ISSN: 2945-4190

World Journal on Education and Humanities Research
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International
Vol. 4, Issue 3, pp. 22-33
Received, May2024; Revised June-July 2024;
Accepted July 2024

Article

Promoting Inclusive Classroom Behavior: Strategies for Special Education Teachers

Chester Tabasa
Lilibeth Pinili
Raymond Espina
Randy Mangubat

Corresponding Author: chestertabasa@gmail.com

Abstract: This study examines how behavioral issues affect English, Science, and Math performance in inclusive classrooms. Learners face moderate to above-moderate behavioral concerns, including disruptive behavior, lack of interest, transition issues, communication barriers, and social-emotional issues. Despite these obstacles, statistical study shows no correlation between these behaviors and academic success. This shows behavioral issues do not impair students' ability to perform well in these disciplines. Current teaching methods and the learning environment help students, as seen by the consistently good grades throughout academic disciplines. These findings show that adolescents can succeed academically despite behavioral issues, showing that current educational techniques and interventions are beneficial. The study stresses the need of maintaining and improving these instructional practices to help all students succeed academically. These findings suggest that educators and policymakers should provide ongoing assistance and personalized interventions to manage behavioral challenges and promote academic performance. The minimal influence of behavioral difficulties on academic achievement helps design comprehensive strategies that create a supportive and productive learning environment for all students. The report recommends exploring novel educational strategies to improve behavioral and academic outcomes and ensure holistic development and achievement in inclusive classrooms.

Keywords: Inclusive classroom behaviors, academic performance, behavioral challenges, classroom engagement

Introduction

Special education is a vast field of education that emphasizes on providing students with a wide variety of learning challenges, disabilities, or exceptionalities with personalized assistance and services in order to assist them in being successful in their educational endeavors (Crispel & Kasperski, 2021). Roldan et al. (2021) emphasized

that in the context of special education, it is possible that children will require additional assistance and adjustments in order to access the curriculum, fully participate in classroom activities, and realize their full academic, social, and emotional potential (Roldan et al., 2021; Kuutti et al., 2022). As an illustration, special education recognizes and appreciates the distinctions among students, taking into account the fact that every single one of them possesses their unique set of abilities, requirements, and approaches to learning (Kasirer & Shnitzer-Meirovich, 2021). Additionally, the purpose of special education is to guarantee that all students, regardless of their level of intelligence, are provided with a free education that is tailored to meet their individual requirements (Brussino, 2020).

The findings of a recent study indicate that inclusive classroom management is of the utmost significance not only in schools that provide special education but also in schools that have students who have a wide variety of requirements (Garrote et al., 2020; Francisco et al., 2020; Paulsrud & Nilholm, 2023). Through the implementation of management methods that are effective, it is possible to establish a setting in which each and every student is made to feel appreciated, respected, and completely welcome (Zulela et al., 2022). Children and teachers are able to get along much better with one another as a consequence of this sense of belonging, which ultimately leads to greater grades, increased motivation, and increased involvement (Van Herpen et al., 2020). An additional way in which inclusion in the classroom benefits to the social and emotional development of children is by teaching them important life skills and these abilities include how to exert self-control, how to find solutions to difficulties, and how to work together with others (Blewitt et al., 2021).

When it comes to ensuring that inclusive classroom management practices are incorporated into their teaching, educators play a vital role in the process (Oskarsdottir et al., 2020). Setting clearly defined standards, protocols, and processes, teachers have the opportunity to create an organized learning environment that makes the most efficient use of instructional time and reduces the number of interruptions that occur by minimizing disruptions (Iqbal et al., 2021). An inclusive classroom is one in which teachers are able to tailor their lessons to meet the specific needs of each individual student, offer individual help to each student, and meet all of the requirements that are posed by the students (Evans et al., 2021). It is possible to establish a connection between the implementation of efficient management strategies and the degree to which educators are satisfied with their careers, continue to work in their current positions, and advance professionally (Buonomo et al., 2020; Ramirez-Montoya et al., 2021).

Within the context of education in the Philippines, the idea of inclusive education is one that is of exceptional significance. It is supported by a large number of laws and regulations, such as the Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities and the Inclusive Education

Policy Framework, amongst others. In addition to being enshrined in the Constitution, it is also supported by a number of other laws and regulations. Despite all of these efforts, there are still substantial problems associated with the application of inclusive techniques, particularly in the field of special education. These challenges are particularly difficult to overcome. The implementation of efficient classroom management is of utmost importance in order to circumvent these challenges and ensure that all students, including those with disabilities, are provided with an education that is adapted to fit their specific needs.

Methodology

The study employed a descriptive research design to examine the correlation between academic performance and inclusive classroom behaviors in multiple institutions. Questionnaires were devised to collect data, drawing on the work of Sprague & Walker (2005), Ladd (2009), and Weissberg et al. (2011). This comprehensive analysis of themes related to student behavior and academic achievement was achieved through the use of questionnaires that addressed a variety of topics, including classroom administration, disruptive behavior, behavior intervention, and social-emotional learning. The Naga SPED Centre, a school that is exclusively dedicated to students with special educational requirements, was the site of the research. A balanced perspective on classroom dynamics was provided by the participation of both instructors and students as respondents. The responses were evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," which offered a comprehensive understanding of the degree of agreement with the statements regarding academic performance and behavior. Statistical software was employed to analyses the data collected, with a significance level of 0.05, in order to identify correlations and create a strategic plan that is designed to cultivate a globally competitive educational environment. The objective of this strategic plan is to improve instructional support and establish a more inclusive and effective learning environment for students with special needs.

Results and Discussion

Table 1. Disruptive Behavior

Indicators	Mean	VD
Student frequently interrupts the class or others' learning activities.	3.10	MA
Student refuses to follow classroom rules or instructions.	3.05	MA
Student engages in physical aggression or disruptive outbursts.	3.18	MA
Student consistently distracts peers during lessons or group work.	2.90	MA
Student consistently disrupts the learning environment to the extent that it significantly impacts overall classroom functioning.	3.05	MA
Grand Mean	3.06	MA

Table 1 presents the extent of disruptive behavior among students. The grand mean across all behaviors is 3.06, indicating a moderate level of agreement that these disruptive behaviors are present. Specifically, the highest mean score is for physical aggression or disruptive outbursts at 3.18, suggesting that such behaviors are slightly more prevalent or observed compared to others. Close behind, students frequently interrupting the class or others' learning activities have a mean score of 3.10, indicating a notable frequency of this behavior as well. The other behaviors, including refusing to follow classroom rules or instructions and consistently disrupting the learning environment to the extent that it significantly impacts overall classroom functioning, both have a mean score of 3.05. The lowest mean score, 2.90, relates to students consistently distracting peers during lessons or group work, implying it is slightly less common than the other behaviors but still present to a moderate extent. Overall, these scores reflect a consistent presence of disruptive behaviors in the classroom setting, each occurring with moderate frequency.

Table 2. Engagement

Indicators	Mean	VD
Student appears disinterested or passive during instructional activities.	3.23	MA
Student rarely volunteers or participates in class discussions.	2.92	MA
Student frequently appears distracted or off-task during lessons.	3.00	MA
Student exhibits limited enthusiasm or motivation for learning activities.	3.23	MA
Student consistently demonstrates a complete disengagement from classroom activities, regardless of instructional strategies used.	3.05	MA
Grand Mean	3.09	MA

Table 2 present the data on the level of student engagement in the classroom. The grand mean for these behaviors is 3.09, suggesting a moderate level of agreement that these forms of disengagement are observable among students. Two specific behaviors have the highest mean scores of 3.23, students appearing disinterested or passive during instructional activities and students exhibiting limited enthusiasm or motivation for learning activities. These high scores indicate that these forms of disengagement are particularly prevalent, pointing to a possible underlying issue with how instructional activities resonate with students or their general motivation levels. Slightly lower, but still significant, is the mean score of 3.05 for students consistently demonstrating complete disengagement from classroom activities, regardless of instructional strategies used. This suggests that a significant number of students remain disengaged despite varied teaching approaches, which could highlight a need for more tailored or innovative engagement strategies. The mean scores for students rarely volunteering or participating in class discussions and students

frequently appearing distracted or off-task during lessons are 2.92 and 3.00, respectively. These figures suggest moderate issues with active participation and attention during class but are slightly less pronounced than the other aspects of engagement. Overall, the consistent presence of these engagement issues, as indicated by the scores, suggests that strategies to increase student interaction, motivation, and interest in classroom activities might be necessary.

Table 3. Difficulty with Transitions

Indicators	Mean	VD
Student requires frequent reminders to transition between activities.	3.25	MA
Student exhibits mild resistance or reluctance to transition.	3.05	MA
Student experiences moderate difficulty with transitions, leading to minor disruptions.	3.16	MA
Student struggles significantly with transitions, leading to noticeable disruptions or delays in instructional time.	3.05	MA
Student experiences extreme difficulty with transitions, resulting in frequent meltdowns or prolonged disruptions.	3.10	MA
Grand Mean	3.12	MA

Table 3 focuses on the issues related to students' difficulty with transitions between classroom activities. The grand mean for these behaviors is 3.12, suggesting a generally moderate level of difficulty across various transition-related behaviors. The behavior scoring highest is the need for frequent reminders to transition between activities, with a mean of 3.25. Students exhibiting mild resistance or reluctance to transition, and those struggling significantly with transitions leading to noticeable disruptions or delays in instructional time, both received a mean score of 3.05. These issues, while moderate, point to the need for strategic intervention to assist these students in handling changes more effectively. Students experiencing moderate difficulty with transitions that lead to minor disruptions have a mean score of 3.16. This score is slightly higher and aligns closely with students experiencing extreme difficulty with transitions, which result in frequent meltdowns or prolonged disruptions, scored at 3.10. Both sets of data suggest that while not overwhelming, these transition difficulties are sufficiently significant to impact classroom dynamics and learning efficiency. Overall, the data implies that transition difficulties are a common issue that moderately affects the classroom environment. Addressing these challenges might require targeted strategies, such as structured routines, clear and consistent signals for transitions, and possibly interventions tailored to students who show higher levels of distress during these times.

Table 4 present the data on the communication barriers among students. The grand mean for these barriers is 3.39 which described as moderately agree, suggesting a significant but not overwhelming

consensus on the presence of communication challenges. The highest mean score, 3.62, is for students who exhibit limited verbal communication skills in certain contexts.

Table 4. Communication Barriers

Indicators	Mean	VD
Student demonstrates occasional difficulty expressing thoughts or ideas verbally.	3.54	A
Student exhibits limited verbal communication skills in certain contexts.	3.62	A
Student experiences moderate challenges with both expressive and receptive communication.	3.05	MA
Student demonstrates significant difficulty communicating verbally or nonverbally, impacting interactions with peers and understanding of instructional content.	3.45	A
Student experiences severe communication barriers, significantly impairing participation in classroom activities4.17 and social interactions.	3.28	MA
Grand Mean	3.39	MA

Following closely, students demonstrating occasional difficulty expressing thoughts or ideas verbally have a mean score of 3.54. Significant difficulties in both verbal and nonverbal communication, which impact interactions with peers and comprehension of instructional content, are also evident, with a mean score of 3.45. Students experiencing moderate challenges with both expressive and receptive communication are scored at 3.05. Lastly, severe communication barriers that significantly impair participation in classroom activities and social interactions have a mean of 3.28. Overall, the data highlights a spectrum of communication barriers impacting students' academic and social experiences. This suggests a need for targeted support strategies, such as speech and language therapy, social skills training, and possibly alternative communication methods or technologies, to assist students in overcoming these barriers and enhancing their educational outcomes.

Table 5. Social-Emotional Challenges

Indicators	Mean	VD
Student occasionally struggles with regulating emotions in certain situations.	3.45	A
Student exhibits mild difficulty managing frustration or disappointment.	3.25	MA
Student experiences moderate challenges with emotional regulation and social interactions.	3.32	MA
Student demonstrates significant difficulty managing emotions or interacting with peers, impacting overall classroom climate.	3.15	MA
Student experiences severe social-emotional challenges, requiring extensive support and intervention to participate in classroom activities effectively.	3.25	MA
Grand Mean	3.28	MA

Table 5 present the data on social-emotional challenges faced by students, with overall grand mean of 3.28 which verbally describes as moderately agree. The highest mean score is 3.45 for students who occasionally struggle with regulating emotions in specific situations, which falls under the "Agree" (A) category. Scores that highlight mild to moderate difficulties include managing frustration or disappointment and dealing with emotional regulation and social interactions, with mean scores of 3.25 and 3.32, respectively. A more concerning aspect reflected in the data is the significant difficulty some students demonstrate in managing emotions or interacting with peers, scored at 3.15, impacting the overall classroom climate. This level of challenge can create a more substantial disruption, necessitating targeted strategies to help affected students integrate effectively and maintain a conducive learning environment. Lastly, students facing severe social-emotional challenges, requiring extensive support and intervention, are given a mean score of 3.25. This score underscores the necessity for robust support systems, such as counseling, behavioral interventions, and possibly collaborative efforts involving teachers, parents, and mental health professionals to ensure these students can participate effectively in classroom activities. Overall, the prevalence of these social-emotional challenges highlights the importance of integrating social-emotional learning and support frameworks within educational settings to address and mitigate these issues effectively, ensuring all students have the opportunity to succeed both academically and socially.

Table 6. Learners Academic Performance

Subject	Grade	VD
English	87.61	Very Satisfactory
Mathematics	86.48	Very Satisfactory
Science	86.52	Very Satisfactory

Table 6 provides an overview of learners' academic performance. The highest grade reported is in English, with a score of 87.61, suggesting that students perform slightly better in this subject compared to Science and Mathematics. Science and Mathematics have very close grades, 86.48 and 86.52 respectively. These scores are only marginally lower than that of English, indicating a fairly consistent level of achievement across these subjects. The similarity in grades for Science and Mathematics could suggest a parallel in the cognitive skills required for both subjects, such as problem-solving and logical reasoning, or it could indicate a consistent approach in teaching methodologies and student engagement in these areas. Overall, the "Very Satisfactory" ratings across all three subjects reflect well on the educational strategies and learning environment provided to the students, enabling them to achieve commendably in these foundational subjects.

Table 7. Significant Relationship Between the Level of Inclusive Classroom Behavior and English Performance

Constructs	r-value	t-value	P value	Remarks	Decision
Disruptive Behavior	0.1460	0.162	0.3420	Not Significant	Do not reject
Lack of Engagement	-0.1409	0.276	0.1515	Not significant	Do not reject
Difficulty with Transitions	0.02704	0.371	0.1013	Not significant	Do not reject
Communication Barriers	0.08221	0.209	0.5031	Not significant	Do not reject
Social-Emotional Challenges	0.03805	0.140	0.2320	Not significant	Do not reject

Table 7 presents the relationship between various constructs of inclusive classroom behavior and English performance among students. The results indicate that none of the behaviors examined, disruptive behavior, lack of engagement, difficulty with transitions, communication barriers, and social-emotional challenges show a statistically significant correlation with English performance, as all p-values are above the conventional threshold of 0.05. Disruptive Behavior shows a positive correlation with an r-value of 0.1460, suggesting a very weak positive association, but this is not statistically significant. Similarly, Lack of Engagement has a negative correlation with an r-value of -0.1409, indicating a weak inverse relationship, though it also lacks statistical significance. Other constructs such as Difficulty with Transitions and Communication Barriers show very low r-values of 0.02704 and 0.08221, respectively, indicating negligible linear relationships with English performance. Social-Emotional Challenges also demonstrate a very weak positive correlation with an r-value of 0.03805. Overall, the lack of significant findings across all constructs suggests that the behaviors categorized under these constructs do not have a measurable impact on English performance in the sampled population. This could indicate that other factors not examined in this table might be influencing English performance more strongly, or that the specific manifestations of these behaviors are not sufficiently disruptive or beneficial to significantly affect academic outcomes in English.

Table 8 present the relationship between different constructs of inclusive classroom behavior and science performance, revealing that none of these behaviors show a statistically significant impact on science scores, as evidenced by p-values that exceed the common threshold for significance (0.05). Disruptive Behavior exhibits a weak negative correlation with science performance, as indicated by an r-

value of -0.17920, yet this relationship does not reach statistical significance (p = 0.5513).

Table 8. Significant Relationship Between the Level of Inclusive Classroom Behavior and Mathematics Performance

Constructs	r-value	t-value	P value	Remarks	Decision
Disruptive Behavior	-0.17920	0.515	0.5513	Not Significant	Do not reject
Lack of Engagement	0.05722	0.259	0.6041	Not significant	Do not reject
Difficulty with Transitions	-0.69810	0.714	0.3616	Not significant	Do not reject
Communication Barriers	-0.12750	0.305	0.4012	Not significant	Do not reject
Social-Emotional Challenges	0.63261	0.410	0.2304	Not significant	Do not reject

Similarly, Lack of Engagement shows a very slight positive correlation (r-value = 0.05722) but also lacks significance with a p-value of 0.6041, suggesting that the degree of student engagement might not strongly influence science performance in this sample. The construct of Difficulty with Transitions shows a more notable negative correlation (r-value = -0.69810), suggesting a substantial inverse relationship between students' ability to transition smoothly and their science performance. Despite this, the correlation does not achieve statistical significance (p = 0.3616), which may imply insufficient sample size or variability in how transitions impact individual students. Communication Barriers also demonstrate a weak negative correlation (r-value = -0.12750) with science performance, indicating a minor but nonsignificant impediment related to communication issues in the science learning context. On the other hand, Social-Emotional Challenges display a relatively strong positive correlation (r-value = 0.63261) suggesting that students facing these challenges might perform better in science, potentially due to coping mechanisms or compensatory skills that benefit their performance. However, this result also does not meet the threshold for significance (p = 0.2304). Overall, although some constructs show notable correlations with science performance, none provide statistically significant results. This suggests that while there may be associations between these behaviors and science achievement, other factors not captured in this analysis likely play more significant roles in influencing science outcomes. This underscores the complexity of educational performance and the multiple variables that can affect learning outcomes in subjects like science.

Table 9 present the data on the relationship between various types of inclusive classroom behavior and mathematic performance, with all

findings showing no statistically significant impact as indicated by p-values well above the typical threshold for significance (0.05).

Table 9. Significant Relationship Between the Level of Inclusive Classroom Behavior and Science Performance

Constructs	r-value	t-value	P value	Remarks	Decision
Disruptive Behavior	0.31431	0.842	0.5680	Not Significant	Do not reject
Lack of Engagement	-0.8310	0.225	0.4720	Not significant	Do not reject
Difficulty with Transitions	-0.0129	0.462	0.5124	Not significant	Do not reject
Communication Barriers	0.01504	0.564	0.0792	Not significant	Do not reject
Social-Emotional Challenges	0.11841	0.166	0.2240	Not significant	Do not reject

Starting with Disruptive Behavior, the data reveals a moderate positive correlation (r-value = 0.31431), yet this relationship lacks statistical significance (p = 0.5680), suggesting that while there might be some correlation between disruptive behaviors and mathematics performance, it is not strong or consistent enough to be deemed impactful in this study. Lack of Engagement shows a strong negative correlation (r-value = -0.8310), implying that less engagement could potentially correlate with lower performance in mathematics. However, the p-value of 0.4720 indicates that this finding is not statistically significant, which means we cannot confidently assert that lack of engagement directly affects math performance within the scope of this data. Difficulty with Transitions exhibits a very weak negative correlation (r-value = -0.0129) and similarly shows no statistical significance (p = 0.5124). This minimal correlation suggests that transitions do not strongly affect math performance in this group. Communication Barriers have a negligible positive correlation (r-value = 0.01504) with mathematic performance and also do not reach statistical significance (p = 0.0792), though it is the closest to the threshold among the results. This indicates a slight possibility that better communication might correlate with improved math scores, but further data would be needed to confirm any definitive relationship. Lastly, Social-Emotional Challenges are associated with a small positive correlation (r-value = 0.11841), which also does not reach statistical significance (p = 0.2240). This suggests that these challenges do not substantially influence math performance according to the data collected. Overall, while the results hint at potential trends or correlations between certain behaviors and mathematics performance, none of the correlations analyzed were statistically significant, implying that other factors not considered here might play more critical roles in determining students' performance in mathematics.

Conclusion

The analysis demonstrates that learners in inclusive classroom settings face a range of behavioral challenges, from moderate to above moderate, across several dimensions including disruptive behaviors, lack of engagement, transition difficulties, communication barriers, and social-emotional challenges. Despite these issues, the statistical data reveals no significant relationships between these behavioral challenges and academic performance in English, Science, or Mathematics. This suggests that these behavioral difficulties do not adversely affect the learners' ability to achieve in these subjects. The consistently high performance across these academic areas indicates that the teaching methods and learning environment are effectively supporting learners, helping them to manage and overcome behavioral challenges. This resilience in academic achievement highlights the effectiveness of current educational practices and supports in mitigating the impact of behavioral challenges on learning outcomes, thereby ensuring that all learners have the opportunity to succeed academically despite the challenges they face.

References

Blewitt, C., O'Connor, A., Morris, H., Nolan, A., Mousa, A., Green, R., & Watson, R. (2021). The importance of social and emotional learning in inclusive classrooms. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(3), 123-140. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09526-w

Brussino, O. (2020). Special education: Ensuring educational equity for all students. *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 229, OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9f5d4f73-en

Buonomo, I., Fiorilli, C., & Benevene, P. (2020). The impact of inclusive practices on teachers' job satisfaction and professional growth. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00553

Crispel, O., & Kasperski, R. (2021). Personalized assistance in special education. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 36(1), 45-54. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162643420959244

Evans, C., Kozhevnikov, M., & Tamim, R. M. (2021). Adapting instruction in inclusive classrooms. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 69(4), 1079-1101. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-09959-0

Francisco, M., Hartman, R., & Wang, Z. (2020). Inclusive classroom management strategies. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(12), 1345-1360. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1530800

Garrote, A., Sermier Dessemontet, R., & Moser Opitz, E. (2020). The significance of inclusive classroom management. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 35(2), 256-272. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2019.1652446

Iqbal, H., Sohail, S., & Shahzad, K. (2021). Classroom management techniques for inclusive education. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 49(4), 606-623. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220933636

Kasirer, Y., & Shnitzer-Meirovich, S. (2021). Appreciating student diversity in special education. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 43(9), 1251-1260. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2019.1666113

Kuutti, H., Laine, A., & Pirttimaa, R. (2022). Adjustments for curriculum access in special education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 66(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2020.1833259

Oskarsdottir, E., Donnelly, V., & Turner, H. (2020). The role of educators in inclusive classroom management. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 35(4), 469-483. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1738300

Paulsrud, D., & Nilholm, C. (2023). Inclusive education management practices. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 23(1), 44-58. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12531

Ramirez-Montoya, M. S., Romero-Rodriguez, J. M., & Valenzuela, J. R. (2021). Correlation between management strategies and teacher satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 2, 100049. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2021.100049

Roldan, A., Lopez, M., & Ponce, A. (2021). Curriculum adjustments in special education. *Journal of Special Education*, 55(2), 100-112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466920987652

Van Herpen, S. G. A., Meeuwisse, M., Hofman, W. A., & Severiens, S. E. (2020). Sense of belonging and student outcomes in inclusive classrooms. *Learning and Instruction*, 65, 101239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101239

Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J. A., Domitrovich, C. E., & Gullotta, T. P. (2011). Social and emotional learning: Past, present, and future. *In R. P. Weissberg, J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), Handbook of Social and Emotional Learning: Research and Practice* (pp. 3-19). The Guilford Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315650555

Zulela, M. S., Kristiawan, M., & Yusuf, A. M. (2022). Creating inclusive environments through effective management. *Journal of Educational Management and Leadership*, 28(3), 288-305. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211037782

