

English Teachers' Assessment Practices in Inclusive Elementary School Classrooms

I Gede Angga Pebriawan*, Ni Luh Putu Eka Sulistia Dewi, A.A Gede Yudha Paramartha

Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Indonesia

* anggapebriawan16@gmail.com (Primary Contact)

ABSTRACT

Keywords

Diagnostic Assessment, Formative Assessment, Summative Assessment, Inclusive Classroom, English Language Learning, Elementary School

Article History

Received: 2026-07-10
Accepted: 2026-07-20

English language learning in inclusive elementary school classrooms involves students with diverse abilities and learning needs, requiring assessment practices that accommodate their characteristics. However, teachers still face various challenges in implementing assessments that address the needs of all students, while studies specifically examining assessment practices in inclusive elementary school English classrooms remain limited. This study aimed to analyze the implementation of assessment and the challenges faced by teachers in inclusive English language learning. This study employed a qualitative approach with a single case study design. The participants consisted of one English teacher and 28 second-grade elementary school students. Data were collected through document analysis, classroom observation, and interviews, and were analyzed using data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The findings revealed that assessment was implemented through diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments, with adaptations provided for students with special needs. Teachers faced challenges related to the diversity of students' abilities, limited instructional time, and the absence of structured differentiated assessment guidelines. This study concludes that assessment in inclusive classrooms is implemented adaptively to accommodate diverse learning needs. These findings imply the need to develop systematic differentiated assessment guidelines and to enhance support and professional training for teachers.

Copyright © 2026, Pebriawan et al.
Published by MAN 4 Kota Pekanbaru
DOI: [10.56113/takuana.v5i2.633](https://doi.org/10.56113/takuana.v5i2.633)

1. INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education is a global educational policy derived from the Education for All movement initiated by UNESCO in 1990, strengthened through the Salamanca Statement in 1994 and the Dakar Framework for Action in 2000, which emphasize equitable access to education for all learners without discrimination (Nurfadillah et al., 2022). This framework highlights that education systems must accommodate learner diversity in terms of background, ability, and learning needs (Rojo-Ramos et al., 2022).

In Indonesia, inclusive education is reinforced by national regulations that guarantee the right of all citizens to education and emphasize the provision of special education services for learners with special needs (Yuniarni et al., 2023). Consequently, schools are expected to implement learning environments that are responsive to student diversity, particularly in terms of instructional practices and classroom assessment. Inclusive classrooms are defined as learning environments where students with diverse abilities, including students with special needs, learn together in the same setting. In Grade 2 of SD Dana Punia Singaraja, the classroom consists of regular students and two students diagnosed with Down syndrome and Autism-Spectrum Disorder. Classroom observations indicate substantial learner diversity in terms of learning speed, comprehension, concentration, and task completion. While some students can follow instruction independently, others require repeated explanations, additional support, and extended time to complete tasks. These conditions reflect the complexity of managing learning in inclusive classrooms that serve heterogeneous learners.

Within such contexts, assessment plays a crucial role in supporting inclusive learning. One approach that aligns with learner diversity is differentiated assessment, which refers to the adaptation of assessment methods, processes, tasks, and expectations based on students' readiness, learning profiles, and learning needs (Tomlinson, 2014; Strogilos et al., 2020). Differentiated assessment enables teachers to provide equitable opportunities for students to demonstrate learning while maintaining shared learning objectives. Thus, assessment is not only a measurement tool but also a mechanism for instructional responsiveness in inclusive classrooms. Assessment practices are closely linked to the quality of inclusive learning. Through assessment, teachers identify students' learning needs, monitor progress, and make instructional decisions that support student development (Finn et al., 2024; Tai et al., 2023). In inclusive classrooms, effective assessment ensures that all learners, including those with special needs, can participate meaningfully in learning activities and receive appropriate learning support. Therefore, assessment functions as an integral component of inclusive pedagogy rather than a separate evaluative process.

In this study, assessment practices are categorized into diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments. Diagnostic assessment is used to identify students' initial learning readiness. Formative assessment is conducted throughout instruction to monitor learning progress and provide feedback. Summative assessment is used to evaluate learning outcomes at the end of instruction. In inclusive classrooms, these assessments are implemented in adaptive ways to accommodate student diversity and learning conditions. Classroom observations in Grade 2 English learning on prepositions reveal a heterogeneous learning process. Students show variation in understanding instructions, concentration, and task completion. Some students learn independently, while others require continuous guidance and additional time. Instruction is delivered using contextual examples, followed by task-based assessment and collective discussion. Assistant teachers also play an important role in supporting students with special needs, particularly in simplifying instructions and assisting during learning activities. Their involvement is especially prominent in formative assessment, where continuous monitoring and feedback are required.

Previous studies have examined inclusive education from policy and instructional perspectives, including implementation frameworks and teaching strategies (Supriatna & Malihah, 2021; Hidayati, 2020). Other studies have addressed assessment challenges for

students with special needs in inclusive settings (Amka & Dalle, 2023; Puspitawati et al., 2023). However, these studies primarily focus on macro-level issues or general assessment challenges rather than classroom-based implementation of assessment practices in English language learning at the elementary level. Despite growing attention to inclusive education, limited empirical evidence exists on how diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments are implemented in real inclusive English classrooms. In addition, little is known about how teachers adapt assessment practices to accommodate diverse learner needs within daily instructional practice in elementary schools.

This study contributes to the literature by providing an in-depth analysis of differentiated assessment practices in an inclusive elementary English classroom. Unlike previous studies that emphasize policy or general challenges, this study focuses on how diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments are operationalized in classroom practice. It also highlights how differentiated assessment supports instructional responsiveness in inclusive learning environments. This study aims to analyze the implementation of assessment and the challenges faced by teachers in inclusive English language learning. This study is limited to a single English teacher in one Grade 2 inclusive classroom at an elementary school setting, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other contexts. In addition, the study focuses primarily on teacher practices in implementing diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments without involving students' perspectives on their assessment experiences. Therefore, future research is recommended to involve multiple inclusive classrooms and include students' perspectives to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of differentiated assessment practices in inclusive English language learning at the elementary level.

2. METHOD

This study employed a qualitative single case study research design to explore in depth the implementation of assessment practices particularly diagnostic and formative assessment and the challenges faced in Grade 2 English learning within an inclusive classroom at SD Dana Punia Singaraja. A single case study design was selected because the study focused on a bounded system, namely one inclusive classroom where assessment practices were naturally embedded in daily instructional activities. The use of a single case study design allowed the researcher to obtain a rich, detailed, and contextualized understanding of assessment practices in real classroom settings rather than generalizing findings across multiple contexts.

Compared to other qualitative approaches such as phenomenology or ethnography, the case study design was considered more appropriate because the focus of this study was not on lived experiences or cultural patterns, but on specific classroom-based assessment practices within a clearly defined instructional setting. The research was conducted at SD Dana Punia Singaraja, located in Singaraja, Buleleng Regency, Bali, Indonesia. The participant of this study was one Grade 2 English teacher who taught in the inclusive classroom. Although there were three English teachers at the school, only one teacher was responsible for teaching the inclusive class. Therefore, this teacher was considered the key informant because she was directly involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of assessment practices in the classroom. The selection of a single participant was justified by the bounded nature of the case, where depth of information was prioritized over the number of participants.

Data in this study were collected through semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis. These methods were used to ensure triangulation of data sources and to obtain a comprehensive understanding of assessment practices in the inclusive classroom. Document analysis was conducted to examine learning documents related to assessment practices, including lesson plans, assessment rubrics, student assignments, and progress reports. The purpose of document analysis was to identify both planned and implemented assessment strategies in the inclusive classroom. The blueprint of document analysis checklist is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The Blueprint of Document Analysis Checklist

No	Document Type	Dimension Assessed	Indicators
1	Lesson Plans (RPP / Teaching Module)	Planning of Assessment	Assessment objectives clearly stated Assessment methods aligned with learning objectives Planned adaptation for students with special needs Criteria of success clearly defined
2	Assessment Rubrics / Instruments	Implementation of Assessment	Availability of scoring guidelines Assessment criteria are measurable Evidence of differentiated criteria Transparency of scoring system
3	Student Assignments / Work	Evidence of Assessment Practice	Variety of assessment tasks Level of difficulty adjusted Feedback provided to students Evidence of individualization
4	Progress Reports / Academic Records	Follow-up and Evaluation	Documentation of learning progress Record of assessment results Notes related to special needs students Remedial or enrichment documented

Classroom observation was conducted to examine the implementation of assessment practices during English learning activities. The observation focused on assessment implementation, adaptation for diverse learners, teacher and student interaction, and inclusive classroom context. The blueprint of observation sheet is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The Blueprint of Observation Sheet

Observation Focus	Indicators	Evidence
Assessment Implementation	Teacher conducts assessment during the lesson Teacher provides instructions before assessment	Classroom observation Classroom interaction
Assessment Adaptation and Inclusive Classroom Context	Teacher modifies tasks for diverse student abilities Teacher provides additional time or support	Teaching activities Classroom observation
Teacher Student Interaction	Teacher gives feedback during assessment	Teacher responses

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the English teacher to explore assessment understanding, strategies, inclusive assessment practices, and challenges in implementation. The blueprint of interview guidelines is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The Blueprint of Interview Guidelines

No	Interview Focus	Indicator	Number of Questions
1	Teachers' understanding of assessment	Teacher explains the concept and purpose of assessment	1
2	Assessment strategies	Teacher identifies types and procedures of assessment used	2
3	Inclusive practices	Teacher explains how assessments are adapted for diverse learners	3
4	Challenges	Teacher identifies challenges in implementing assessment in inclusive classroom	4
Total Questions			4

A summary of research questions, data collection methods, and instruments is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Research Questions, Data Collection Methods, and Instruments

Research Question	Data Collection Methods	Instruments
RQ1: How do English teachers conduct assessments in the grade 2 English subject in inclusive classroom at SD Dana Punia Singaraja?	Document Analysis	Document Analysis Checklist
	Classroom Observation	Observation Sheet
	Semi-structured Interview	Interview Guide
RQ2: What challenges do English teachers face in conducting assessments in the grade 2 English subject in inclusive classroom at SD Dana Punia Singaraja?	Classroom Observation	Observation Sheet
	Semi-structured Interview	Interview Guide

Data analysis followed the Miles and Huberman interactive model, consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification. The analysis was conducted through a systematic coding procedure. First, all data from interviews, observations, and documents were transcribed and organized. Second, open coding was conducted by identifying meaningful segments related to assessment practices in inclusive classrooms. Third, codes were grouped into categories, including diagnostic assessment practices, formative assessment practices, assessment adaptation for diverse learners, and assessment challenges. Finally, thematic analysis was conducted by identifying patterns across categories to generate overarching themes related to differentiated assessment practices in inclusive classrooms. To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, triangulation was applied by comparing data from interviews, observations, and document analysis. In addition, member checking was conducted by confirming key interpretations with the participant to ensure accuracy and credibility of the findings.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. The Implementation of Assessment in Grade 2 Inclusive Classroom at SD Dana Punia Singaraja

Assessment in the Grade 2 inclusive classroom was implemented through three interconnected types, namely diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment. These assessments were designed in the teaching module and implemented in classroom practice with varying degrees of adaptation to students' diverse learning needs. Diagnostic assessment was conducted at the beginning of instruction to identify students' prior knowledge and readiness. The teacher used oral prompting questions related to the learning topic, particularly in Unit 8 "Elephant is Big." This assessment was applied equally to all students, while additional scaffolding was provided by the assistant teacher for students with special needs. Although diagnostic assessment was consistently implemented, adaptation was not explicitly embedded in the planning document but emerged during classroom interaction. This finding was supported by the interview with the English teacher:

"I conduct diagnostic assessments at the beginning of the lesson using simple questions related to the students' experiences. For example, before introducing the topic of animals, I ask what kinds of animals they have seen and which ones are large or small. The goal is to assess the students' prior knowledge while also creating a more comfortable and interactive classroom atmosphere."

The observation data also showed that the teacher consistently conducted diagnostic assessment at the beginning of every lesson through oral questioning during all classroom observations. These findings indicate that diagnostic assessment functioned to identify students' readiness and prior knowledge before instruction. Although implemented consistently, differentiation mainly occurred during classroom interaction rather than being formally documented in the lesson plan.

Formative assessment was the most frequently implemented assessment type during instruction. It was conducted continuously through practice exercises, oral questioning, and immediate feedback. Compared to diagnostic assessment, formative assessment showed a higher level of adaptation, particularly through differentiated tasks where students with special needs received fewer and simpler questions. In addition, assistant teachers played a significant role in supporting students' understanding and task completion. This indicates that formative assessment functioned as an ongoing monitoring and support mechanism within inclusive learning. This practice was confirmed by the teacher during the interview:

"I conduct formative assessments throughout the learning process. I observe the students' engagement, their responses to questions, their ability to answer orally, and the results of their work in class. I also provide immediate feedback, such as verbal praise or corrections. From this, I can assess the students' progress in understanding the material being taught. Additionally, during the assessment process, students with special needs are assisted or accompanied by a support teacher who is responsible for supervising and providing guidance tailored to each student's individual needs."

This evidence was consistent with classroom observations, which showed that formative assessment was implemented continuously, feedback was provided during assessment activities, and students with special needs received additional instructional support from the assistant teacher. These findings demonstrate that formative assessment functioned as an ongoing monitoring process that enabled the teacher to adjust instruction according to students' learning progress and diverse learning needs. Summative

assessment was implemented at the end of each learning unit and semester through daily tests and examinations. Unlike diagnostic and formative assessment, summative assessment showed limited flexibility in planning documentation but was adapted in practice through reduced question numbers for students with special needs while maintaining alignment with core learning indicators. However, compared to formative assessment, summative assessment received less emphasis in terms of instructional adaptation and classroom interaction, indicating a more standardized evaluation approach. The interview also supported this finding:

"I conduct summative assessment at the end of each unit through daily tests and at the end of the semester through the final examination. I adjust the number of questions based on students' needs, where students with special needs are given fewer questions compared to regular students, although the content still refers to the same learning indicators. During the assessment, students with special needs are also assisted by a support teacher who helps them understand instructions, stay focused, and complete the tasks according to their abilities."

Observation findings likewise showed that students with special needs completed summative assessments with assistance from the support teacher while assessment procedures remained aligned with the learning objectives. These findings indicate that although summative assessment remained relatively standardized, teachers still implemented practical adaptations to accommodate students' diverse learning needs. Overall, the findings indicate that formative assessment dominated classroom practice, followed by diagnostic assessment, while summative assessment was relatively less elaborated in implementation. The three types of assessment were interconnected but demonstrated different levels of differentiation and instructional flexibility.

To enhance the clarity and coherence of the findings, a synthesis of the assessment practices is presented in the following table. The table summarizes the key characteristics of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments in the inclusive classroom, highlighting their purposes, implementation, differentiation practices, and instructional roles within the learning process.

Table 5. Synthesis of Assessment Implementation in Inclusive Classroom

Type of Assessment	Purpose	Implementation	Differentiation	Key Role
Diagnostic	Identify prior knowledge and readiness	Oral questioning at beginning of lesson	Limited (mainly during interaction, not planning)	Teacher and assistant teacher
Formative	Monitor learning progress and provide feedback	Exercises, questioning, immediate correction	High (task simplification, reduced workload)	Teacher and assistant teacher
Summative	Evaluate learning achievement	Daily tests and semester exams	Moderate (reduced number of questions)	Teacher and assistant teacher

3.2. Challenges Faced in Conducting Assessment in the Grade 2 English Subject in Inclusive Classroom at SD Dana Punia Singaraja

Challenges in implementing assessment in the inclusive classroom were categorized into three main aspects namely pedagogical, administrative, and institutional challenges. Pedagogical challenges were related to the diversity of students' learning needs and emotional readiness, particularly among students with special needs. Students showed

varying levels of responsiveness during diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment activities, requiring continuous adjustment in instructional and assessment strategies. This finding was supported by the teacher's explanation during the interview:

"The main challenge in conducting assessment is the diversity of students' abilities in the classroom. In my class, students have different levels of understanding and learning pace, where some students can easily follow the lesson while others require more guidance and repeated explanations, particularly students with special needs."

The classroom observation also demonstrated that students with special needs required additional guidance and assistance from the support teacher during assessment activities, indicating that differentiated instructional support was necessary throughout the assessment process. These findings indicate that the diversity of students' learning characteristics required teachers to continuously adapt both instructional practices and assessment implementation within the inclusive classroom. Administrative challenges were mainly associated with limited instructional time. The teacher needed to simultaneously manage instruction, assessment, feedback, and individual student support within a single lesson, which limited the depth of assessment implementation. This challenge was confirmed by the teacher during the interview:

"I also find that time limitation becomes another challenge in the implementation of assessment. It is often difficult to provide individual feedback and assistance to all students during the learning process because instructional time must be managed efficiently according to the lesson schedule."

Although classroom observations showed that feedback was consistently provided during assessment activities, teachers were required to balance instructional time with the diverse support needs of students. These findings suggest that time constraints limited teachers' opportunities to provide individualized assessment and continuous support for every student during classroom instruction. Institutional challenges were related to the absence of structured guidelines for assessment in inclusive classrooms. As a result, assessment practices were largely based on teacher judgment, classroom experience, and collaboration with assistant teachers rather than standardized institutional frameworks. This finding was explicitly expressed by the teacher:

"In addition, there is no specific guideline for inclusive assessment in the teaching module. Therefore, I need to independently adjust assessment strategies and procedures based on classroom conditions and students' individual needs."

Document analysis also showed that although the teaching module contained assessment objectives and assessment methods, detailed procedures for differentiated assessment were not explicitly described in the planning documents. These findings indicate that the absence of structured institutional guidelines required teachers to independently develop differentiated assessment practices based on classroom experience and students' learning needs.

3.3. Discussion

This section discusses the findings of the study based on the research questions and relevant theories. The discussion focuses on the interpretation of how assessment is implemented in the Grade 2 English inclusive classroom at SD Dana Punia Singaraja and how teachers face challenges in implementing assessment practices in inclusive settings.

The discussion emphasizes the relationship between assessment practices and the concept of differentiated assessment in inclusive education.

The findings indicate that diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments in the inclusive classroom were implemented through adaptive practices that accommodate students' diverse learning needs. These practices show that assessment in inclusive education is not merely a measurement tool but also a flexible process that supports participation and learning development, which is consistent with the concept of differentiated assessment in inclusive education (Tomlinson, 2014; Strogilos et al., 2020).

The present findings are generally consistent with the study conducted by Ningsih & Fitriani (2022), which reported that assessment in inclusive education serves not only to evaluate learning outcomes but also to identify students' learning needs as the basis for instructional planning. Similarly, this study found that diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments were implemented to support students' learning processes according to their diverse learning needs. However, while Ningsih & Fitriani (2022) discussed assessment in inclusive schools in general, the present study specifically describes how those assessment practices were implemented in English language learning within a Grade 2 inclusive elementary classroom.

The diagnostic assessment in this study reflects a cognitive-oriented approach focused on identifying students' prior knowledge at the beginning of learning. This indicates that the implementation of diagnostic assessment has not fully captured the broader purpose of inclusive assessment, which should also include non-cognitive dimensions such as emotional readiness, motivation, and learning behavior. The limited scope of diagnostic assessment suggests that the teacher's assessment practice is still developing toward a more comprehensive learner profiling approach in inclusive education (Lubis & Syawalina, 2025). This condition implies that assessment practices are still influenced by practical classroom constraints rather than a fully structured inclusive assessment framework, which results in a partial implementation of diagnostic assessment in inclusive settings (Marlina et al., 2023). This finding is also in line with Wijaya & Ridha (2024), who found that assessment in inclusive elementary schools was used to identify students' learning needs before planning appropriate instruction. Likewise, the diagnostic assessment in this study was conducted at the beginning of learning to identify students' prior knowledge and readiness. However, the present study found that diagnostic assessment mainly focused on identifying cognitive readiness through oral questioning, while broader learner profiling had not yet been systematically implemented.

The formative assessment demonstrates the strongest representation of differentiated assessment practices in this study. The implementation shows that teachers adjusted learning tasks, provided simplified materials, reduced task quantity, and offered continuous feedback during learning activities. These practices indicate the presence of product and process differentiation, where assessment is adapted based on students' readiness and ability levels. This aligns with the principle of differentiated instruction that emphasizes equitable learning opportunities rather than uniform treatment of students (Tomlinson, 2014). Furthermore, the use of immediate feedback strengthens students' learning process by enabling them to understand and correct mistakes during instruction, which reflects formative assessment as a tool for learning improvement rather than only evaluation (Black et al., 2009). Therefore, formative assessment in this study functions as a

dynamic and responsive assessment process that supports inclusive learning through continuous adjustment and feedback.

The findings are also consistent with Rahayu et al. (2021), who found that English teachers' assessment practices were primarily focused on observation and performance tasks, while portfolios and self-assessment were rarely implemented. Similarly, formative assessment in the present study emphasized classroom observation, questioning, classroom tasks, and immediate feedback. Unlike Rahayu et al. (2021), this study further demonstrates assessment adaptations through simplified tasks and assistance from support teachers for students with special needs.

The summative assessment shows that differentiation is applied in a more limited form, mainly through reducing the number and complexity of questions for students with special needs while maintaining the same learning indicators. This indicates that summative assessment is implemented in a more standardized structure compared to formative assessment, but still includes elements of equity through workload adjustment. However, the differentiation remains at a basic level because it focuses mainly on task reduction rather than modification of assessment format, criteria, or alternative assessment strategies. This suggests that summative assessment in this study reflects early-stage differentiated assessment implementation, where adaptation is still limited to simplifying assessment demands rather than redesigning assessment approaches more comprehensively (Baruta, 2023). These findings also support Marza et al. (2022), who argued that applying the same assessment standards to all students is ineffective because it overlooks individual differences in students' abilities and learning characteristics. Similarly, the present study found that teachers reduced the number of questions for students with special needs while maintaining the same learning objectives. However, the differentiation identified in this study remained limited to task modification rather than broader modifications of assessment criteria or assessment design.

The involvement of the assistant teacher plays a crucial role in supporting the implementation of assessment in inclusive classrooms. The assistant teacher facilitates students with special needs by providing instructional clarification, maintaining focus, and offering learning support during assessment activities. This collaboration indicates that differentiated assessment in inclusive classrooms is not only dependent on task adaptation but also on collaborative teaching practices that ensure students can participate meaningfully in assessment activities (Sopwandin & Rostiana, 2024). Therefore, assessment implementation in inclusive classrooms requires shared responsibility between teachers to ensure equity and accessibility. This finding is also comparable with Dewi et al. (2025), who found that although institutional support was available, challenges remained in differentiated instruction and classroom management. Likewise, the present study demonstrates that collaboration between the English teacher and the support teacher played an important role in facilitating assessment implementation by providing guidance and individualized assistance for students with special needs during assessment activities.

Overall, the findings show that assessment practices in the inclusive classroom reflect differentiated assessment principles, particularly in formative assessment, while diagnostic and summative assessments are still limited in scope and depth. This indicates a gap between theoretical expectations of inclusive assessment and actual classroom implementation, where adaptation is more practice-driven rather than systematically designed. The challenges found in this study can be categorized into pedagogical,

administrative, and institutional aspects, which collectively influence the implementation of assessment in inclusive classrooms. From a pedagogical perspective, the main challenge lies in the diversity of students' learning abilities and emotional readiness. Students with special needs require different levels of support, time, and instructional adjustment, which makes it difficult for teachers to implement assessment uniformly. This condition requires teachers to continuously adjust their strategies during instruction, indicating that assessment in inclusive classrooms is highly dynamic and context-dependent (Marza et al., 2023).

From an administrative perspective, limited instructional time becomes a significant challenge in implementing assessment effectively. Teachers are required to conduct teaching, assessment, monitoring, and feedback simultaneously within a single learning session. This creates pressure in managing classroom activities, particularly when providing differentiated support for students with varying needs. Time constraints therefore directly affect the depth and quality of assessment implementation in inclusive classrooms (Rasmitadila et al., 2023). From an institutional perspective, the absence of specific guidelines for inclusive assessment is a major challenge. Teachers rely on personal experience, collaboration with assistant teachers, and classroom conditions to adapt assessment practices. While this allows flexibility, it also creates inconsistency in implementation. This indicates the need for structured institutional frameworks to support more systematic and consistent implementation of differentiated assessment in inclusive education (Jaya et al., 2025; Ningsih & Fitriani, 2022).

Theoretically, these challenges indicate that inclusive assessment requires integration between pedagogical competence, administrative support, and institutional policy. Without these three components, assessment practices tend to rely heavily on individual teacher judgment, which may limit consistency and sustainability in inclusive education practices. The challenges identified in this study are also consistent with previous empirical studies. Yuliawati et al. (2023) identified limited coordination and the lack of institutional support as barriers to inclusive education, while Padmadewi et al. (2024) reported that teachers still required competency development and professional support in implementing inclusive education. Similarly, the present study found that teachers experienced challenges related to students' diverse abilities, limited instructional time, and the absence of structured differentiated assessment guidelines. These findings indicate that both classroom-level and institutional factors continue to influence the implementation of assessment in inclusive elementary classrooms.

The practical implication of this study suggests that schools should strengthen teachers' competencies in differentiated assessment through continuous professional development focusing on conducting diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments, as well as modifying assessment instructions, task difficulty, and time allocation according to students' learning needs. Furthermore, schools should develop structured differentiated assessment guidelines covering procedures for diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment, adjustment of assessment tasks, use of observation and feedback during learning, and collaboration with special education teachers when assessing students with special needs to ensure consistency, fairness, and effectiveness in inclusive classrooms. The theoretical implication of this study contributes to the understanding that differentiated assessment in inclusive education is not only a conceptual framework but also a practice that emerges gradually through classroom adaptation, particularly in contexts where formal guidelines are limited.

The limitation of this study is the use of a single case and a single teacher, which limits the generalizability of the findings. In addition, the study focuses primarily on teacher perspectives without including students' perspectives on assessment experiences. Future research is recommended to involve multiple classrooms and include student perspectives to provide a more comprehensive understanding of differentiated assessment practices in inclusive education.

4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that assessment in the inclusive English classroom is implemented as a flexible and continuous process to support students' learning. Assessment is not only used to measure results, but to monitor progress and adjust teaching according to students' needs. This shows that inclusive assessment requires adaptability and responsiveness from the teacher. However, the implementation of assessment in an inclusive classroom is challenging due to diverse student abilities and limited time. Therefore, effective inclusive assessment depends not only on teacher effort but also on adequate institutional support and clear assessment guidelines.

REFERENCES

- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting Inclusion and Equity in Education: Lessons From International Experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
- Aldabas, R. (2020). Special Education Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preparedness to Teach Students with Severe Disabilities in Inclusive Classrooms: A Saudi Arabian Perspective. *SAGE Open*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020950657>
- Amka, A., & Dalle, A. (2023). The Challenges Faced by Teachers in Conducting Assessment for Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Schools. *Journal of ICSAR*, 7(1), 26–32.
- Amanullah, A. S. R. (2022). Mengenal Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus: Tuna Grahita, Down Syndrome, dan Autisme. *ALMURTAJA: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam Anak Usia Dini*, 1(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.58518/almurtaja.v1i1.1793>
- Asrial, Syahrial, Kurniawan, D. A., Putri, F. I., Perdana, R., Rahmi, Susbiyanto, & Aldila, F. T. (2024). E-Assessment for Character Evaluation in Elementary Schools. *Qubahan Academic Journal*, 4(3), 806–822. <https://doi.org/10.48161/qaj.v4n3a595>
- Baruta, Y. (2023). *Asesmen Pembelajaran pada Kurikulum Merdeka: Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Pendidikan Dasar, dan Pendidikan Menengah*. Penerbit P4I.
- Black, P., London, K. 's C., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. In *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability (formerly the Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education)* (Vol. 1, Number 1).
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2018). *Doing Interviews*. SAGE Publications.
- Budiono, A. N., & Hatip, M. (2023). Asesmen Pembelajaran pada Kurikulum Merdeka. *Jurnal Axioma: Jurnal Matematika dan Pembelajaran*, 8(1), 109–123. <https://doi.org/10.56013/axi.v8i1.2044>

- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dewi, K. S., Padmadewi, N. N., Artini, L. P., Adnyani, N. L. P. S., Santosa, M. H., & Lee, Y. S. (2023). Inclusive Education for Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder in an Indonesian Bilingual Elementary School: A Program Evaluation Study Using CIPP Model. *Journal of Educational Evaluation Studies*, 4(2), 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.4.10>
- Dignath, C., Rimm-Kaufman, S., van Ewijk, R., & Kunter, M. (2022). Teachers' Beliefs About Inclusive Education and Insights on What Contributes to Those Beliefs: A Meta-Analytical Study. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(4), 2609–2660. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-022-09695-0>
- Finn, G. M., Tai, J., & Nadarajah, V. D. (2024). Inclusive Assessment in Health Professions Education: Balancing Global Goals and Local Contexts. *Medical Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.15535>
- Florian, L., & Camedda, D. (2020). Enhancing Teacher Education for Inclusion. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(1), 4–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1707579>
- Florian, L., & Pantić, N. (2021). Teacher Education for Inclusive Education: A Framework for Developing Inclusive Practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(2), 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2019.1691993>
- Hidayati, T. (2020). Teaching English to Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Classroom: A Case Study at an Elementary School in Lombok. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 3(6), 695–703.
- Kemendikbudristek. (2021). *Panduan Asesmen Pembelajaran Kurikulum Merdeka*. Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.
- Leko, M. M., Cook, B. G., & Cook, L. (2021). Qualitative Methods in Special Education Research. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 36(4), 278–286.
- Lim, W. M. (2025). What is Qualitative Research? An Overview and Guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 33(2), 199–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2024.12.001>
- Lubis, S. K., & Syawalina, S. (2024). Learning Assessment in The Merdeka Curriculum: Diagnostic, Formative, and Summative. *Jurnal PTK dan Pendidikan*, 10(2), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.18592/ptk.v10i2.12599>
- Marlina, M., Kusumastuti, G., & Ediyanto, E. (2023). Differentiated Learning Assessment Model to Improve Involvement of Special Needs Students in Inclusive Schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16(4), 423–440. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16425a>
- Marza, R. A., Nasien, D., & Purwanto, A. J. (2023). Teacher's Role: Learning Service of Children with Special Needs in Inclusive School. *Journal of Psychology and Instruction*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpai.v6i3.59111>
- Mohan, R. (2023). *Measurement, Evaluation and Assessment in Education*. PHI Learning.

- Ningsih, L. Z., & Fitriani, W. (2022). Pentingnya Asesmen dalam Menyusun Program Pembelajaran di Sekolah Inklusi. *Gema Pendidikan*, 29(2).
- Ningsih, R., et al. (2023). Trends of Inclusive Education in Higher Education: A Bibliometric Review. *Journal of Education Research*.
- Nurfadhillah, S. et al. (2022). Analisis Implementasi Assessment pada Pembelajaran Inklusi di SDN Cibodas 1 Kota Tangerang. *Masaliq*, 2(6), 705–723.
- Padmadewi, N. N., et al. (2024). Inclusive education: Survey on Teachers' Perception of its Implementation. *Indonesian Journal of Instruction*, 5(3), 315–330. <https://doi.org/10.23887/iji.v5i3.81932>
- Rahayu, K. A. (2021). The Implementation of Authentic Assessment in English Instruction. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*, 5(1), 122–128. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jppp.v5i1.31723>
- Rasmitadila, R., et al. (2023). Barriers And Teachers' Efforts in Inclusive Classrooms. *International Journal of Special Education*, 38(2), 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.52291/ijse.2023.38.21>
- Rojo-Ramos, J., et al. (2022). Spanish Physical Education Teachers' Perceptions About Inclusive Education. *Children*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/children9010108>
- Sharma, U., & Salend, S. J. (2021). *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Inclusive and Special Education*. Oxford University Press.
- Sopwandin, I., & Rostiana, I. N. (2024). *Pendidikan Inklusi*. Selat Media.
- Strogilos, V., et al. (2020). Differentiated Instruction for Students with Disabilities in Early Childhood Co-Taught Classrooms. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24(4), 443–461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1466928>
- Tai, J., Ajjawi, R., Bearman, M., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Jorre de St Jorre, T. (2023). Assessment for Inclusion: Rethinking Contemporary Strategies in Assessment Design. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 42(2), 483–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2057451>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How To Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms*. ASCD.
- UNESCO. (2020). *International Perspective on Inclusive Education Systems*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Utami, N. W. P., & Putra, I. N. A. J. (2021). Tantangan Guru dalam Melaksanakan Asesmen bagi Siswa Spesial di SD Inklusi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sekolah Dasar*, 5(3), 456–464.
- Yuniarni, D., et al. (2023). Persepsi Guru TK Terhadap Pendidikan Inklusif. *Jurnal Obsesi*, 7(1), 629–636. <https://doi.org/10.31004/obsesi.v7i1.3615>