

School-Based Nonformal Learning Support for Slow Learners: A Case Study of the Talent Optimizing Program in History Education

Danu Eko Agustinova^{1*}, Gadis Sakiakirti², Rabaah Binti Abdullah³

^{1,2} Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

³ Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia

*Correspondence author: danu_eko@uny.ac.id

Submitted: July 24, 2025. Revised: July 28, 2025. Accepted: August 4, 2026.

Abstract

Background - Inclusive vocational schools require learning support that can respond to individual needs beyond the temporal and pedagogical limits of ordinary classroom instruction. The Talent Optimizing Program (TOP) at SMK Budi Mulia Dua Yogyakarta provides flexible, individualized assistance that complements formal history lessons and can therefore be examined as school-based nonformal learning support.

Research Urgency - Studies of inclusive schooling commonly focus on classroom accommodation, whereas research on nonformal education rarely examines supplementary learning organized inside a formal school. This separation leaves insufficient evidence about how a hybrid support program is organized for slow learners and how its educational value should be interpreted.

Research Objective - This study analyzes the organization and enactment of TOP in Grade X history learning, identifies pedagogical and organizational constraints, and interprets the learning changes perceived by students and school personnel.

Research Methodology - A descriptive qualitative case study was conducted during the 2024/2025 academic year at SMK Budi Mulia Dua Yogyakarta. Participants were selected purposively by role and included the history teacher, principal, TOP coordinator, supporting educators, and Grade X students identified as slow learners. Data from non-participant observations, semi-structured interviews, and program documents were analyzed iteratively through coding, thematic condensation, data display, verification, and source-and-method triangulation.

Research Results - TOP operated through four connected functions: diagnostic observation and individualized planning, flexible one-to-one sessions, coordination with educators and families, and continuous adaptive evaluation. Repetition, contextual examples, visual media, quizzes, and simplified explanations supported access to history content. However, limited instructional time, insufficiently differentiated learning plans, restricted history-specific media and inquiry, and teachers' limited preparation constrained program quality. Participants and records indicated improvement in comprehension, engagement, discipline, interaction, independence, and attainment of teacher-set standards, but the case-study design does not establish causality.

Research Conclusion - TOP functioned as a complementary school-based nonformal learning mechanism that created protected time and flexible support for slow learners. Its continuation should be accompanied by stronger individualized planning, sustained professional learning, accessible history inquiry, and systematic progress monitoring.

Research Novelty/Contribution - The study conceptualizes a school-based support program as a bridge between formal inclusive schooling and nonformal education and shows that its contribution depends on the integration of program flexibility, inclusive pedagogy, disciplinary knowledge, and organizational coordination.

Keywords: school-based nonformal education, inclusive education, slow learners, history learning, individualized support

How to Cite:

Agustinova, D. E., Sakiakirti, G., & Abdullah, R. B. (2026). School-Based Nonformal Learning Support for Slow Learners: A Case Study of the Talent Optimizing Program in History Education. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 12(2), 576-586. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v12i2.30971>

INTRODUCTION

Education is more accurately understood as a continuum of formal, nonformal, and informal learning than as a set of mutually exclusive sectors. Nonformal education is intentional and organized but remains more flexible in participation, scheduling, curriculum, and certification than formal schooling; it can therefore complement institutional routines when those routines cannot respond adequately to a specific group or need ([Simac et al., 2021](#); [Prasetyo et al., 2024](#); [Saripah et al., 2025](#); [Dumasari et al., 2024](#)). This complementary function is also relevant inside schools. A school may organize optional or supplementary learning beyond the ordinary class structure, and needs analysis should determine its design rather than assuming that formal provision is sufficient ([Dumasari et al., 2024](#); [Yuliani et al., 2024](#)). In this study, the term school-based nonformal learning support refers to planned, flexible, individually scheduled assistance that is located in a formal school but operates outside the ordinary whole-class lesson and does not lead to a separate qualification.

The relationship between nonformal learning and inclusion deserves particular attention. Nonformal settings may increase access by adapting time, interaction, materials, and participation to the learner, yet access alone does not guarantee inclusion. Programs must also address communication, accessibility, staff capability, learner agency, and continuity of support ([Tkachenko, 2021](#); [Norberto Rocha & de Abreu, 2024](#); [Melania et al., 2024](#); [Hamzah et al., 2024](#)). Evidence that nonformal education can produce lasting benefits is promising but heterogeneous, and outcomes depend on program quality, context, and follow-up rather than on the label of nonformal education itself ([Simac et al., 2021](#); [Darmawan et al., 2025](#)). Consequently, a school-based program should be evaluated not only by its existence but by how it diagnoses needs, organizes learning, coordinates actors, monitors progress, and connects supplementary support to the formal curriculum.

Inclusive education similarly requires more than placing learners in a common institution. It involves identifying and removing barriers to presence, participation, achievement, and belonging through changes in policy, culture, and practice ([Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [Jackson-Summers et al., 2024](#)). Reviews show that definitions of inclusion vary considerably and that weak conceptualization can reduce inclusion to location or individual remediation ([Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [Jackson-Summers et al., 2024](#)). An adequate analysis must therefore examine how ordinary provision is extended, how learner perspectives inform support, and whether institutional arrangements increase meaningful participation ([Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [Berti et al., 2023](#)). Inclusive participation can produce academic and social benefits when support is designed for interaction rather than separation ([Kart & Kart, 2021](#); [Berti et al., 2023](#)). A supplementary program can contribute to inclusion when it enables access to the common curriculum without isolating the learner or transferring all responsibility for change to the learner.

Students described in school records as slow learners may require more time to process information, smaller instructional steps, repeated and explicit explanations, concrete examples, visual representations, and frequent checks for understanding. The category should not be used as a fixed deficit identity; rather, it signals a mismatch between current learning demands and the support available. Indonesian studies report the value of visual media, remedial instruction, individual assistance, Montessori-informed routines, familiar examples, and sustained communication among teachers, specialists, and families ([Handayani & Martaningsih, 2022](#); [Mukhlis et al., 2023](#); [Iryana et al., 2024](#); [Wati & Hendriani, 2024](#); [Prawesti & Yoenanto, 2021](#); [Chumairo et al., 2022](#); [Sukinah et al., 2024](#); [Pozas et al., 2021](#)). These findings support flexible assistance, but they also show why an individualized plan must be based on observed needs rather than reproduced uniformly across students.

Inclusive pedagogy seeks to expand what is ordinarily available to all learners while providing additional intensity when necessary ([Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [King-Sears et al., 2023](#)). Research on universal design for learning and secondary content instruction supports multiple representations, explicit modeling, scaffolded practice, response monitoring, and accessible ways for students to demonstrate learning ([King-Sears et al., 2023](#); [Bray et al., 2024](#); [Zhang et al., 2022](#)). A response-to-intervention logic likewise connects increasing instructional intensity to evidence of learner response instead of relying on a one-time label ([King-Sears et al.,](#)

[2023](#); [Zhang et al., 2022](#)). Within a school-based nonformal program, these principles imply a cycle of initial diagnosis, individualized planning, deliberately adapted instruction, and documented review.

History learning adds disciplinary demands that generic simplification cannot resolve. Learners are expected to organize chronology, explain causation and change, evaluate sources, compare accounts, and construct claims from evidence ([Wilke et al., 2023](#); [van Loon & Waldis, 2024](#); [Sutimin et al., 2025](#)). Studies of adolescents, including learners who experience difficulty with complex text, show that explicit heuristics, guided source reading, structured writing, and document-based inquiry can make historical reasoning more accessible ([Wilke et al., 2023](#); [van Loon & Waldis, 2024](#)). Instruction for learners who need additional support should therefore retain meaningful historical thinking while reducing unnecessary linguistic and cognitive load. Intensive teaching of complex historical content can combine explicit explanation with diagrams, vocabulary support, review, and guided discussion rather than replacing disciplinary learning with memorization alone ([Wilke et al., 2023](#); [van Loon & Waldis, 2024](#)).

Teacher capability and organizational support strongly shape whether such adaptations occur. Teachers' attitudes, knowledge, confidence, and opportunities for collaboration affect the implementation of inclusion ([Donath et al., 2023](#); [Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [Jackson-Summers et al., 2024](#)). Focused training can improve Indonesian teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and inclusive strategies, but professional learning must connect directly to classroom practice ([Donath et al., 2023](#); [Matschiner, 2023](#)). This issue is especially important in vocational schools, where teachers require pedagogical competence and relevant disciplinary or occupational knowledge ([Antera, 2021](#); [Popova et al., 2022](#)). When a teacher's academic background differs from the assigned subject and preparation in special education is limited, individualized support depends not only on personal effort but also on mentoring, specialist input, collaborative planning, and sustained professional development ([Suminar et al., 2024](#)).

SMK Budi Mulia Dua Yogyakarta has implemented inclusive education since 2010 and organizes the Talent Optimizing Program (TOP) to provide individualized assistance to students with identified learning needs. For Grade X students described as slow learners, TOP history sessions are generally conducted one-to-one once a week at times adjusted to the student and the school schedule. Although the program is situated inside a formal vocational school and supports the formal history curriculum, its flexible scheduling, individualized participation, supplementary function, and absence of a separate credential give it the characteristics of school-based nonformal learning. This hybrid arrangement has rarely been examined in research that usually treats inclusive classroom practice and nonformal education as separate domains.

This study therefore aims to analyze how TOP is organized and enacted as school-based nonformal learning support in Grade X history, what pedagogical and organizational constraints affect its implementation, and what learning changes are perceived by students and school personnel. The analysis contributes to nonformal education by explaining how flexibility can be embedded within a formal institution without losing connection to the common curriculum. It also contributes to inclusive history education by identifying the conditions under which individualized support expands access to disciplinary learning rather than functioning as a detached remedial activity.

METHOD

Research Approach and Case Boundaries

This study used a descriptive qualitative case-study design because it sought an in-depth explanation of a contemporary educational program within its institutional setting ([Priya, 2021](#)). The bounded case was TOP support for Grade X history learning during the 2024/2025 academic year at SMK Budi Mulia Dua Yogyakarta, Kenayan, Wedomartani, Ngemplak District, Sleman Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta. The unit of analysis was the organization and enactment of TOP, including learner identification and planning, the conduct of individual history sessions, coordination among school actors and families, evaluation, implementation

constraints, and perceived learning changes. The design was descriptive and interpretive; it was not intended to estimate prevalence, compare groups, or establish a causal effect.

Program Context

TOP was treated analytically as school-based nonformal learning support rather than as a second formal course. The program complemented the regular history curriculum, provided individually arranged sessions outside the ordinary whole-class structure, adjusted time and learning targets to student needs, and did not award a separate qualification. This operational definition allowed the study to examine how nonformal characteristics—flexibility, responsiveness, and individualized participation—interacted with formal school requirements. The case boundary excluded general classroom inclusion practices that were not connected to TOP and TOP activities in subjects other than history.

Participants and Selection

Participants were selected purposively on the basis of direct involvement in the case. Key informants comprised the history teacher, the school principal, and the TOP coordinator because they were responsible for instruction, institutional policy, and program coordination. Supporting informants comprised mentor or other subject teachers involved in learner assistance and Grade X students recorded by the school as slow learners who participated in TOP history sessions. Selection therefore followed role relevance and experience of the program rather than statistical representation. Findings use the role-based codes GS for the history teacher, KS for the principal, and KTOP for the TOP coordinator; students and supporting educators are reported by role. The description of roles, setting, selection logic, data sources, and analytic procedures follows established expectations for transparent qualitative reporting ([Priya, 2021](#); [Braun & Clarke, 2021](#)).

Data Collection

Data were generated through non-participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. Observation at the school used an observation sheet to record the opening, explanation, pacing, media, learning tasks, student responses, evaluation, and closing of TOP history sessions. Semi-structured interviews followed prepared questions but allowed follow-up probing about initial learner assessment, individualized planning, instructional adaptation, scheduling, teacher preparation, coordination, family communication, evaluation, and perceived change. The documents reviewed included Individual Learning Plans (ILPs; locally referred to as RPI), learning media, communication books, student score lists and evaluation records, photographs, and program documentation. Each source was used to clarify a different aspect of the case: observations documented enacted practice, interviews elicited explanations and experiences, and documents provided evidence of planning, communication, and recorded progress.

Data Analysis

Analysis proceeded iteratively alongside data organization. The researchers first familiarized themselves with the observation notes, interview records, and documents, then coded segments concerning program purpose, learner diagnosis, ILP development, session organization, instructional strategies, coordination, evaluation, constraints, and perceived outcomes. Related codes were condensed into provisional categories and displayed in a source-by-theme matrix so that statements from different roles could be compared with observations and documents. Categories were then reviewed against the full dataset, combined or separated where necessary, and developed into four interpretive themes: TOP as school-based nonformal support, individualized history instruction, organizational and teacher-preparation constraints, and perceived outcomes with program boundaries. This process combined the interactive logic of data condensation, display, and verification with thematic analysis procedures of familiarization, coding, theme review, definition, and reporting ([Braun & Clarke, 2021](#); [Byrne, 2022](#)).

Credibility, Research Ethics, and Methodological Boundaries

Credibility was strengthened through source triangulation among students and school personnel and method triangulation across observation, interview, and documentary evidence ([Priya, 2021](#)). A claim was retained as a program finding when it was supported by more than one source or when its source-specific status was made explicit; convergent and inconsistent evidence was examined during theme review. An audit trail linked codes, categories, themes, and supporting records, and the report distinguishes observed practices, participant perceptions, documentary records, and researcher interpretation in line with qualitative quality criteria ([Braun & Clarke, 2021](#); [Byrne, 2022](#)). Confidentiality was protected by omitting names and individual score details and by using role-based codes. The evidence is bounded to one program, one subject, and one school year; frequency, representativeness, long-term retention, and causal effectiveness cannot be inferred from the design.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

TOP as School-Based Nonformal Learning Support

TOP organized learning support through a recurring cycle of initial observation, individualized planning, implementation, and review. At the beginning of the semester, teachers observed students' learning characteristics, preferences, readiness, and difficulties. These observations informed an ILP specifying individual targets, material, media, and support. The ILP differed from the regular whole-class lesson plan and could be adjusted when a student's condition or progress changed. Accounts from GS, KS, and KTOP and the reviewed ILP documents consistently positioned the plan as a working guide rather than a fixed administrative form. This diagnostic function is important because nonformal provision is most defensible when it responds to an identified gap in ordinary provision rather than duplicating it ([Dumasari et al., 2024](#); [Yuliani et al., 2024](#)).

Sessions were generally conducted once a week, although the day and time varied among students. Instruction was individual and face-to-face, creating protected time for explanation and review that was difficult to secure in the regular timetable, where vocational subjects received priority and history had limited time. The arrangement illustrates how formal and nonformal learning can be bridged: TOP retained the objectives of the formal history curriculum while adapting participation, pacing, and interaction through a supplementary structure ([Simac et al., 2021](#); [Prasetyo et al., 2024](#); [Saripah et al., 2025](#)). Its educational identity was therefore defined by function rather than location. Consistent with a holistic view of lifelong learning, the boundaries between formal and nonformal learning were permeable, and the two forms became complementary within one institution ([Simac et al., 2021](#); [Prasetyo et al., 2024](#)).

Coordination extended beyond the individual session. A communication book recorded activities, materials, and progress for exchange between school and home. The history teacher, TOP coordinator, mentor teachers, and principal contributed different forms of support, while periodic parent meetings linked academic and non-academic development. These practices gave TOP an organizational function: it connected learner diagnosis, instruction, progress information, and family communication. Such coordination is necessary for inclusive nonformal provision because accessibility depends on human support, communication, and the participation of learners and families, not merely on modified materials ([Tkachenko, 2021](#); [Norberto Rocha & de Abreu, 2024](#); [Melania et al., 2024](#); [Hamzah et al., 2024](#)).

The program nevertheless remained closely dependent on school routines. Limited history time, variable scheduling, and reliance on available staff meant that flexibility could either improve access or produce fragmented continuity. This finding qualifies an overly optimistic view of nonformal education. Flexible provision can create relevant opportunities, but lasting benefit depends on implementation quality, continuity, and follow-up ([Simac et al., 2021](#); [Darmawan et al., 2025](#)). For TOP, nonformal flexibility should therefore be anchored in a minimum frequency of contact, explicit learner goals, documented review, and coordination with the formal history teacher.

Individualized History Instruction Within TOP

A typical session began with a greeting, a brief review of earlier material, and an informal check of the student's immediate condition. GS repeated key explanations, reduced the amount of information presented at one time, and connected historical content to familiar contexts such as family, school, and hometown. PowerPoint slides and historical images were used to make abstract information more concrete. At the end of a session, students were invited to restate the material in simple language, although the timing and form of this activity were adjusted to emotional readiness. These practices reflected an attempt to extend ordinary teaching through flexible pacing and representation rather than excluding students from the common topic, which is central to inclusive pedagogy ([Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [King-Sears et al., 2023](#); [Zhang et al., 2022](#)).

Lecturing, reading, and writing remained dominant, and students were generally less active during question-and-answer activities. Several student accounts associated monotony with the limited use of practical or interactive tasks. Short quizzes, pictures, additional points, and snacks sometimes increased immediate participation. The pattern suggests that individualized delivery alone did not automatically produce active learning. Engagement includes behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions, so observable compliance should not be treated as equivalent to understanding or interest ([Wong & Liem, 2022](#)). Rewards may initiate participation, but their effects depend on meaning and context and should support rather than replace competence, autonomy, feedback, and task value ([Bardach & Murayama, 2025](#); [Wong & Liem, 2022](#)).

The visual materials supported attention, but their instructional role was inconsistent. Multimedia is most effective when words and images are integrated around the learning goal, extraneous information is limited, and cues direct attention to essential relations ([Bray et al., 2024](#); [King-Sears et al., 2023](#); [Hollingshead et al., 2022](#); [Zhang et al., 2022](#)). For history, slides and images should represent chronology, spatial movement, causal relationships, perspective, and evidence rather than function as decoration. Technology-pedagogy-content integration can help teachers convert PowerPoint from a presentation aid into a structured learning medium ([Kurniawan & Sumargono, 2021](#); [Sutimin et al., 2025](#)).

Repetition and short quizzes were potentially productive when they required retrieval rather than passive rereading. Distributed encounters with material and practice testing support retention, especially when prompts are brief, focused, and followed by explanation ([Agarwal et al., 2021](#); [Carpenter et al., 2022](#); [McDermott, 2021](#)). Continuous evaluation in TOP drew on assignments, observation of attitude and skills, communication-book notes, and end-of-chapter assessment. GS, KS, and KTOP described evaluation as a basis for judging understanding, adapting subsequent sessions, reflecting on teaching, and reporting progress to parents. This function is consistent with formative assessment when evidence is used to decide the next instructional step and feedback is timely, specific, and linked to the learning goal ([Xuan et al., 2022](#)).

The major pedagogical gap was that simplification and repetition were more developed than historical inquiry. Accessible disciplinary tasks could include arranging illustrated event cards on a timeline, identifying the author and context of a short source, comparing two brief accounts, selecting evidence for a claim, and explaining cause and consequence with sentence frames. Research demonstrates that explicit source heuristics, guided document reading, structured writing, and evidence-based discussion can support students who experience difficulty with complex historical text ([Wilke et al., 2023](#); [van Loon & Waldis, 2024](#)). Such routines make historical reasoning visible without removing its intellectual substance ([Wilke et al., 2023](#); [van Loon & Waldis, 2024](#); [Sutimin et al., 2025](#)).

The ILP should consequently specify not only simplified content but also the type and intensity of scaffold, the historical-thinking target, the evidence that will show progress, and the condition under which support will be adjusted. Multiple representations, explicit modeling, guided practice, and varied response modes can improve access when they are connected to systematic monitoring ([King-Sears et al., 2023](#); [Bray et al., 2024](#); [Zhang et al., 2022](#)). The reviewed evidence also supports the practical strategies reported in Indonesian slow-learner research visual media, familiar examples, remedial assistance, and intensive communication while underscoring that these strategies must remain responsive to individual evidence

([Handayani & Martaningsih, 2022](#); [Mukhlis et al., 2023](#); [Iryana et al., 2024](#); [Wati & Hendriani, 2024](#); [Prawesti & Yoenanto, 2021](#); [Chumairo et al., 2022](#); [Sukinah et al., 2024](#); [Pozas et al., 2021](#)).

Organizational and Teacher-Preparation Constraints

The history teacher's academic background was civics rather than history, and most subject teachers did not have a special-education background or specialized preparation for learners with special educational needs. Participants did not regard the background mismatch as an absolute barrier because mentor teachers, assistant teachers, and TOP personnel provided support. However, its effect was visible in planning and enactment: the teacher reported difficulty selecting history-specific models, media were sometimes monotonous or closer to civics, and several ILPs were insufficiently differentiated. These findings show that pedagogical adaptation requires both inclusive competence and disciplinary judgment. Vocational teachers need a coherent combination of subject or occupational knowledge and pedagogy, not interchangeable general teaching skills ([Antera, 2021](#); [Popova et al., 2022](#)).

The school held annual workshops and discussion forums with speakers from special education and psychology. These activities demonstrated institutional recognition of the problem but had not yet become sustained, practice-focused professional learning. Reviews of teacher learning emphasize that change develops through interaction among teacher knowledge, school conditions, learner evidence, and repeated opportunities to test and refine practice ([Donath et al., 2023](#); [Popova et al., 2022](#)). Effective professional development is content focused, coherent with immediate work, sufficiently sustained, and supported by active learning and follow-up ([Donath et al., 2023](#); [Matschiner, 2023](#)). Coaching and collaborative inquiry can strengthen implementation because teachers receive feedback while applying new routines to authentic lessons ([Donath et al., 2023](#); [Popova et al., 2022](#)).

For TOP, professional learning should integrate inclusive pedagogy with history-specific design. Teachers could collaboratively examine ILPs and student work, develop accessible source sets, rehearse scaffolded questioning, compare evidence of response, and revise the next session. Evidence from Indonesian training indicates that focused preparation can improve teacher attitudes, knowledge, and inclusive strategies ([Donath et al., 2023](#); [Matschiner, 2023](#)). International reviews also caution that professional-development programs frequently omit follow-up and practical enactment even when their stated content is appropriate ([Popova et al., 2022](#); [Donath et al., 2023](#); [Sutimin et al., 2025](#)). A recurring cycle of planning, observation, feedback, and revision would therefore be more credible than relying on one annual workshop.

The findings further demonstrate that inclusive practice is an organizational responsibility. Teacher attitudes and confidence matter, but they are shaped by training, collaboration, leadership, workload, and access to specialist support ([Donath et al., 2023](#); [Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [Jackson-Summers et al., 2024](#)). School leadership should allocate protected planning time, define coordination responsibilities, maintain access to special-education expertise, and ensure that TOP goals are reviewed with classroom evidence. These measures move the program away from dependence on individual goodwill and toward a sustainable institutional mechanism for removing barriers ([Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [Norberto Rocha & de Abreu, 2024](#); [Donath et al., 2023](#)).

Perceived Learning Outcomes and Program Boundaries

Observation, interviews, and documents indicated perceived improvement after students participated in TOP. KS, KTOP, GS, supporting educators, and participating students described gradual gains in understanding of history material, discipline, participation, social interaction, and independent learning. Students expressed satisfaction with their progress, while educators associated individual sessions with greater willingness to respond and complete tasks. Documentation showed that the students' history scores met the standards established by the history teacher during the period reviewed. The evidence was strongest where participant accounts converged with communication books and assessment records; nevertheless, it documents perceived and recorded change within the case rather than a causal program effect.

The perceived changes are educationally plausible because TOP created additional processing time, repeated opportunities to retrieve content, closer feedback, and continuity between teaching and family communication. However, the available records did not include a standardized baseline, a comparison condition, systematic implementation-fidelity measures, or long-term follow-up. It is therefore impossible to isolate TOP from maturation, regular classroom instruction, family support, teacher attention, or other school experiences. This distinction is important because inclusive and nonformal programs are often judged from positive narratives without sufficient evidence about mechanisms and durability ([Simac et al., 2021](#); [Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [King-Sears et al., 2023](#); [Darmawan et al., 2025](#)).

Program monitoring should retain both academic and participation outcomes. Academic indicators can include accuracy in chronology, use of evidence, explanation of cause and change, retention across sessions, and transfer to new sources. Participation indicators can include task initiation, sustained attention, help seeking, confidence in explaining ideas, interaction, and increasing independence. Targets should be individualized but connected to the formal curriculum, and the same evidence should inform the student, history teacher, TOP coordinator, mentor, and family. This approach prevents individualized support from becoming an isolated track and aligns response intensity with documented learner progress ([King-Sears et al., 2023](#); [Zhang et al., 2022](#)).

Taken together, the findings show that the principal contribution of TOP was not a single teaching technique but an organizational space in which diagnosis, individualized pacing, instructional adaptation, monitoring, and communication could be connected. Its limitations arose where that space lacked sufficient disciplinary resources, differentiated plans, sustained teacher learning, or continuity. The case therefore extends inclusion beyond physical placement and extends nonformal education beyond community programs: school-based nonformal support can strengthen access to the common curriculum when flexibility is governed by evidence, collaboration, and learner participation ([Koutsouris et al., 2024](#); [Norberto Rocha & de Abreu, 2024](#); [Saripah et al., 2025](#); [Suminar et al., 2024](#)).

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that TOP functioned as school-based nonformal learning support by complementing formal Grade X history instruction with diagnostic observation, individualized planning, flexible one-to-one sessions, adaptive teaching, continuous evaluation, and communication among educators and families. Repetition, contextual examples, visual media, quizzes, and simplified explanations improved access to content, while participant accounts and school records indicated gains in comprehension, engagement, discipline, interaction, independence, and attainment of teacher-set standards. These changes must be interpreted as context-bound perceptions and records rather than proof that TOP alone caused the outcomes. Program quality was constrained by limited history time, insufficient differentiation in some ILPs, restricted use of history-specific inquiry and media, and limited teacher preparation in both the discipline and special education. TOP should be continued with minimum continuity standards, ILPs that specify historical-thinking goals and progress evidence, accessible source-based tasks, sustained coaching and collaborative planning, and shared monitoring with students and families. Conceptually, the study shows that nonformal education can operate within a formal school as an evidence-guided bridge to the common curriculum; practically, it identifies the organizational and pedagogical conditions required for that bridge to support inclusion rather than become a separate remedial track.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, P. K., Nunes, L. D., & Blunt, J. R. (2021). Retrieval practice consistently benefits student learning: A systematic review of applied research in schools and classrooms. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33, 1409–1453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09595-9>

- Antera, S. (2021). Professional competence of vocational teachers: A conceptual review. *Vocations and Learning*, 14(3), 459–479. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-021-09271-7>
- Bardach, L., & Murayama, K. (2025). The role of rewards in motivation—Beyond dichotomies. *Learning and Instruction*, 96, Article 102056. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.102056>
- Berti, S., Grazia, V., & Molinari, L. (2023). Active student participation in whole-school interventions in secondary school: A systematic literature review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35, Article 52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09773-x>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis?. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Bray, A., Devitt, A., Banks, J., Sanchez Fuentes, S., Sandoval, M., Riviou, K., Byrne, D., Flood, M., Reale, J., & Terrenzio, S. (2024). What next for Universal Design for Learning? A systematic literature review of technology in UDL implementations at second level. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(1), 113–138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13328>
- Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke’s approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity*, 56(3), 1391–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y>
- Carpenter, S. K., Pan, S. C., & Butler, A. C. (2022). The science of effective learning with spacing and retrieval practice. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1, 496–511. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-022-00089-1>
- Chumairo, P. Z., Efendi, M., Samawi, A., Hidayaturrahman, D., Ediyanto, E., & Sunandar, A. (2022). Game interaktif berbasis Universal Design Learning bagi siswa slow learner di sekolah inklusi. *JP (Jurnal Pendidikan): Teori dan Praktik*, 6(2), 123–128. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jp.v6n2.p123-128>
- Darmawan, D., Hadiyanti, P., Wibowo, S., Syah, R., & Abdillah, M. F. (2025). Development of digital learning media for community-based education: A collaborative innovation and literacy framework. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 11(2), 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v11i2.32060>
- Donath, J. L., Lüke, T., Graf, E., Tran, U. S., & Götz, T. (2023). Does professional development effectively support the implementation of inclusive education? A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35, Article 30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09752-2>
- Dumasari, R., Sutisna, A., Hadiyanti, P., & Mawardi, M. (2024). Evaluating technical guidance in the functional role of learning facilitators: A multidimensional approach to enhancing educational outcomes. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 10(1), 135–146. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v10i1.255>
- Hamzah, A., Hatimah, I., Saepudin, A., Pramudia, J. R., & Masingboon, K. (2024). Participatory learning is needed to increase family independence in handling post-stroke patients at home. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 10(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v10i1.1410>
- Handayani, T., & Martaningsih, S. T. (2022). Peran guru kelas dalam mengatasi kesulitan belajar anak slow learner di SD Muhammadiyah Dadapan. *Jurnal Fundadikdas (Fundamental Pendidikan Dasar)*, 5(2), 124–136. <https://doi.org/10.12928/fundadikdas.v5i2.4702>
- Hollingshead, A., Lowrey, K. A., & Howery, K. (2022). Universal Design for Learning: When policy changes before evidence. *Educational Policy*, 36(5), 1135–1161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904820951120>
- Iryana, R., Hidayat, S., & Mulyadi, S. (2024). Learning model management for slow learners in an inclusive classroom setting at an elementary school. *Indonesian Journal of Primary Education*, 8(2), 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijpe.v8i2.61103>
- Jackson-Summers, A. G., Mrakovcich, K. L., Gray, J. P., Fleischmann, C. M., Emami, T., & Page, E. J. (2024). A systematic review of inclusive pedagogical research using the CIRTl inclusive pedagogy framework: Multi-disciplinary and STEM perspectives, current trends and a research agenda. *Discover Education*, 3, Article 30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00093-y>
- Kart, A., & Kart, M. (2021). Academic and social effects of inclusion on students without disabilities: A review of the literature. *Education Sciences*, 11(1), Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11010016>

- King-Sears, M. E., Stefanidis, A., Evmenova, A. S., Rao, K., Mergen, R. L., Owen, L. S., & Strimel, M. M. (2023). Achievement of learners receiving UDL instruction: A meta-analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 122, Article 103956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103956>
- Koutsouris, G., Bremner, N., & Stentiford, L. (2024). Do we have to rethink inclusive pedagogies for secondary schools? A critical systematic review of the international literature. *British Educational Research Journal*, 50(1), 260–286. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3926>
- Kurniawan, P. W., & Sumargono, S. (2021). Development of history learning media based on TPACK assisted by Ms. PowerPoint integrated with Ispring Suite. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(4), 248–259. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i4.2456>
- Matschiner, A. (2023). A systematic review of the literature on inservice professional development explicitly addressing race and racism. *Review of Educational Research*, 93(4), 594–630. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543221125245>
- McDermott, K. B. (2021). Practicing retrieval facilitates learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 609–633. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-051019>
- Melania, M., Kadir, A., Pamungkas, A. R., & Gupta, S. (2024). Contribution of non-formal education to improve the quality of human resources. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 10(1), 169–178. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v10i1.2015>
- Mukhlis, A., Havida, B. K. N., & Nurani, A. A. (2023). Special assistance teachers learning strategies for slow learner students in inclusive elementary schools. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Sekolah Dasar*, 7(1), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jippsd.v7i1.122424>
- Norberto Rocha, J., & de Abreu, W. V. (2024). Editorial: Inclusion in non-formal education places for children and adults with disabilities. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, Article 1485770. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1485770>
- Popova, A., Evans, D. K., Breeding, M. E., & Arancibia, V. (2022). Teacher professional development around the world: The gap between evidence and practice. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 37(1), 107–136. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkab006>
- Pozas, M., Letzel, V., Lindner, K.-T., & Schwab, S. (2021). DI (Differentiated Instruction) does matter! The effects of DI on secondary school students' well-being, social inclusion and academic self-concept. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, Article 729027. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.729027>
- Prasetyo, I., Tohani, E., & Adeoye, M. A. (2024). Current study of nonformal education program in the era of the Industrial Revolution 4.0. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 10(2), 446–456. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v10i2.7402>
- Prawesti, F. S., & Yoenanto, N. H. (2021). Strategi pembelajaran Shaw untuk meningkatkan keterampilan guru mengajar siswa slow learner. *Jurnal Ecopsy*, 8(1), 66–78. <https://doi.org/10.20527/ecopsy.2021.02.006>
- Priya, A. (2021). Case study methodology of qualitative research: Key attributes and navigating the conundrums in its application. *Sociological Bulletin*, 70(1), 94–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038022920970318>
- Saripah, I., Pramudia, J. R., Ardiwinata, J. S., & Boriboon, G. (2025). Enhancing transformative learning through 'Setara Daring': A framework for optimizing equivalent education in Bandung, Indonesia. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 11(1), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v11i1.15825>
- Simac, J., Marcus, R., & Harper, C. (2021). Does non-formal education have lasting effects?. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 51(5), 706–724. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2019.1669011>
- Sukinah, Mumpuniarti, & Murdiyani, K. K. (2024). Learning accommodation for slow learners in inclusive elementary schools. *INKLUSI*, 11(2), 247–266. <https://doi.org/10.14421/ijds.110207>
- Suminar, T., Siswanto, Y., Wardani, S., Yusuf, A., & Islahuddin, I. (2024). Determinant model of graduate competence partnership-based life skills training in the Industry 4.0 era. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 10(1), 195–209. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v10i1.1658>

- Sutimin, L. A., Sariyatun, S., Musadad, A. A., Yuniyanto, T., & Abidin, N. F. (2025). TPACK research trends in Indonesia: Contributions to enhancing the equivalency education history teacher community. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 11(1), 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v11i1.20625>
- Tkachenko, L. (2021). Opportunities for non-formal education for people with special educational needs. *Professional Education: Methodology, Theory and Technologies*, 14, 251–265. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2415-3729-2021-14-251-265>
- van Loon, K., & Waldis, M. (2024). Image interpretation scaffolds support adolescents' historical reasoning. *Learning and Instruction*, 94, Article 101993. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101993>
- Wati, M. L., & Hendriani, W. (2024). Strategi mengajar siswa lamban belajar (slow learners): A narrative review. *EduInovasi: Journal of Basic Educational Studies*, 4(2), 901–911. <https://doi.org/10.47467/edu.v4i2.2314>
- Wilke, M., Depaepe, F., & Van Nieuwenhuyse, K. (2023). Fostering secondary students' historical thinking: A design study in Flemish history education. *Journal of Formative Design in Learning*, 7(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41686-023-00074-8>
- Wong, Z. Y., & Liem, G. A. D. (2022). Student engagement: Current state of the construct, conceptual refinement, and future research directions. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34, 107–138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09628-3>
- Xuan, Q., Cheung, A., & Sun, D. (2022). The effectiveness of formative assessment for enhancing reading achievement in K-12 classrooms: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 990196. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.990196>
- Yuliani, L., Hufad, A., Komar, O., Karwati, L., & Hamdan, A. (2024). Andragogy training model in advanced level training by early childhood educators to improve learning. *Journal of Nonformal Education*, 10(2), 392–401. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jone.v10i2.12358>
- Zhang, L., Jackson, H. A., Yang, S., Basham, J. D., Williams, C. H., & Carter, R. A. (2022). Codesigning learning environments guided by the framework of Universal Design for Learning: A case study. *Learning Environments Research*, 25(2), 379–397. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09364-z>