'societal problem'. The definition stated in Law number 8 of 2016 law and the Government Regulation number 13 of 2020 that: "Persons with *disabilities are any person with long term physical, intellectual, mental, and/or sensory limitations who in interacting with others may experience obstacles and difficulties to participate fully and effectively with other citizens on the basis of equal rights.*" (Art. 1) emphasizes the position of disabled persons in the context of barriers and limitations in participating in society.

The aforementioned discourses have produced two different yet complementary perspectives in viewing disability within the context of inclusive education. The medical discourse relies heavily on biomedical analysis to identify, classify, and regulate disability, leading to a more objective understanding and correlation of how certain medical impairments limit one's abilities. Meanwhile, the social discourse that considers disability not only as a medical problem but also a social problem is rather subjective in that it adds more variables to the 'disability' narratives, taking into account the social, cultural, political, and historical phenomena so as to label certain people as 'disabled' in their relationships with others.

Action orientation

Identifying the relation of discourses helps reveal the values and 'action orientation' of the discourse being analyzed. In this study, a combination of medical and social discourses is considered to have developed a problematic understanding of inclusion for disabled persons as well as a problematic allocation of responsibilities of both the agents and the subjects of discourse. To some extent, the medical discourse has convinced society of how certain individuals can be considered 'sick', 'unhealthy', or in extreme cases 'abnormal'. Numerous scholars have showcased how medical establishments are essentially exclusive as they develop a new regime of truth about what a 'healthy and normal' body should look like, which in turn defines 'abnormal' bodies that should be 'fixed' (For instance see Pylypa, 1998; Powell & Chen, 2017; Hancock, 2018).

In terms of inclusive education, medical discourse is used specifically to define and constitute disabled persons as 'students with abnormalities' as opposed to 'regular students'. This is clearly stated in the core objectives of Indonesia's inclusive education policy, particularly in the

Regulation of the Minister of National Education number 70 of 2009, which defines inclusive education as "*an education administration system that provides opportunities for all students who have* <u>*abnormalities*</u> *and have potential intelligence and/or special talents to participate in school or learning in an educational environment together with students in general*" (Art. 1). In this sense, social discourse merges with medical discourse to emphasize 'students with abnormalities' as a separate identity category from 'regular students', and the understanding of 'regular students' underlies the normative understanding of non-disabled bodies. By viewing disabled students as non-normative and 'abnormal', disability is considered as an undesirable phenomenon. Thus, various inclusion efforts are made to make sure that disabled students can be re-conformed into normality. Social discourse, in this case, convinces the target audience to make inclusion efforts that 'eliminate barriers' so that disabled persons can fully participate within the normalized able-bodied society. To a certain degree, it can be assumed that the combination of medical and social discourses reflects neoliberal values and the political interests of the Indonesian government, as stated in article 1 of Law number 8 of 2016 that it: "*...provides opportunities and/or access to persons with disabilities to channel their potentials in all aspects of the administration of the state and society*" (Art 1.2). This implies an inclusion effort to normalize disabled persons in accordance with the demands of the society, thus making them productive citizens.

Positioning

The above analysis shows how subjects with disabilities are constituted as 'deviant' subjects that need to be regulated based on the medical and social contexts of normalcy. In this analysis, positioning reveals how each subject and agent is positioned around one another, forming the attribution of obligation and responsibility within the discourse. So far, the understanding of inclusive education is based upon the medical and social definitions of disability that put forward the 'truth' that sees disability as an undesirable phenomenon that is 'abnormal' and 'deviant'. In this regard, according to Law number 8 of 2016, the Indonesian government has put a heavy emphasis on the establishment of a "Disability Service Unit" whose function is, among others, to "*make early detection and early intervention for students and prospective students with disabilities*" (Art. 42.2e). This means that the government advocates interventions in the occurrence of disability. Thus, for those who "slips" through these early interventions and

become 'disabled' citizens, their abnormalities are labeled as 'special needs' that should be accommodated (see Baker, 2017:145-148). Inclusive education, therefore, emphasizes the obligation of agents to take 'special accommodations' to support these needs. These 'special accommodations' are in the form of "Disability Service Unit", which functions to provide and maintain 'special classrooms', 'special educators/school guardians', 'special facilities', and many others (The Ministry of Education and Culture, 2009; the Republic of Indonesia, 2016 & 2020). The responsibilities are delegated to the agents of governmentalization, i.e., schools and educators, to support disabled students according to their 'special needs'. Since the priority of the Indonesian government is to form the ideal disabled subjects in regards to their normalized capabilities, these 'special measures' further subject disabled persons to behave normally in accordance with the demands of the society.

5.2. Policy discourse in the practice

The previous analysis has discussed how disabled subjects are constituted within inclusive education according to medical and social discourses. In short, the inclusive education discourse has put forward certain approved practices and obligations, such as the categorization of disabled students as opposed to regular students and the justification of special measures intended to normalize students according to the standardized norms of able-bodiedness. Furthermore, this second part of the analysis examined how such constructed 'truth' is applied and practiced by schools and educators. In this part, the experiences of students labeled 'disabled' were specifically reflected to seek an understanding of the effects of the discourse on its subjects. Here, I used the labels that the students attach to themselves to cite their statements. For instance, Ica calls herself blind, therefore I wrote '(Ica, blind)' after her quotation.

The interviews conducted with the participants of this study about the problems they face at school mainly discussed three aspects. First, most interview participants experience ableism throughout their time at school; normality is set out according to how non-disabled students participate at school, and disabled students are seen as a disruption to it. Second, the 'special accommodation' functions to adapt disabled students to normalcy. Third, because of these practices of ableism and 'special accommodation', disabled students are subjectified, making them begin to place themselves within the discourse and subsequently perceive themselves as 'lacking' and in need of 'special accommodation'.

5.2.1. Ableism: Compulsory 'able-bodiedness'

Ableism, in a simple term, is a mindset that favors or views able-bodiedness as a standard of normality in regards to the body/mind characteristics (Campbell, 2009:5). It does not focus on negative connotations or stigma per se; instead, it establishes compulsory means of being 'able'. Thus, it renders disability as a problem that should either be excluded or regulated into normalcy. Based on the results of the interviews, it can be concluded that the 'medical' narrative of disability within inclusive education policy discourse has, first and foremost, justified ableism attitudes and practices of school agents and non-disabled students. This means schools have sorted their students based on their 'abilities' as defined by the medical context.

> *"They kept asking if I was truly ready to learn alongside non-disabled students even if there were no adequate facilities to accommodate me in the classroom. [They said,] "We don't have any special instructors to help you. We use [regular] physical books, how will you manage to catch up with the others? That would be a problem." Thus, they had an internal discussion for a while, and in the end, they said they were not ready to accept me."* (Ica, blind)

The first ability that students need to have is the ability to 'read'. However, based on Ica's experiences, what is meant by the school committees is that students must have the ability to read 'normally' like 'regular students. Although not explicitly mentioned, to some extent, the statement "we use [regular] physical books" implies a compulsory means of having well-functioning eyes for 'reading'. Medical discourse played a role here as the school committees concluded that Ica did not meet the requirements for inclusion in their mainstream 'population' (students) based on their assessment. Instead, Ica's existence is seen as 'a problem', a fear-inflicting conundrum which has the potential to disrupt the normalcy that they have built (Campbell, 2009:13); for them, admitting disabled students into their 'population' would require a major transformation of the school system regarding the provision of 'special accommodations' as regulated by the government.

Ableists tend to do anything to maintain a 'perfect, normalized' system by segregating disabled individuals from the social structures (ibid, p. 11). On the other hand, ableism also works to force individuals labeled disabled to 'mirror' the behavior of the able-bodied individuals.

> "*During the interview, I told them [the school committees] that I was deaf and asked if I could answer their questions in writing. They immediately said I couldn't due to limited time, so I was forced to speak using verbal language. I mean, in the end I could only speak very slowly, and if only I was allowed to write down my answers, I don't think it would have made any difference in terms of the time [spent for the interview].*" (Iam, deaf).

The second ability that students need to have is the ability to 'speak', or more specifically, the ability to 'speak clearly using verbal language'. For the able-bodied individuals, verbal language has become a necessary means of communication, and therefore the schools set up this ability as compulsory. Accordingly, a test is set which requires prospective students to demonstrate their 'verbal communication skills' in order to be admitted. In the process, however, schools inevitably opt out of other communication skills that certain individuals may prefer. Instead of coming up with new ways that consider human diversification, they maintain a normalized system; they force 'all' individuals to partake in a test which clearly benefited certain individuals, namely 'the normates' with their ability to communicate verbally. In Iam's case, his ability to 'speak' was questioned because indeed, he has different skills from the normates. Iam was forced to 'mirror' how non-disabled students speak. Iam's last statement illustrates how the school committees did not actually care about the time limit during the interview; they were only interested in seeing if Iam could conform to the communication skill standards they have set.

Numerous scholars have outlined how ableism does not only appear in statements or conversations (Campbell, 2009; Dolmage, 2017). In fact, ableism is everywhere; from how one's building is constructed, whether they prefer having stairs compared to elevators for their building, to the structures of the system within an institution, whether they only use physical books and apply a verbal teaching style or whether they provide soft files. All sorts of questions like these tend to be asked when someone practices ableism (see Dolmage "Academic Ableism", 2017). Based on the experiences of the interviewees, ableist attitudes can mostly be identified within the school structures. Uky stated, "*The school also only has physical books, so we are required to be able to read [from physical books, hard copies]*" (Uky, blind). As stated previously above, ableist normativity has dictated students to study only from physical books or hard copies. Uky further experienced ableism during her in-class exams:

"*When the [exam] questions were being distributed in the classroom, I was left out so I had to ask her [the teacher], "Ma'am, do you make a PDF copy for me?" She immediately got angry and in a high tone, she went, "Well, you are the only disabled kid in this classroom. Look, there are thirty-five other students here, so you should be the one who fit in with us! If you don't want to, fine! You're on your own but don't cause any problems!"* (Uky, blind)

Despite the fact that, once again, an education agent in school views disability as a 'problem' against the pre-established normative system, it is clear that, in the discourse of Uky's educator, non-disabled students are seen as the normates who meet the standards of normality at school. Here, the school structure is more in favor of non-disabled students, as the educator only provides exam questions in physical form intended for sighted persons. Uky, who was seen as a "problem" in the system, was encouraged to regulate herself in accordance with the ableist norm.

5.2.2. The "special accommodation" in question

"Special accommodation" is understood as the main pillar of Indonesia's inclusive education strategies as it covers nearly half of the entire document. While the initial plans in the policy can be seen as well-intended procedures that can enable disabled students to enjoy their time in mainstream schools without being subject to any restrictions, it appears that these procedures are interpreted differently by educators as they maintain an ableist culture. Within the ableist culture, able-bodiedness becomes the unquestioned norm (Campbell, 2009:10-11). In this regard, the standard of how the learning process is carried out or how the exams are conducted remains in accordance with the normalized able-bodied standards. Contrarily, the idea of inclusion in this culture emphasizes the need for 'special accommodations' to help disabled students in conforming to the standards of normality. According to the interview participants of this study, they are often being ruled out and seen as 'problems' that should be 'fixed', thus needing special accommodations.

"*The first day of the orientation week was very stressful for me. I think that at some point one of the teachers saw me struggling to follow the instructions, and in the following week they assigned a special instructor*

to help me. I was so relieved; I thought I would have to fend for myself

during that time." (Ana, deaf and wheelchair user)

The inclusive learning process begins by assigning disabled students with respect to their impairments and difficulties. Then, assessments are carried out to reveal the 'severities' of their disabilities. From the assessments, certain accommodations are provided to 'support' these students to be able to conform to the 'normalcy'.

> "*In every exam, we are provided with special classrooms and special*
>
> *instructors according to our conditions. But there are also ... [some*
>
> *students], because they only have mild disabilities, they can stay in the*
>
> *same classroom as the others. But there are also those who must be placed*
>
> *in special classrooms with instructors.*" (Iki, deaf)

This shows that the procedure for providing 'special accommodation' in the form of a classroom is characterized by processes of othering which are constructed by finding and diagnosing deficiencies and differences in the body/mind of disabled students as compared to non-disabled students. This also reflects Foucault's grid of specification (Foucault, 1972:46-48), that the identity of disabled persons is classified according to the characteristics of their bodies and abilities, as well as the severity of their conditions, and categorized in relation to certain knowledge and discourses. Students who are marked as 'disabled' are then regulated as those who need to be segregated and allocated. An exception is made, however, for those who are still considered 'close to normal', i.e., students with 'mild' disabilities who can still meet the normalized standards of 'regular students'. These students are excluded from the inclusive measures and interventions.

In practice, these special measures are interpreted in different ways. Usually, they only work for those who can be accommodated to conform to 'normalcy'. On the other hand, those who are already ruled out as 'beyond repair', namely the disabled persons, are regulated as 'special exceptions' who are not included in the normalized learning processes. This is in accordance with Sar's experience. "*When my condition is 'unsteady', my teacher allows me to leave the classroom to refresh my mind so that I don't disturb the teaching and learning process.*" (Sar, a person with ASD). To a greater extent, quiet behavior is understood as one of the socially and

culturally accepted norms that students are obliged to follow in the classroom. In inclusive education, however, certain individuals are excluded from the mainstream disciplinary practices of these norms. In Sar's case, for example, as she is labeled as "lacking the mental capacity"[3] to behave like her non-disabled peers and the teacher also decides that no 'special accommodation' can support her to conform to the norms, she is considered the 'special exception' being left out.

Such 'special exceptions' are also reflected during classes requiring specific abilities such as mathematics and P.E. *"In math class, we are there just to sit, listen, and be quiet. We are not included in the learning process; there are no accommodations or any instructors. My teacher once said to me, "Oh, you don't need to study like the others; your eyesight will only get worse if you force yourself to study [math]". And then the teacher would give me a standard passing grade."* (Hil, blind). According to Hil, there is currently no proper system to teach visually-demanding subjects to students labeled as 'blind'. Meanwhile, during P.E class, Ana experienced a similar exclusion. *"Usually, I come to the class only to fill out the participation book and then I just sit quietly while other students play sports. I really can't participate because the teacher is afraid that my condition will get worse."* (Ana, deaf and wheelchair user). This proves that, as stated earlier, the ableist society that favors able-bodiedness will maintain ableist normativity, and the only way for marginalized bodies to be accepted is by being shaped through these 'special accommodations' and forced to meet the standards. Instead of transforming the teaching and learning process by which disabled students can be included without getting any of these 'special accommodations', the ableist system remains unchanged. This results in two possibilities: students labeled as disabled are either 'accommodated' to meet the ableist normativity; or, they are considered 'incapable', thus being excluded and ruled out. Overall, the central aim of this practice is to preserve the normalcy of the 'socially accepted' educational processes.

5.2.3. Subjectivity

Policy discourse and practices will eventually shape subjectivity, which is the last stage of the FDA. First of all, it is necessary to discuss how discourse has shaped subjectivity by referring to

---

[3] The discourse echoes the medical discourses used by medical establishments and even organizations such as WHO which defines autism as characterized by: "*difficulty with social interaction and communication. Other characteristics are atypical patterns of activities and behaviors*" (WHO, 2022). These discourses are further interpreted in the ableist culture as shown by Sar's educators.

Foucault who defines subjectivity as "*the way in which the subject experiences himself in a game of truth where he relates to himself*" (2000:146). As stated previously above, policy discourse has positioned individuals labeled as 'disabled' as the targets for inclusive education strategies. In inclusive education policies, disabled students are constituted and determined based on medical discourse which describes the characteristics of their body/mind "impairments" as opposed to the non-disabled. These policies further establish the 'truth' that individuals with 'disability' labels attached to them should be regulated by the inclusive education strategies. However, this discourse has unconsciously made these subjects see themselves in this constructed truth (Bajada, Callus, and Borg, 2021:15). This means that students begin to view themselves as 'disabled' based on the medical knowledge and discourse about their body, and thus, consider themselves in need to be regulated into inclusive spaces, as stated by Aji as follows:

> *"So, in my high school there are several kinds of school admissions, for instance there is a regular admission for regular students, merit-based admission, and inclusive admission for disabled persons. At that time, I chose the inclusive admission."* (Aji, blind)

In educational practice, inclusion is interpreted in the same sense as special education, meaning that inclusive institutions have become a form of educational system that is separate from the regular system that organizes disabled students into a limited and narrow space where 'inclusion' can be applied (Slee & Allan, 2001:183). As mentioned by Aji, schools provide a separate admission procedure exclusively meant for disabled students. Aji, who has been labeled as 'disabled' throughout his life, believes that he needs such inclusive procedures. Thus, instead of questioning the existence of this segregated process, he accepted it as the truth.

Some disabled students assume that if mainstream schools do not provide such inclusive admission procedures for them, they have to compete with able-bodied students who they believe have better physical and intellectual capacities than them. As a result, many were reluctant to enroll themselves through the same admission procedure as non-disabled students, as Ana commented: "*I'd rather choose another school that has inclusive admission than being forced to compete with them*" (Ana, deaf and wheelchair user). Regarding this, Uky also stated, "*At that time, I really wanted to go to [redacted] high school, but they did not offer a special admission*

for disabled students. During the admission exam… How should I put it… I mean… It was a blind person versus the non-disabled, with the same set of questions and everything, it was tough." (Uky, blind). Since inclusive education policies and discourse have become the truth, disabled students tend to think of themselves as 'lacking' compared to non-disabled students. Consequently, they begin to place themselves within these inclusive limitations, such as choosing schools that offer special admissions or those that have been officially registered as inclusive schools.

Disabled students who have experienced these limited inclusion processes are further exposed to subjectification within the school environment. Subjectification, according to Foucault, is a process that "*categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him*" (1982:781). In this case, disabled students who are seen as problems that should be fixed by these 'special accommodations' are further imposed on a certain knowledge that makes them the 'discounted' Others (see Goffman, 1963).

> "*I get bullied sometimes, like being teased for not being able to hear, for example. I have to avoid sitting with many students, and because they always mingle at the back [of the classroom], I prefer to sit at the front [of the classroom]. I rarely get along with my hearing peers.*" (Iam, deaf)

Since disabled students have been labeled with respect to their impairments, such subjectification often leads to them being rejected, discriminated against, and ignored. To some extent, stigma is always present in these ableist practices of 'inclusion'. Non-disabled students, in particular, perceive their disabled peers as lacking the ability to be independent. Hence, many of them try to 'help' or intervene whenever their disabled classmates do something.

> "*Whenever I move a little, for example if I stand up and try to lift or move some stuff, all my classmates will freak out and say, "Hil, you can't see! Just sit down and don't move, let us take care of it". So, like, I have a very limited space to move around because they are constantly watching over me.*" (Hil, blind)

In certain cases, teachers also view disabled students whom they teach differently from the non-disabled students. Some students even have the 'inclusive' label attached to them by teachers, while others are subjugated and looked down upon as "non-mainstream". These labels leave disabled students with limited options and constant surveillance from both their teachers and their special instructors, as stated by Iki: *"During my three years of school, I never once sat in the back row. I always had to be in the front [row]. My teachers would always look for me if they could not see me sitting in the front."* Although not mentioned, these statements imply how Iki has been labeled as having 'special needs' and therefore should be tended, thus regulating the surveillance practices of Iki's surroundings.

These practices of subjectification, stigmatization, and labeling not only limit disabled students as the "lacking others" but also make them begin to see themselves within these constructed identities and characteristics. In other words, these ableist perspectives and practices are further internalized by disabled students:

> *"I felt very isolated at that time because I was the only student with disabilities; everyone else is normal with no deficiency."* (Usa, physical disability)

> *"I don't like being called an inclusive student; I want to be normal. Calling me 'inclusive [student]' is like saying that I'm different, "Oh, this kid needs special support.*" (Iki, deaf)

The ableist discourse is echoed in the discourses of these disabled students since they view non-disabled persons/students as "normal", hence situating themselves as the abnormal ones. In addition to forging the identities of disabled students, subjectification further constructs the position of the able-bodiedness as an ideal and desirable phenomenon that disabled students strive to become one by taking on "*the performative act of mirroring in the lives of normative subjects*" (Campbell, 2009:13). It can be argued that this also explains why disabled students do not question the existence of these 'special accommodations', because such accommodations have become the truth that will 'assist' them to appear 'normal'.

5.3. Resistance: The silent discourse of inclusive exclusion

> *"Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather*
> *consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation*
> *to power."* (Foucault, 1978:95-96)

In simple terms, resistance is in a way another form of power (Heller,1996:98-99). It results in a new discursive formation that governs its subjects and agents according to their own knowledge, standards, and ideals as opposed to what other dominant discourse has established, termed by Heller as 'counter-hegemony' (ibid.). In this context, resistance can be understood from how the inclusive education discourse is reversed and challenged in another form of power relations. Thus, this section refers to the experiences of disabled students who choose to be in an exclusive space despite the government's efforts for inclusion. These students do not see "full participation and inclusion in the normative community" as an ideal condition, and therefore refuse to be governed and controlled into the inclusion programs.

Foucault views resistance as the moment when the target subjects and/or agents in a discourse begin to question whether the established imposition is, in fact, a power relation that regulates and controls them (Chokr, 2004:8). With this context, the discussion should be started by reflecting on one of the statements from Ana: "*Some friends don't want to accept the idea of inclusivity because they are more comfortable being exclusive*". As previously explained, the inclusive education discourse has built a regime of truth that disabled students should be regulated into mainstream institutions, and further implies the existence of special institutions as an anomaly in the society. In other words, disabled students are targeted to 'leave' such exclusive, special institutions in order to realize the ideality of (inclusive and diverse) civilization. The statement "[they] don't want to accept the idea of inclusivity" implies that the inclusion discourse has actually silenced those who already feel comfortable being in an exclusive environment where they live and participate within their own exclusive community. Hence, some of them refuse to accept the dominantly constructed 'truth'.

Ocha, another interview participant who chose to stay in an exclusive space, stated, *"I have everything I need at my school."* This implies that she does not see the inclusion programs as necessary since her well-being and individual needs have been achieved within this exclusive space. For some disabled persons, individual well-being and needs are premises that they

consider more important than the obligation to participate in the inclusive community. This allows them to traverse and overcome the dominant inclusion discourse. Furthermore, Ocha also mentioned: "*I always hear [bad/difficult] stories from my friends in the community. But for me, my teachers understand my condition, so I don't have to repeatedly explain my difficulties while studying.*" These statements indicate that the inclusion process is precarious, since according to Ocha's friends, being in an "inclusive" school is a constant exhausting battle of discrimination and rejection. This underlines their decision to remain in an exclusive space so as to stay safe and comfortable. Agonism (in the form of exhaustion to communicate their difficulties) becomes an undesirable situation, and this is further understood as something to be rejected.

Reflecting on the experiences of their friends who study in inclusive schools, some disabled students refuse to associate with 'regular students' as there is a possibility that they will be considered different. "*All my classmates [in the same class] are in the same condition as me, so I don't feel different. The [school] environment also supports us just like normal, for instance we have guiding blocks for blind students in the hallways so we can hangout and walk together with them [blind students] without feeling like burdening each other. I can act normally without any judgment because we have similar situation.*" (Uti)*. From these statements, it can be seen that their understanding of ideality and normality is actually very similar to that of the inclusive education discourse; to be ideal means being average and considered normal by the community around them. In the inclusion discourse, this requires all individuals, regardless of differences, to be equal as well as to participate, communicate, and act in a certain way that is considered normal by the society (Simons & Masschelein, 2005:216-217). However, for the resisting subjects, the very notion of ideality has another meaning and is implemented in different ways. For them, 'being average' means they are not seen as different in the community; they are in the matrix where they look and act the same way, and there is no room for differences, thus being considered ideal. To take an example, the final statement of Uti: "*I don't feel different at school, so why should I leave?*" emphasizes that exclusive institutions work well for them, so they do not feel the need to leave in favor of 'inclusion' regulated by the government.

6. CONCLUSION

With the overarching research question of "*why has inclusive education not been able to support the well-being of disabled students?*", this thesis aims to investigate how power operates within the inclusive education discourse and affects the well-being of disabled students in Indonesia. In the analysis, sub-questions were formulated to discuss how the inclusive education policy discourse is constructed and to examine the extent to which this discourse has regulated and affected students who study in inclusive education institutions.

First, biopower can be identified in the inclusion agenda as it aims to organize and regulate students to be integrated in mainstream schools. By applying FDA, the analysis revealed that medical and social discourses have complemented each other in the inclusive education strategies that constitute disabled persons as the passive subjects of the discourse that needs to be regulated; and schools as its active agents to regulate disabled subjects. The employment of this discourse further defines disabled students in relation to special education, where agents are positioned as the ones who should accommodate their needs in inclusive schools. Furthermore, by reflecting on the experiences of disabled students who study in inclusive schools, the analysis showed that an inclusive education system is practiced separately from the mainstream one. To a large extent, the inclusive education system can be assumed as another form of special education system organized within the mainstream system. However, inclusive education has not supported the well-being of disabled students in schools since ableist culture is still firmly embedded in the inclusion practices. Ableism establishes a standard of normalcy of the able-bodied and justifies the problematic provisions of "special accommodations" built not to actually support the well-being of disabled students but to regulate and re-conform them to normalcy. These practices then construct stigma and negative identities and labels attached to disabled students who are considered 'lacking'. Furthermore, subjectification leads to internalized ableism that makes disabled students view themselves as 'different' from other regular students, thus starting to regard the practices of exclusion in the name of 'special accommodation' as normal because they are modified in the narrative that disabled students can only become normal if 'special accommodations' are provided for them.

Overall, inclusive education is formulated with the aim of 'normalizing' disabled students according to ableist norms in educational institutions. It emphasizes that disabled students must

be included in mainstream society to support the progress and prosperity of the country. However, as these narratives become a dominant discourse that constitutes the 'truth', some people begin to sense the existence of power structures and relations within it. Consequently, resistance occurs at the lowest level, mainly because of the discourses of disabled students who stay in their exclusive space. In such resistance, inclusion is seen not as a process of assimilating everyone into a single normalized space that favors certain types of individuals, but rather as an element through which people can enjoy their lives and activities in a homogeneous and equal manner, which they find in the exclusive or special education. Here, the resisting subjects (disabled students in special schools) refuse to be set into situations where discrimination and elements of othering can potentially occur, which they believe exist in inclusive education practices. Moreover, these people believe that their exclusive space has provided everything they need, thus the idea of inclusion set out by the government is deemed unnecessary.

Due to several limitations, this thesis is still far from perfect. First of all, the analysis specifically focuses on the discussion of power relations in the inclusive education discourse in Indonesia. Therefore, the results of the analysis may be difficult to generalize as this particular issue may only reflect social and cultural understandings in Indonesian society. In addition, the analysis merely provides one single perspective to approach the very complex problems of inclusive education practices in Indonesia. For these reasons, further studies are extremely needed to uncover the root causes in the strategies and practices of inclusive education in Indonesia. Furthermore, this thesis only discusses the experiences of disabled students regarding the offline learning system in inclusive schools. Thus, future studies can explore their experiences of inclusion in the virtual learning system during the COVID-19 pandemic. Inclusion issues can also be approached to investigate the impact of the current inclusive education system on the opportunities of disabled persons to find employment as well as on other social opportunities for them in the society, e.g., whether or not inclusive education has brought more or fewer opportunities for disabled persons. More studies can also be aimed at further revealing inclusion problems in other institutions, such as the government agencies and companies, as the inclusion agenda should not be limited to the educational environment; it should also be established within the system of society as a whole.

REFERENCES

Books and journal articles

Abdin, M. & Tetelepta, J. M. (2021). "Faktor Penghambat Pemenuhan Hak Pendidikan Disabilitas di Kota Ambon". *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan, 18(2)*, pp. 92-102.

Adioetomo, S. M., Mont, D., & Irwanto. (2014). "*Persons with Disabilities in Indonesia: Empirical Facts and Implications for Social Protection Policies*". Tim Nasional Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan or TNP2K [The National Team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction].

Ajisukmo, C. R . P. (2017). "*Practices and Challenges of Inclusive Education In Indonesian Higher Education*". Paper presented at 25th ASEACCU Conference on "Catholic Educational Institutions and Inclusive Education: Transforming Spaces, Promoting Practices, and Changing Minds". University of Thailand, Bangkok.

Amka. (2017). "Problems and Challenges in the Implementation of Inclusive Education in Indonesia". *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 7(10)*, pp. 159-167.

Anomsari, E. T. & Mursalim, S. W. (2020). "Mainstreaming Disability: Challenges and Strategies Towards Equality and Decent Work in Indonesia". *Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora, 10(1)*, pp. 1-9.

Astuti, D. S. & Sudrajat. (2019). "Promoting Inclusive Education for Social Justice in Indonesia", *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 398*, pp. 178-183.

Bajada, G., Callus, A., & Borg, K. (2021). "Unpretentious education: a Foucaultian study of inclusive education in Malta", *Disability & Society*.

Baker, B. (2017). "The Hunt for Disability: The New Eugenics and the Normalization of School Children". *World Yearbook of Education 2017*.

Barida, M., Rofiah, N. H., Fitrianawati, M. (2019). "Acceptability of Students With Disabilities in Higher Education: Towards Inclusive Education at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Indonesia". *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, pp. 151-158.

Bowen, G. (2009). "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method". *Qualitative Research Journal 9(2)*, pp. 27-40.

Campbell, F. M. (2001). "Inciting legal fictions: Disability's date with ontology and the ableist body of the law". *Griffith Law Review 10*, pp. 42–62.

Campbell, F. M. (2009). "*Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Abledness*". Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chokr, N. N. (2004). "*Foucault on Power and Resistance: Another Take --Toward a Post-postmodern Political Philosophy*". The Annual Conference of the Society for European Philosophy, August 26-28, 2004 at the University of Greenwich (London, UK).

Dolmage, J. T. (2017) "*Academic Ableism*". Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Dyson, A., & Forlin, C. (1999). An international perspective on inclusion. In P. Engelbrecht, L. Green, S. Naicker, & L. Engelbrecht, (Eds.), *Inclusive education in action in South Africa*. Pretoria: van Schaik.

Efendi, M. (2018). "The Implementation of Inclusive Education in Indonesia for Children with Special Needs: Expectation and Reality". *Journal of ICSAR, 2(1)*, pp. 142-147.

Foucault, M. (1972). "*The Archaeology of Knowledge*". London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1977). "*Discipline and Punish*". New York: Random House, Inc.

Foucault, M. (1978). "*The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction*". New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). "*Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*". New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1982). "The Subject and Power". *Critical Inquiry, 8(4)*, pp. 777-795.

Foucault, M. & Faubion, J. D. (ed.) (2000). "*Michel Foucault: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology: Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984, volume two*". New York: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2006). "*History of Madness*". Oxford: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2008). "*The Birth of Biopolitics*". New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Goodley, D. (2014). "*Dis/ability studies: Theorising disablism and ableism*". Oxon: Routledge.

Graham, L. J. (2010). "The Product of Text and 'Other' Statements: Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault". *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 43(6)*, pp. 663-674.

Hall, S. (2001). "Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse". In Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J. Yates (eds). *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, pp. 72-81.

Hamidi, J. (2016). "Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Disabilitas dalam Memenuhi Hak Mendapatkan Pendidikan dan Pekerjaan". *Jurnal Hukum Ius Qula Iustum Fakultas Hukum Universitas Islam Indonesia 23(4)*, available at: https://journal.uii.ac.id/IUSTUM/article/view/7632/6650

Hancock, B. H. (2018). "Michel Foucault and the Problematics of Power: Theorizing DTCA and Medicalized Subjectivity". *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy, 43*, pp. 439–468.

Handayani, T., & Rahadian, A. S. (2013). "Peraturan perundangan dan implementasi pendidikan inklusif". *Masyarakat Indonesia, 39(1)*, pp. 27-48.

Handoyo, (2019). "*A multimethod exploration of stigma towards people with intellectual disability in Indonesia*". A Thesis Submitted in Fulfillment of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Division of Psychiatry, University College London.

Heller, K. J. (1996). "Power, Subjectification and Resistance in Foucault". *Substance, 25(1)*, pp. 78-110.

Irvan, M. & Jauhari, M. N. (2018). "Implementasi Pendidikan Inklusif sebagai Perubahan Paradigma Pendidikan di Indonesia". *Buana Pendidikan: Jurnal FKIP Unipa Surabaya, 26*, pp. 175-187.

Jauhari, A. (2017). "Pendidikan Inklusi sebagai Alternatif Solusi Mengatasi Permasalahan Sosial Anak Penyandang Disabilitas", *Jurnal IJTIMAIYA 1(1)*, pp. 23-38.

Junaidi, A. R. (2019). "Inclusive Education in East Java: The Case of Inclusive Education Policy and Practice in East Java, Indonesia". *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 382*, pp. 544-549.

Karuniasih, N. N. M. P., Nugroho, W. B., & Kamajaya, G. (2016). "Tinjauan Fenomenologi atas Stigmatisasi Sosial Penyandang Disabilitas Tuna Rungu". *Jurnal Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Udayana*.

Kristiyanti, E. 2013, *New Opportunities for Vulnerable Children Program (N-OVC)*, "Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif di Enam Provinsi di Indonesia: Sebuah Pembelajaran". Hellen Keller International- Indonesia.

Kristiandy, F. (2021). "Analisis Kesejahteraan Hak Penyandang Disabilitas : Situasi, Kondisi, Permasalahan Dan Solusi Penyandang Disabilitas Di Lingkungan Sekitar Dan Lembaga Pemasyarakatan". *Widya Yuridika: Jurnal Hukum, 4(1)*, pp. 125-134.

Larasati, D., Huda, K., Cote, A., Rahayu, S. K., Siyaranamual, M. (2019). "*Policy Brief: Inclusive Social Protection for Persons with Disability in Indonesia*". Tim Nasional Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan or TNP2K [The National Team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction]

Lusli, M., Zweekhorst, M. B. M., Miranda-Galarza, B., Peters, R. M. H., Cummings, S., Seda, F. S. S. E., Bunders, J. F. G., Irwanto. (2015). "Dealing with Stigma: Experiences of Persons Affected by Disabilities and Leprosy". *BioMed Research International*, pp. 1-9.

Maftuhin, A. (2016). "Mengikat Makna Diskriminasi: Penyandang Cacat, Difabel, dan Penyandang Disabilitas". *INKLUSI: Journal of Disability Studies, 3(2)*, pp. 139-162.

Mitchell, D. (2002). "Narrative prosthesis and the materiality of metaphor. In Snyder, Brueggemann & Garland-Thomson (eds). *Disability Studies: Enabling the Humanities*, pp. 15-30.

Mulyadi, A. W. E. (2017). "Policy of Inclusive Education for Education for All in Indonesia". *Policy & Governance Review, 1(3)*, pp. 201-212.

Murdianto & Jayadi, S. (2020). "Discriminative Stigma Against Inclusive Students in Vocational High School in Mataram, Indonesia". *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding, 7(1)*, pp. 614-622.

Napsiyah, S. (2018). "Disability Mainstreaming Program: In Search of Disability Inclusion in Islamic Higher Education". International Conference on Diversity and Disability Inclusion in Muslim Societies (ICDDIMS 2017). *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 153*, pp. 30-36.

Nurjannah, Lintangsari, A. P., Rahajeng, U. W., Arawindha, U. (2020). "*Disability is Diversity: A Multiculturalism Perspectives on Disability Inclusion in Higher Education*". ISCS 2020.

Oktadiana, R., Wardana, A. S. (2019). "The Implementation of Inclusive Education Policy for Disabled Students in Indonesia". *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 296*, pp. 47-50.

Powell, J. & Chen, S. (2017). "Foucault and technologies of Health". *Trends in Medicine 17*, pp. 1-5.

Pratiwi, C. N. & Wahyudi, A. (2019). "Diskriminasi Siswa Disabilitas di Sekolah Inklusi Sidosermo". *Jurnal Sosiologi Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Hukum Universitas Negeri Surabaya*, pp. 1-4.

Purbani, W. (2013). "Equity in the Classroom: The System and Improvement of Inclusive Schools in Yogyakarta, Indonesia (A Case Study)". *US-China Education Review 3(7)*, pp. 507-518.

Pylypa, J. (1998). "Power and Bodily Practice: Applying the Work of Foucault to an Anthropology of the Body". *Arizona Anthropologist 13*, pp. 21-36.

Runswick-Cole, K. (2011). "Time to end the bias towards inclusive education?". *British Journal of Special Education*, pp. 112-119.

Saputra, A. (2016). "Kebijakan Pemerintah Terhadap Pendidikan Inklusif". *Golden Age Jurnal Ilmiah Tumbuh Kembang Anak Usia Dini, 1(3)*, pp. 1-14.

Simons, M. & Masschelein, J. (2005). "Inclusive Education for Exclusive Pupils: A Critical Analysis of the Government of the Exceptional". In Shelley Tremain (ed.), *Foucault and the Government of Disability*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, pp. 208-228.

Slee, R. & Allan, J. (2001). "Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education" . *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 11(2)*, pp. 173-192.

Srinivasan, K., Kasturirangan, R., & Driessen, C. (2020). "Biopolitics". In Aubrey Kobayashi (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography (Second Edition)*. Elsevier. Pp. 339-345. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102295-5.10777-2.

Suharto, S., Kuipers, P., & Dorsett, P. (2016). "Disability terminology and the emergence of 'diffability' in Indonesia". *Disability & Society, 31(5)*, pp. 693-712.

Sullivan, M. (2005). "Subjected Bodies: Paraplegia, Rehabilitation, and the Politics of Movement." In Shelley Tremain (ed.), *Foucault and the Government of Disability*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, pp. 27-44.

Sunardi, Yusuf, M., Gunarhadi, Priyono, Yeager, J. L. (2011). "The Implementation of Inclusive Education for Students with Special Needs in Indonesia". *Excellence in Higher Education 2*, pp. 1-10.

Sunaryo. 2009. "Manajemen Pendidikan Inklusif Konsep, Kebijakan, dan Implementasinya dalam Perspektif Pendidikan Luar Biasa." Dalam *Makalah Jurusan PLB FIP UPI – Februari 2009 Pendidikan Untuk Semua*.

Tremain, S. (2001). "On the Government of Disability", *Social Theory and Practice, 27(4)*, pp. 617-636.

Tremain, S. (2005). "Foucault, Governmentality, and Critical Disability Theory: An Introduction", in Shelley Tremain (ed.), *Foucault and the Government of Disability*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 1-24.

Tremain, S. (2015). "This Is What a Historicist and Relativist Feminist Philosophy of Disability Looks Like", *Foucault Studies, 19*, pp. 7-42.

Tremain, S, (2017). "*Foucault and Feminist Philosophy of Disability*", Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Walton, E. (2018). "Decolonising (Through) Inclusive Education?". *Educational Research for Social Change (ERSC) Volume: 7 Special Issue June 2018*, pp. 31-45.

Widjaja, A. H., Wijayanti, W. Yulistyaputri, R. (2020). "The Protection of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to Work and to Earn a Humane Livelihood", Jurnal Konstitusi, 17(1), pp. 198-223.

Widinarsih, D. (2019). "Penyandang Disabilitas di Indonesia: Perkembangan Istilah dan Definisi". *Jurnal Ilmu Kesejahteraan Sosial 20(2)*, pp. 127-142.

Willig, C. (2008). "*Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology, second edition*". Berkshire: McGraw-Hill, Open University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2016). "*Qualitative Research from Start to Finish, second edition*". New York, London: The Guilford Press.

Official documents

Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. (2009). "*Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 70 Tahun 2009 Tentang Pendidikan Inklusif Bagi Peserta Didik yang Memiliki Kelainan dan Memiliki Potensi Kecerdasan dan/atau Bakat Istimewa*".

OHCHR. (2020). "*Policy Guidelines for Inclusive Sustainable Development Goals: Quality Education*". The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR). Available at: https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Disability/SDG-CRPD-Resource/policy-guideline-foundations.pdf.

PKLK. (2011). "*Pedoman Umum Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif*". Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Republic of Indonesia. (2016). "*Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2016 Tentang Penyandang Disabilitas*".

Republic of Indonesia. (2020). "*Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 13 Tahun 2020 Tentang Akomodasi yang Layak untuk Peserta Didik Penyandang Disabilitas*".

Special Education Directorate. (2004). "Pedoman Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Inklusif". Jakarta: Dirjen Dikdasmen, Depdiknas.

UN General Assembly. (1993). "*Standard rules on the equalization of opportunities for persons with disabilities : resolution adopted by the General Assembly*", 20 December 1993, A/RES/48/96, available at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/3b00f2e80.html

UN General Assembly. (2007). "*Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities : resolution / adopted by the General Assembly*", 24 January 2007, A/RES/61/106, available at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/45f973632.html.

UN General Assembly. (2015) "*Transforming our world : the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*", 21 October 2015, A/RES/70/1, available at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html.

UNESCO. (1994). "*The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*". Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2005). "*Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring Access to Education for All*". Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO. (2013). "*Education Sector Technical Notes: Inclusive Education*". Paris: UNESCO.

Website and online articles

CSIE. (2020). "*The UNESCO Salamanca Statement*", 18 November 2020, available at: http://www.csie.org.uk/inclusion/unesco-salamanca.shtml#:~:text='%20Special%20needs%20education%20incorporates%20proven,child%20fitted%20to%20the%20process.

"Bercacat". 2016. From the Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language (KBBI), available at: https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/bercacat.

Hall, M. C. (2019). "Critical Disability Theory", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/disability-critical/.

United Nations. (2020). "*Education for all*", 2 September 2020, available at: https://www.un.org/en/academic-impact/education-all

Wahyu, F. (2020). "*Viral Siswa Disabilitas di Purworejo Jadi Korban Perundungan, Ini Kata Kepala Sekolah*", Liputan6, 13 February 2020, available at: https://www.liputan6.com/regional/read/4177821/viral-siswa-disabilitas-di-purworejo-jadi-korban-perundungan-ini-kata-kepala-sekolah.

World Health Organization. (2022). "*Autism*", WHO, 30 March 2022, available at: https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/autism-spectrum-disorders-(asd).

CONSENT FORM

Terima kasih atas kesediaan Anda untuk diwawancarai sebagai bagian dari proyek penelitian di atas. Prosedur beretika untuk penelitian akademis yang diterapkan oleh Lund University mengharuskan partisipan wawancara untuk secara jelas menyetujui partisipasinya dalam wawancara dan menyetujui bagaimana informasi dari wawancara ini akan digunakan. Lembar persetujuan ini diperlukan bagi peneliti untuk memastikan bahwa Anda memahami maksud dari keterlibatan Anda, dan menyetujui persyaratan dari partisipasi Anda. Dalam hal ini:

- Wawancara akan direkam dan diproduksi dalam bentuk transkrip wawancara;
- Transkrip wawancara akan dianalisis oleh peneliti;
- Transkrip wawancara hanya dapat diakses oleh peneliti dan rekan akademis yang mungkin berkolaborasi di dalam proyek penelitian ini;
- Rekaman wawancara yang sebenarnya akan disimpan oleh peneliti;
- Variasi lain dari ketentuan di atas akan disusun berdasarkan persetujuan eksplisit dari Anda.

Dengan berpartisipasi dalam wawancara ini, partisipan wawancara juga memahami bahwa kata-katanya dapat dikutip secara langsung di dalam proyek penelitian. Sehubungan dengan ini, silahkan centang/setujui dengan lisan pada pernyataan yang Anda setujui:

	Saya setuju untuk dikutip secara langsung.
	Saya setuju untuk dikutip secara langsung apabila nama Saya disamarkan.
	Saya setuju bahwa peneliti dapat menerbitkan dokumen yang berisi kutipan oleh saya.

Semua atau sebagian dari wawancara Anda dapat digunakan:

- Dalam makalah akademik, makalah kebijakan, atau artikel berita;
- Sebagai informasi masukan untuk penelitian lainnya;
- Sebagai arsip proyek penelitian seperti yang telah disebutkan di atas.

Saya setuju untuk memproses data pribadi Saya sesuai dengan ketentuan di atas.

_____

Nama dan Tanda Tangan Partisipan   Tanggal

INTERVIEW GUIDELINE

Pertanyaan pembuka
1. Ceritakan sedikit tentang dirimu.
2. Apakah sekolahmu merupakan sekolah inklusif?
3. Apakah jarak dari sekolah ke rumahmu jauh?

Persepsi dan Nilai
1. Apa yang kamu ketahui tentang inklusi dan juga sekolah inklusif?
2. Menurutmu, apakah orang-orang disekitarmu sudah memahami konsep inklusivitas dengan baik?

Tantangan dan Kesempatan
1. Bisakah kamu menceritakan pengalamanmu dalam menempuh pendidikan?
   a. Apa tantangan yang kamu hadapi saat memilih sekolah pertama kali?
   b. Bagaimana perilaku guru-guru dan teman-teman sekolahmu saat itu? Bagaimana kamu menanggapinya?
   c. Apakah guru sudah bisa mengakomodasi proses pembelajaran dengan baik?
   d. Apakah kamu merasa dapat berpartisipasi aktif di kelas?
   e. Apakah ada kesulitan lain yang kamu hadapi di sekolah (dalam hal akses, fasilitas, dukungan guru)? Apakah itu menghalangimu untuk bisa diterima di kelas?
   f. Terlepas dari halangan yang kamu alami, apakah kamu memiliki pengalaman baik di sekolah?
2. Setelah selesai sekolah/kuliah di institusi inklusif.
   a. Apakah menurutmu sekolah telah meningkatkan keterampilanmu untuk bisa menempuh pendidikan tinggi dan berkarir?
   b. Apakah kamu bisa bebas memilih masa depan yang kamu inginkan? Ataukah kamu masih menerima hambatan, baik dari lingkungan sekitarmu atau dari institusi yang kamu tuju?
3. Menurutmu, apakah penyandang disabilitas sudah memiliki kesempatan yang sama dengan orang lainnya?

Pertanyaan penutup
1. Apa harapanmu kedepannya untuk pendidikan dan sekolah inklusif di Indonesia?