

The Social Work Educator and Inclusivity: Boundary Broker or Boundary Protector?

Anneline Keet

Department of Social Work, University of the Free State, South Africa
E-mail: KeetACS@ufs.ac.za

KEYWORDS Boundary Practice. Critical Disability Studies. Inclusive. Social Justice

ABSTRACT This paper looks at social work educators and their response to students with disabilities participating in the Bachelor of Social Work degree. The researcher argues that although the social work profession can be identified as one of the boundary brokers for inclusivity regarding students with disabilities, the social work educators may find it difficult to understand these educational rights as a social justice issue. The researcher uses literature on boundary practice to discuss the contradictions locked up in the social worker as educator role. Insights into critical disability studies are used to pathologize educational needs outside of those of the mainstream student population. The research is auto-ethnographic in nature, allowing the researcher to retroactively reflect on past experiences as a member of a community of social work educators. This auto-ethnography is also complemented with interviews with two fellow social work educators as well as two social work students with disabilities.

INTRODUCTION

Institutions of Higher Education according to Shefner et al. (2014) provide opportunities for social justice related work. It should thus be a space with a high level of responsiveness towards all students participating in its educational programmes. Students from minority groups such as those with disabilities, students of colour, gay and lesbian students, those from financially marginalised groups should feel at home in an academic space that stimulate conversations about social justice, responsive citizenship and a more equal society. This stimulated the researcher's thoughts around the experience of the student with disabilities as minority group in the department where she teaches. The researcher's initial thoughts around this has been an assumption that by virtue of her training in the social work profession, she would be well suited to act as ambassador for inclusive educational practices for students with disabilities. However, the researcher has realised that as an educator, her role is significantly different from that of her professional orientation as a social worker. As a result the researcher has the potential to draw boundaries around her occupational space that allows her to meet the requirements of the job she is doing. These boundaries can however be a tool that marginalises certain students, limiting their full participation in the educational programme. The researcher uses critical disability

studies as a theoretical frame to problematize the notion of students with disabilities in inclusive education. She furthermore uses boundary practice to locate social work educators in their professional orientation. The objectives that guide this study is firstly to create an awareness of the role contradictions for social workers as teachers and as practitioners. Secondly, by involving the voice of the student with disabilities in the study, it serves to sensitize the social work educator towards the needs of the student. Finally, the study also serves to highlight the challenges involved for both students with disabilities and educators in programmes with a high volume of service learning. The researcher uses auto-ethnography as methodological tool to make sense of her feelings around this issue. As the personal style of this method can be critiqued for its' subjectivity, engagement with educators as counterparts as well as students with disabilities forms part of the data for this research. This methodology is discussed in the next section.

THE USE OF AUTO-ETHNOGRAPHY FOR THIS TEXT

The researcher decided to use auto-ethnography as research methodology as it would allow her to reflect deeply on her own experiences. It would also allow her access to the experience of students and educators in a more per-

sonalised manner. Auto-ethnographies “are highly personalized accounts that draw upon the experience of the author/researcher for the purposes of extending sociological understanding” (Sparkes 2002: 21). Wall (2006) describes it as a research method that allows you to use yourself to get to culture. Chang (2007) is of the impression that it is autobiographical and ethnographic at the same time. Rubin and Babbie (2011) describes ethnographic studies as focusing on detailed and accurate descriptions rather than on explanation. As is the case with ethnography, auto-ethnography wants to achieve the goal of cultural understanding. In this context, self-observation, data through participation, interviews and the review of literature generate essential information. Through a process of triangulation, data is analysed and interpreted to understand the cultural meanings of events, behaviour and thought. According to Ellis and Bochner (2000) autobiographies self-consciously explore the interplay of the introspective, personally engaged self with cultural descriptions. It is through this form of writing that the researcher can investigate these phenomena and at the same time reflect on my own positioning as educator.

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL WORK IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Social Justice is a key principle of the Social Work Professional Code of Practice (SACSSP 2012). According to Waitoller and Kozleski (2013) the education system recognises the social work profession as part of the professionals acting as boundary workers on behalf of students with disabilities. Social workers amongst other professionals have the potential to apprentice teachers in practice that can dismantle compounding barriers that keep certain kinds of students from learning in mainstream schools. In this context as boundary worker the social work profession has a significant social justice role, working towards inclusive educational opportunities for all students. Liasidou (2012) explains that inclusive education embodies values and principles that challenges the ways in which educational systems reproduce and perpetuate social inequalities with regard to marginalised and excluded groups of students across a range of abilities, characteristics, developmental trajectories and socioeconomic circumstances. As

a result, inclusion is unavoidably linked to the principles of equality and social justice.

When the researcher think of a student’s disappointment at an event where there is no provision for a ramp so that she can, just like all the other students, go on the stage to receive her certificate, the researcher inevitably think of how easy abled people can miss the point of inclusive practice. The fact that the student would still receive the certificate in front of the audience, just in front of the stage, was not the point. The very act created a difference between her and the rest of her academic counterparts. The researcher is therefore of the impression that what the student wants is to experience campus life like the rest of the student population. The researcher is using critical disability studies to help her contextualise her reflection.

CRITICAL DISABILITY STUDIES AS A MEANS TO HIGHLIGHT SOCIAL JUSTICE ISSUES

Despite the fact that the notion of disability has not been explicitly touched upon in critical pedagogy according to (Gabel 2002; Goodley 2011; Erevelles 2000), a critical pedagogical framework can provide a theoretical platform against which the notion of disability can be problematized, deconstructed and repositioned. Giroux (1992) and McLaren (1998) are of the opinion that it provides theoretical demands against the oppression and marginalization of certain groups of students. Critical pedagogy’s focus on issues of marginalisation, power, justice and social transformation can mobilise new theorisations with regard to the complex nature of disability and the ways in which disabled students are socially and educationally positioned. The emphasis is placed on questioning whose values and interests shape dominant educational discourses that oppress and marginalise certain groups of students (McLaren 1998). The student as described in an earlier part of this document had to fit into a dominant educational arrangement and as a result experienced forms of exclusion. When analysing this incident happening at a departmental event through a critical disability lens, we can identify ways in which the social context and school functioned as a site of injustice (Lingard and Mills 2007). In another incident, a student group project resulted in some conflict amongst the group members.

One of the group members requires interpretation services for his educational interactions, including his sessions with the group. Close to the due date for project submission, the group were making appointments to discuss their project at very short notice. This student needs to make arrangements with the interpretation services on campus well in advance. When he was unable to attend the sessions as the very tool he needed to participate in the discussions (interpretation services) could not be arranged on such short notice, his group members regarded him as not contributing to the project and informed the researcher as such. He also approached the researcher, explained his dilemma and asked if it is possible for him to work alone rather than in a group. The researcher was reluctant to agree to this as it would mean that the student would be excluded from a form of learning offered through group assignments. Nordberg (2007) uses the views of Collier (1985) who calls the desirable outcomes of syndicate work (four to eight students working largely without presence of a tutor) “numerous”: increased motivation among students, evidenced by the extra time and energy put into the work and the sense of obligations to other members; and development of higher order skills, evidenced through the application of concepts, improved capacity for interpreting evidence and analysing concepts, more sophisticated problem-solving, a more critical approach to reading, and a keener appreciation of the provisional nature of the state of knowledge. An educator participating in this study indicate that while there can be disagreements between group members during group assignments, the activity in itself allows for the development of tolerance, resilience, cohesion and interdependence amongst students.

A student participant to this study relates his experience at a previous educational institution. *“There were no access and facilitators and therefor depressing. I was the only one with my type of impairment and felt very much isolated and dependent entirely on the information I obtained through self-study. I was supposed to go an extra mile towards understanding the contents of the modules all by myself because there were no services to facilitate my learning experiences.”*

When Goodley (2012: 634) looks at the emergence of critical disability studies, he uses five insights of this field. One of his insights is the

concept of “bodies that matter”. This refers to the causal link between the body and disability. For Ghai (2006: 147), disabled bodies risk becoming dis-embodied because of constructions around them that threaten to create a total invisibility of the disabled individual. At the same time, however, McGuire (2010) argues that disability marks the body in ambiguous ways. For her the body appears and disappears, is noticed and is hidden as movement occurs through various physical and social spaces, and as people find themselves in different political and historical moments. For the researcher’s student participant, the total lack of provision in the educational institution for his disability caused his body to disappear, an invisibility of him as individual with a disability, resulting in an inaccessible learning environment.

While writing this paper, the researcher realises just how firmly her own mind is set in an ablest frame. While driving two students to their service learning site one Friday morning, the researcher encountered a blind student who is trying to cross the road. The researcher had to stop abruptly because she and a driver in front were driving relatively fast. The researcher felt guilty, wondering whether she would have been driving with more caution if the lens through which she view the world were different. This is after all a university where many disabled students, including blind students have to navigate their way to classes on a daily basis. How is it that the researcher never have this in mind while driving on campus? Campbell (2008) indicate that ableism refers to a network of beliefs, processes and practices that produces a particular kind of self and body. The researcher worried that in her ablest mind-set, the body of the disabled student disappears, creating a risk of physical harm and generalised exclusion as a result.

It is also possible that in the very act of making provision for the education of the student with disabilities as they enter the institution, components of the body (the need for social engagement with others like themselves), can disappear. A participant in this study indicate how, when entering the institution she wanted to participate in the mainstream orientation activities of the organization and how much she wanted to live in a hostel allocated for first years. However, at the time, none of the first year hostels made provision for students with her dis-

ability and she stayed in a senior hostel. As a result, when entering the classroom she felt like she was the one left out, the one who did not know any of the classmates. The researcher suppose in this context the body of the disabled student appeared in its need for specific forms of provision to ensure inclusion, however the social need of the very body disappeared.

A participant indicate how in his previous Higher Education Institution he was influenced by what the FOTIM (Foundation of Tertiary Institutions of the Northern Metropolis) 2011, in their 2009-2011 research project, identify as the continued use of a medical discourse of disability and how it influences the way in which institutions respond to students with disabilities, particularly in terms of addressing their needs within the teaching and learning process. This report suggests that this medical discourse deflect attention away from the extent to which the teaching methods and materials used, the manner in which classes and learning have been managed and organised and the nature in which assessment practices may in fact act as a barrier to equitable participation of students with disabilities. Barriers are thus inherent in the curricula itself. The same participant is of the impression that his experience as a student at his current institution is much more positive and that staff attitudes and the academic setting is a lot more conducive to his learning. The researcher does however recall a staff conversation where the dilemma of field placement for a participant's service learning was discussed. There are, by virtue of a student's specific disability more aspects that need to be considered when training outside of the classroom needs to take place. These considerations can cause frustration and a demand for more support than what is offered from the Unit for Students with Disabilities (as it is called in the researcher's Higher Education Institution). It also has the potential for more exclusionary practices in the future when new student intake takes place. The FOTIM research project suggests that students with disabilities are still being excluded or channelled based on mere perceptions of their capabilities where the need for fieldwork or practical development in off-campus facilities or use of graphic material or specific types of equipment are used as excuses for not allowing them to participate in non-traditional courses and degree programmes. It is within the direction that these staff conversa-

tions as referred to above can take that the social work educator can become a boundary protector rather than a boundary worker. A participant in this study indicate that a contract should be signed with the student at the onset of studies, clarifying the expectations of the course and obtaining a commitment from the student to participate according to these expectations. While it is important for students to take responsibility for their own learning, individuals should not lose sight of the dominance of an ablest educational setting that may make full participation impossible. The responsibility should thus be on the system to remove barriers as well as the student to engage. Botham and Nicholson (2014) in a study focussing on the support needed for the transition of disabled students from university to field placements suggest that discriminatory behaviour in practice education can result from poor planning, poor communication of required adjustments, poor cooperation from placement providers, a lack of awareness of disability equality and relevant legislation and a reluctance from students to disclose due to fear of discrimination. They suggest that there need to be a more coordinated communication between all stakeholders in practice education, that disability awareness training should be offered and that universities should take the lead in educating placement educators.

Another insight from Goodley (2012) refers to the self and the other. In this he suggests that a key site of oppression for disabled people refers to the moments when they feel judged as they fail to match up to the ideal individual. When one of the researcher's participants relates the fear of entering the university as a first year student, not only because of the concerns of coping with the academic expectations, but also because of the exposure to an environment that may be difficult to concur, there is already a sense of judgement against the ideal other, the normalised concept of the body. The student's experience of a selection process that poses specific questions related to the disability and how this will influence the meeting of departmental expectations is understandably complex. When answering these questions, students have to proof themselves against the ablest norms of the institution. Goodley (2012) suggests that the person with a disability disrupt the idea of the normative individual against which we are supposed to judge ourselves. Ablest processes cre-

ate a human standard, which presumes able-bodiedness, initiates the norm and decontaminates the ablest ideal. The disabled individual in this context becomes the deficiency in relation to the norm. Without the institution intending to do so, the admission process leaves the student to explain why they think they are capable of dealing with curriculum despite their disability. A social justice discourse in inclusive education policy and practice necessitates “changing systems that perpetuate racism, power, and exclusion” (Mullen and Jones 2008: 331); and it involves questioning the ways in which academic institutions value certain student-identities while devaluing others (Harwood and Humphry 2008; Graham 2005; Youdell 2006). This perspective concentrates on transcending deficit oriented and blame-the-victim approaches that according to Johnson (2004) define educational bodies, relationships and structures. It is in this context that certain students are ostracized to the margins of social and educational domains.

BOUNDARIES AND THE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATOR

Akkerman and Bakker (2011: 132), describe a boundary as “a sociocultural difference leading to discontinuity in action or interaction.” In the context of social work training, boundaries can refer to what is perceived as the typical student and what the educational needs and support systems should be to ensure positive educational outcomes. Boundaries also imply a psychological fence that consists of perceived and real behavioral requirements, rules, and divisions of labor, perceptions of the way people view things to be done and the ways they are accustomed to. When the social work training program is faced with the need to be inclusive of students with different disabilities, it can cause anxiety as adaptation to the existing behavioral requirements and rules may be needed. In the researcher’s initial reflection she views the social work educator as a boundary protector, a role contradictory to the social work professional role of boundary negotiator. In this educational context the Unit for Students with Disabilities plays the role of boundary negotiator. The researcher is therefore left with the question of what is needed to support the social work educator in an inclusive education system. Savol-

ainen et al. (2011) showed through their research as well as through the review of other research on the subject, that more attention needs to be provided to what educators perceive as their lack of knowledge and ability to build support networks in order to operate effectively within inclusive education systems. Educator who do not feel that they have the necessary knowledge and support network, may become protective of their boundaries as they feel more competent working within the homogeneous space where student needs are similar. Two educators participating in this project were wondering whether the teaching style used in class is not very disruptive for a student with a sensory disability. When the student is using interpretation services due to a hearing disability and the teaching style is interactive with the educator moving around in class, this may be good for student interaction but can serve as barrier for this particular student. One participant is of the opinion that sensory disabilities pose challenges within the classroom as well as in service learning. The consideration for the student in a wheelchair is around accessibility of buildings, classrooms and service learning organizations while for the student with a sensory disability the concerns are much more complex. This student runs the risk of losing contact with valuable educational material and in a university setting where knowledge acquisition is fast-paced, this can be a challenge. Both educators interviewed for this project voiced the need for more training from the Unit for Students with Disabilities on the educational needs of students with varied forms of disability. Educators, it seems, want to feel more empowered to be able to serve in the best interest of the student in their class. Eloff et al. (2002) conducted research on the stress experienced by educators when including a student with physical disabilities in an inclusive education system. They found that overall, educators experienced relative mild stress levels about the inclusion of students with disabilities in their mainstream teaching environments. While not presenting itself as a significant stressor, the need for training support to equip educators, presented as an area needing improvement. A response from a research participant also indicated to the researcher that the need to meet the educational requirements of the programme and institution remain essential. When faced with a

choice of diverse service learning exposure (social work service in different context) and a fair change for a student to pass his/her service learning, the latter will take precedence. This coincides with another area indicated in the research of Eloff et al. (2002) where the administrative requirements of the programme presented as the most significant area of potential stress.

BOUNDARY CROSSING AND BOUNDARY OBJECTS

Akkerman and Bakker (2011) use two concepts, namely boundary crossing and boundary objects through which they discuss the continuity of action and interaction despite socio-cultural differences. Boundary crossing refers to the extent to which professionals need to enter into areas unfamiliar to them, spaces that they may feel unqualified for. The researcher realised as she thought around her few years in her current and previous educational institution that what she may have observed as resistance and potentially socially unjust practices, may well be a case of facing the challenge of negotiation and combining elements from the different context so that a hybrid situation can be created.

The concept of boundary object is used by Akkerman and Bakker (2011) to indicate how artefacts can fulfil a specific function in connecting intersecting practices. Boundary objects are those objects that both inhabit several intersecting worlds and satisfy the informational requirements of each of them. The Unit for Students with Disabilities serve as a boundary object, negotiating structural support for inclusivity of students with disabilities and as suggested by education participants, educating the larger university population about inclusive practices. More open conversation practices with students with disabilities, listening to their experiences, also serve as boundary objects helping university lecturers bridging their transecting practices. A participant informs the researcher that the sense of eyesight is more active in deaf people and as a result they are easily distracted by movements leading to a loss of focus and concentration when sharing rooms with other people. To the researcher, this information is extremely important for physical planning and allocation of university accommodation. It is however information that is accessible only through engage-

ment with experts and the person with a particular disability as an expert.

Lamont and Molnar (2002) find that studies on boundaries also represent an appreciation of diversity. In a short review of the literature they found that boundaries are discussed in a wide variety of social sciences to investigate how markers of difference are created, maintained, or contested at many different levels of institutionalization and categorization. The paradigmatic shift can be seen in, for example, the way in which communication and the human mind are profoundly reconceptualised. In communication theories, scholars like Lotman (1990) and Wertsch and Toma (1995) have begun to argue against the basic and commonly held presupposition that communication is a transmission process that works best in situations of sameness in the minds of people. In contrast, they emphasize how words naturally mean different things to different people. In addition to this, authors like Bhabha (1990) and Soja (1996) have called attention to the way in which intersections of cultural practices open up *third spaces* that allow negotiation of meaning and hybridity, allowing for the production of new cultural forms of dialogue, Gutierrez et al. (1995).

The researcher became more and more aware of these *third spaces* as she interacts with students with disabilities in her classroom. A student once shared in a class discussion the experience of going to the beach and wanting to reach the water but the wheelchair does not allow for it. In this, the student was visualising the construction of a ramp that allows wheelchair bound individuals to do so. The researcher realised at that moment that the disabled body has always been absent from her notion of leisure time at the beach. In another class discussion students discussed the provision to be made for students with different disabilities in an inclusive education system and the expense of making educational material available in braille were used as an example. The insights on expenses given by a student with disabilities who are often involved in the processing of material into braille stimulated new discussion on how the commodification of disability created an industry around the service provision that can make access for inclusive practices expensive. Russel and Malhotra (2002) share this view and indicate that entrepreneurs and rehabilitation specialists have made impaired bodies of use to

the economic order by shaping disablement into big business and turning the disabled body into a commodity around which social policies are created or rejected according to their market value, thus creating a corporate solution to disablement.

Boundary objects for Akkerman and Bakker (2011) are those artefacts that serve as organic arrangements allowing different groups to work together. They serve as a means of translation within situations of multisite work relational requirements. Boundary objects that do not capture multiple meanings and perspectives, does not fulfil its purpose. Boundary objects can thus also take the shape of policy documents, guiding people's actions in a specific context, like the Labour Relations Act, policies on equity targets in an organization and the Bill of Rights. The danger of objects with such a material and procedural character is that they fail to meaningfully influence the worldviews of those they serve. They are effective only in so much as they are able to serve as interconnection between different perspectives. How these legislative objects thus translate into spaces of meaningful engagement amongst diverse groups in a university space is the lifeblood of its existence there.

Boundaries for Akkerman and Bakker (2011) are also ambiguous in nature. It serves to create a middle ground, belonging to the different worlds it represents. However, it also creates a space not belonging to any of the worlds and it is in this space where it has the potential to give expression to the meaning of the intersecting worlds. These two authors work with four instruments used for learning in this crisscrossing space. This will be used to illustrate the learning potential of boundary crossing and how it can transpire in the social work educational spaces. The first refers to *identification* that entails a questioning of the core identities of each of the intersecting sites. This act of questioning can lead to renewed insight into what the diverse practices concerns. For the researcher, engaging with students with disabilities, listening to their views and reflecting on these conversations provide her with insights otherwise unattainable. Two common processes seem to take place at this point of identification. There is a process of othering, defining how one practice differs from the other. The second process presenting itself under the concept of identifi-

cation is the legitimization of coexistence. This refers to different groups having to consider the interference between their multiple participations, be able to pursue each other and accept the multiple memberships of people in respective groups. What is typical in this identification space is that boundaries between practices are encountered and reconstructed, without overcoming discontinuities. It is however important for the university and the social work department in particular to challenge the incoherence in coexistence for different groups. Moving along the continuum of mechanisms as proposed by Akkerman and Bakker (2011) is thus necessary.

Coordination takes the process of learning at the boundaries a step further as it refers to a communicative connection between the diverse groups of practice. It entails an effort of translation between the different worlds, creating an inter-subjective ground while at the same time a diversity of possible understandings. Landa (2008) is of the impression that boundary objects shared by both worlds can create a communicative connection between them, creating an arrangement for information sharing focused at enhancing practice. Coordination also entails enhancing boundary penetrability where actions and interactions run so smoothly that there is not even an awareness of different practices running simultaneously. From the researcher's own observation and discussion with colleagues, it seems that the biggest danger of communicative breakdown exists within the facilitation of service learning. In addition to the concerns around a practice placement that can accommodate the students' form of disability, a colleague also shared with the researcher a previous experience of assessing service learning group-work of a deaf student with deaf participants. This exercise created a realization of the limitation in interaction for the person who cannot interact in sign language.

A next level of learning lies in the ability to look back at and make sense of events taking place at the boundaries. *Reflection* refers to the process of comprehending and formulating a perspective, thus making explicit one's understanding and knowledge of a particular issue. Reflexivity gives access to the implicit and unstated assumptions. This perspective making and what Boland and Tensaki (1995) call perspective taking, referring to the process of tak-

ing others in account, are dialogical and creative in nature and generate an opportunity for new learning to take place. Boland and Tensaki (1995) refer to this as a conversation with the self during construction of a perspective and conversation with the other during the interpretation thereof. This process allows for people's view on the world to be enriched and simultaneously their identity to be enriched beyond its current status. Reflexivity in the context of boundary work also creates an opportunity to look at oneself through the eyes of another world. The researcher is not convinced that as a department, she and her colleagues are there yet. The existence of the student with disabilities in her department should lead herself and her colleagues to a space where their own identities are enriched as a result of the space that they share. This process of auto-ethnographic writing gives the researcher an opportunity to reflect and benefit from this.

As a consequence of the three processes as mentioned above, a fourth learning mechanism is a process of *transformation*. It takes place only when confronting a problem that prevents or limit the interactions between intersecting worlds. If confrontations do not occur, transformation is not possible. As a result of the confrontation, there is a recognition of a shared problem space, in the context of diverse educational spaces this can refer to the recurrent interactional breakdown that need to be resolved collaboratively. When the researcher's Department encounter problems in the educational needs of students with disability, it is the act of confrontation that helps the staff to reconsider current practices. The transformation that flow from this confrontation can also lead to a state of hybridization, where the crossing of boundaries allow for the creation of new cultural forms, combining ingredients from different context to form something new. A final process of transformation is that continuous joint work at the boundaries is needed to preserve the productivity of boundary crossing. Transformation requires real dialogue and collaboration, a negotiation of meaning between people on the different sides of the boundary. The university and in particular, the Social Work Department can thus not create inclusive educational spaces without authentic dialogue with the community of people with disabilities. Transformation based on meaningful engagement can contribute to the estab-

lishment of new, in-between spaces. It is in the act of engaging with these mechanisms of learning at the boundaries that the social work educator will become a boundary worker rather than a boundary protector.

CONCLUSION

The debate on inclusive education managed to highlight the right to comprehensive educational experiences for people with disabilities. In the design of separate educational facilities, experts in the field are responsible to furnish these spaces with equipment that address the specific needs of the student. While these facilities are absolutely essential, students with disabilities remain outside of the mainstream educational experience. In an inclusive educational space, existing ablest spaces needs to transform to allow the student with disabilities to exercise their right to a full educational experience. It is within this process of inclusion that the mainstream knowledge-set is most inadequate. Meaningful engagement with experts in the field and students with disabilities as experts can greatly enhance the quality of inclusive spaces in higher education. Students with disabilities should thus be active partners in the development of inclusive spaces.

Engaging in this auto-ethnographic form of writing allowed the researcher to problematize her own position as a social work educator in relation to her role as social work professional. It allowed her to understand her own discomforts in the educational experience as an act of on-going working at the boundaries. The decisions to combine the researcher's auto-ethnographic journey with interviews with other educators as well as students with disabilities allowed her the opportunity to listen to and consider the voices of others as experts of their own experiences. It gave the researcher an opportunity for renewed learning at the boundaries, realising that curriculum reviews towards inclusion cannot be done without the input of the very people whom the inclusion is targeting. The life experience of the student with specific disabilities are full of potential learning that, until the time of engagement at the boundaries, are not accessible to the person without the specific form of disability. Inclusive education spaces thus have significant learning potential.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Educators who do not feel equip to participate in such an inclusive space, would however not be able to make use of the potentially rich educational experience. Instead, they would prefer to protect the space they are familiar with and where they feel capable of producing good results. The social work curriculum should thus create sufficient opportunity for this type of boundary work as the educational potential for educators, students and the larger social work fraternity is significant. It is also important that the Unit for Students with Disabilities in the capacity of boundary object, take on a strong education function towards the rest of the university population. This will broaden their potential for developing and maintaining inclusive educational spaces.

REFERENCES

- van SF, Bakker A 2011. Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2): 132-169.
- Bhabha HK 1990. *Nation and Narration*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Boland RJ, Tenkasi RV 1995. Perspective making and perspective taking in communities of knowing. *Organization Science*, 6: 350-375.
- Botham KA, Nicholson J 2014. Supporting the transition of disabled students from university to practice placement. *Disability and Society*, 29(3):460-476.
- Campbell F 2008. Exploring internalized ableism using critical race theory. *Disability and Society*, 23(2): 151-162.
- Chang H 2007. Auto-ethnography as method. Raising cultural consciousness of self and others. *Studies in Educational Ethnography*, 12: 207-221.
- Collier KG 1985. Teaching methods in higher education: The changing scene, with special reference to group work. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 4:3-27.
- Ellis C, Bochner AP 2000. Auto-ethnography, personal narrative and personal reflexivity. In: N Denzin, Y Lincoln 2000. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp.733-768.
- Eloff I, Engelbrecht P, Swart E 2002. Including a learner with physical disabilities: Stressful for teachers? *Koers*, 67 (1):77-99.
- Erevelles N 2000. "Educating unruly bodies: Critical pedagogy, disability studies, and the politics of schooling." *Educational Theory*, 50(1): 25-47.
- Foundation of Tertiary Institutions of the Northern Metropolis (FOTIM) Project Report. Disability in Higher Education. 2011. Cape Town: FOTIM.
- Gabel S 2002. Some conceptual problems with critical pedagogy. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 32(2):177-201.
- Ghai A 2006. *(Dis)embodied form: Issues of Disabled Women*. Delhi: Shaktioks.
- Giroux H 1992. *Border Crossings. Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Goodley D 2011. *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Goodley D 2012. Dis/entangling critical disability studies. *Disability and Society*, 28: 5-644.
- Graham L 2005. The incidental 'Other': A Foucaultian interrogation of educational policy effects. *Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association*, April 11-16, Montreal, Canada.
- Gutierrez K, Rymes B, Larson J 1995. Script, counter-script and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3): 445-471.
- Harwood V, Humphry N 2008. Taking exception: Discourses of exceptionality and the invocation of the 'ideal'. In: S Gabel, S Danfort (Eds.): *Disability and the Politics of Education, An International Reader*. New York: Peter Lang. pp. 371-83.
- Johnson JR 2004. Universal instructional design and critical (communication) pedagogy: Strategies for voice, inclusion, and social justice/change. *Equity and Excellence in Education* 37: 145-53.
- Lamont M, Molnar V 2002. The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28:167-195.
- Landa MSH 2008. *Crossing the Divide: A Phenomenological Study of Early Childhood Literacy Teachers Who Choose to Work With Children in High-Poverty Schools*. PhD. Thesis, Unpublished: Maryland: University of Maryland.
- Liasidou A 2012. Inclusive education and critical pedagogy at the intersections of disability, race, gender and class. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10(1): 168-183.
- Lingard R, Mills M 2007. Pedagogies making a difference: Issues of social justice and inclusion. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11(3): 233-244.
- Lotman YM 1990. *Universe of the Mind. A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- McGuire A 2010. Disability, non-disability and the politics of mourning: Re-conceiving the 'we'. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 30(3):1-16.
- McLaren P 1998. *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. 3rd Edition. New York: Longman
- Mullen CA, Jones RJ, 2008. Teacher leadership capacity-building: Developing democratically accountable leaders in schools. *Teacher Development*. 12(4): 329-340.
- Nordberg D 2007. Fairness in assessing group projects. A conceptual framework for higher education. *The International Journal for Quality and Standards*, 1(2): 1-20.
- Rubin A, Babbie ER 2011. *Research Methods in Social Work*. 7th Edition. United States: Brooks/Cole.
- Russel M, Malhotra R 2002. Capitalism and disability. *Socialist Register*, 38: 211-228.
- Savolainen H, Engelbrecht P, Nel M, Malinen O 2011. Understanding teachers' attitudes and self-efficacy in inclusive education: Implications for pre-service and in-service teacher education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 27(1): 51- 68.

- Shefner J, Dahms HF, Jones RE, Jalata 2014. *Social Justice and the University: Globalization, Human Rights and the future of Democracy*. London, UK. Palgrave.
- Soja E 1996. *Third Space: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- South African Council for Social Service Professions (SACSSP). Policy Guidelines for Cause of Conduct, Code of Ethics and the Rules for Social Workers. 2012. From <<http://www.sacssp.co.za/website/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Code-of-Ethics.pdf>> (Retrieved on 10 August 2014).
- Sparkes AC 2000. Auto-ethnography and narratives of self: Reflections on criteria in action. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17: 21-43.
- Sparkes AC 2002. Auto-ethnography: Self-indulgence or something more? In: AP Bochner, C Ellis (Eds.): *Ethnographically Speaking: Auto-ethnography, Literature and Aesthetics* Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press. pp. 209-232.
- Waitoller FR, Kozleski EB 2013. Working in boundary practices: Identity development and learning in partnership for inclusive education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 31: 35-45.
- Wall S 2006. An Auto-ethnography on Learning about Auto-ethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(2): 2-12.
- Wertsch JV, Toma C 1995. Discourse and learning in the classroom: A sociocultural approach. In: LP Steffe, J Gale (Eds.): *Constructivism in Education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 159-174.
- Youdell D 2006. Diversity, inequality, and a post-structural politics for education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 27(1): 33-42.