Elizabeth Walton & Gillian Lloyd

An analysis of metaphors used for inclusive education in South Africa

First submission: 17 January 2011
Acceptance: 27 April 2011

Metaphors may delay the implementation of inclusive education. They describe ideas, construct thinking, and have implications for practice. By drawing on various theories of metaphor, the article analyses metaphors that occur in *White Paper Six: special needs education* and in subsequent inclusive education discourse. It focuses on inclusion as a goal, a building, a process and hospitality, and describes what these metaphors offer in order to develop an understanding of inclusive education. These metaphors have conceptual limitations which may affect the way in which inclusion is practised in South Africa. Metaphors that convey inclusion are required as an urgent imperative to ensure that all South African children access quality education.

'n Ontleding van metafore wat vir inklusiewe onderwys in Suid-Afrika gebruik word

Metafore mag moontlik die implementering van inklusiewe onderwys vertraag. Metafore beskryf idees en vorm denke, en het implikasies vir die praktyk. Met verskeie teorieë oor die metafoor as basis analiseer die artikel die metafore wat in die dokument *White Paper Six: special needs education* sowel as in die diskoers oor inklusiewe onderwys aangetref word. Die fokus is inklusiwiteit as 'n doelwit, 'n gebou, 'n proses en gasvryheid, en wat hierdie metafore bied vir die vorming van 'n begrip van wat inklusiewe onderrig beteken. Hierdie metafore het konseptuele tekortkominge wat moontlik 'n invloed sou kon hê op die manier waarop inklusiewe onderwys in Suid-Afrika toegepas word. Metafore van insluiting word benodig as 'n dringende imperatief om te verseker dat alle Suid-Afrikaanse kinders toegang tot gehalte onderwys kry.

Drs E Walton & G Lloyd, Dept of Education Studies, School of Education, Faculty of the Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Private Bag 3, Wits 2050; E-mail: Elizabeth.Walton@wits.ac.za & Gilloyd@mweb.co.za

Acta Academica
2011 43(3): 1-31
ISSN 0587-2405

<http://www.ufs.ac.za/ActaAcademica>

SUN MEDIA BLOEMFONTEIN

Inclusive education has taken a relatively long time to realise in South Africa. While many western countries began to dismantle separate special education systems from the 1970s onwards (Vislie 1995: 46), South Africa traces its history of inclusive education only as far back as 1994, with the advent of democracy. Prior to 1994, South African education was characterised by separation and segregation. Learners were taught separately on the basis not only of race, but also of (dis)ability. A well-resourced separate special education system served the needs of mainly white learners. Black learners with disabilities either attended school with little support or did not attend school at all. One of the first tasks of the post-apartheid government was to ratify a new constitution, which was enacted in 1996, entrenching equality and human rights, including the right to education and freedom from discrimination (RSA 1996a). In the same year, the South African Schools Act was promulgated. This Act gives effect to constitutional values in education with provisions such as prohibiting admission tests for learners to public schools, requiring that learners' educational needs be met without discrimination, and making physical amenities of schools accessible to learners with disabilities (RSA 1996b). After a consultative process, the Department of Education (DoE) published its *White Paper Six: special needs education* (henceforth referred to as the White Paper) in 2001. The White Paper outlines a national strategy to achieve an inclusive education system that will address and accommodate learners who experience various barriers to learning. The existing system would require significant transformation: selected schools would be converted to full service schools to meet a variety of support needs; schools and districts would set up support teams to assist classroom teachers; education managers and teachers would be trained, and special schools would remain not only to serve learners with high needs for support, but also to act as resources for other schools. An ambitious funding strategy would be implemented and a twenty-year plan would be followed.

Since the publication of the White Paper, the DoE has issued various comprehensive policy documents and guidelines to direct the implementation of inclusive education. These include guidelines

for special schools (DoE 2007); full service/inclusive schools (DoE 2009), and a strategy for the screening, identification, assessment and support of learners who experience barriers to learning (DoE 2008a). The national curriculum is based on the principles of inclusion and social justice (DoE 2002: 10 & 2010: 3). Curriculum support documents describe ways to address and accommodate barriers to learning in teaching and assessment (DoE 2003: 31-3). There is evidence of the implementation of inclusive education in both state and independent sectors as some schools have taken responsibility to include all children in their communities and support their diverse learning needs.[1] However, inclusion is not entrenched in South African education. An important reason identified for learners of school-going age, who are absent from school, is their need for special education (RSA 2010: 37). The 2009 Education For All global monitoring report notes that evidence from household surveys shows that the difference in primary school attendance rates between children with disabilities and those without disabilities is 20% in South Africa, one of the highest on the continent (UNESCO 2009: 5). There are many reasons for this. Teachers have expressed resistance to inclusive education, citing their lack of training, the demands of a new curriculum and the pressures of limited resources, including support personnel.[2] Deeply entrenched conservative pedagogical thinking about 'special education' is a significant impediment to transformation (Naicker 2005: 250), and vested interests in mainstream and special schools, district offices and provincial education departments, and universities can work against change. Funding and capacity constraints have been found to delay the implementation of inclusion at various levels in the system. It appears that when provincial education budgets are under pressure, inclusive education is not prioritised (Wildeman & Nomdo 2007: 18).

This article proposes that the choice and use of metaphor in inclusion discourse in this country could also hamper the realisation

1 *Cf* Engelbrecht *et al* 2006: 128, Masondo 2008, Walton 2011: 242, Walton *et al* 2009: 123.

2 *Cf* Du Toit & Forlin 2009: 656, Hall 2002: 36, Stofile & Green 2007: 59, Swart *et al* 2002: 186, Williams *et al* 2009: 198.

of inclusive education. This cannot be proven, given the complex interplay of theory, philosophy, practice and material reality (Allan & Slee 2008: 2) in any context. I (Walton) was alerted to the impact of metaphor in thought and action by an encounter with a teacher in a mainstream school when supervising pre-service student teaching practice. Thabo, in grade one, was not participating in the lesson. He was disturbing other learners and was repeatedly reprimanded by the student teacher. To her evident relief, Thabo finally put his head on his desk and quietly sucked his thumb for the remainder of the lesson. In the post-observation conference with the student and the class teacher, I was told that there was "something wrong with Thabo" and that the teacher was waiting for a place for him in a special school. The teacher had advised the student to ignore Thabo, as long as he did not disrupt the lesson. When I asked the teacher about inclusion, suggesting that Thabo would have benefited from differentiated instruction based on an individual support plan, she said: "Oh, that [inclusion] is a long term goal of the department – we are not too worried about it at this school". By using a goal metaphor for inclusion, Thabo's teacher was able to locate the realisation of inclusion in the future, and not something that is immediately urgent. By giving the education department the ownership of the goal, she effectively distanced herself from personal responsibility for Thabo's inclusion.

1. Metaphors

Metaphors pervade language and have been the object of study since Aristotle. More recently, metaphors have been an area of interest and research in applied linguistics, philosophy, and cognitive psychology. The earlier focus on metaphor as literary ornamentation and poetic device that entailed the transfer, substitution or comparison of characteristics or associations of one word or concept (the vehicle, focus or source domain) with that of another word (the tenor, frame, topic or target) has shifted to linguistic, cognitive and discourse perspectives, all of which have informed this investigation. To account for the new and multiple meanings and understandings created by the

use of metaphors, Black developed an interactionist theory of metaphor which views dynamic interactions between the vehicle domain and the tenor domain (Way 1991: 47). In so doing, Black highlighted the cognitive role of metaphor and emphasised that topic and vehicle are systems of knowledge and belief, and not merely names or features of concepts (Cameron 2003: 18). Kittay, who also affirmed the cognitive dimension of metaphor, offered a "perspectival theory" to advance the interaction theory using semantic fields to show what she called "the relational nature of metaphorical transfer of meaning" (Kittay 1987: 176).

Lakoff and Johnson rejected these linguistic approaches and developed a cognitive or conceptual theory of metaphor, focusing on cognitive mapping rather than on the linguistic features of metaphor. Lakoff (1993: 203) maintains that "the locus of metaphor is not in language at all, but in the way we conceptualize one mental domain in terms of another". The metaphorical linguistic expression is regarded as the means to study the nature of the metaphorical concepts. Lakoff and Johnson have made a significant contribution to the theory of metaphor by describing various kinds of metaphors (for example, structural, orientational and ontological metaphors) and by emphasising, based on empirical findings, the central role that metaphor plays in abstract thought. The observation that metaphorical concepts have the potential to highlight and to hide aspects of a concept is of particular relevance to this investigation (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 7, 10, 245). The cognitive approach to metaphor analysis allows researchers to identify metaphorical language, use this to reconstitute conceptual metaphors, and then analyse the conceptual mappings to discover their assumptions and limitations (Cameron 2003: 19, 20). In this tradition and within the broad field of special education, Danforth & Naraian (2007) investigated the use of the machine metaphor in autism research. Danforth (2007) explored metaphors used to frame Emotional Behavioural Disorder in American public schools, and Danforth & Kim (2008) did a preliminary analysis of metaphors in writing about ADHD and its implications for inclusive education. However, an analysis that focuses

only on the conceptual mappings of metaphor neglects the complex and dynamic discourse contexts in which metaphors are used.

A discourse perspective suggests that the selection and use of metaphor reflects the complex interaction of personal, linguistic, cognitive, affective and sociocultural variables across time (Gibbs & Cameron 2008: 67). Thus the impact of metaphor use should be considered beyond the ideational (that is, helping to explain something complex or abstract in terms of something more familiar or concrete) to that of affect and attitude, which play an important role in the emergence and entrenchment of particular metaphors (Cameron 2003: 23, Cameron & Deignan 2006: 676, Deignan 2005: 131). Some metaphors also become conventionalised through repeated use in specific sociocultural groups and discourse communities. They dynamically shape, encode and reflect the histories, discourse models and ideological positions of these groups or communities (Deignan 2005: 131, Gee 2005: 83, Gibbs & Cameron 2008: 67, 70).

The development of formal or scientific concepts is often mediated by the use of metaphor (Cameron 2003: 33). New or complex concepts are often expressed in terms of physical experience as a "resource-saving technique for interpreting the world" (Schmitt 2005: 366). Inclusion or inclusive education is one such complex concept.[3] This construct is difficult to define adequately, given the variety of ways in which it is conceived and practised within and across contexts (Lunt & Norwich 1999: 32, Mitchell 2005: 3). Writers and theorists in the field emphasise different aspects of inclusive education. Some focus on access, belonging and participation in the general classroom with an underlying culture of diversity (for example, Booth & Ainscow 1998, Sapon-Shevin 2007: 21); others emphasise the organisational aspects of school restructuring and improvement to reduce exclusion and increase participation (for example, Booth & Ainscow 2000: 9, McLeskey & Waldron 2006: 272, Pijl & Frissen 2009: 373),

3 The terms inclusion and inclusive education are used interchangeably in this article, and they should not necessarily be regarded as synonymous. This is partly because of the number of sources referred to, where we 'inclusion' is often used to imply 'inclusive education'. It is, however, beyond the scope of this article to explore the nuances of these terms.

while others focus on support and define inclusive education in terms of the way in which support is facilitated at different levels (for example, Shaddock *et al* 2007: 7, Tomlinson *et al* 2008: 6). In South Africa, it is difficult to find consensus about how inclusive education should be described or implemented, and differing perceptions about what constitutes the inclusive education project may partly account for delays in implementation (Wildeman & Nomdo 2007: 31). It is suggested that the inclusive endeavour in South African schools should be focused on pursuing equity and social justice by identifying and eliminating impediments to the access, participation and belonging of all learners in the curricula, facilities and cultures of their local schools (Walton 2011: 85). This suggests that inclusive education should be framed in terms beyond 'special needs' or disability, while acknowledging that disability compounds other exclusionary pressures. Given the complexity of the concept of inclusive education, it is not surprising to find the frequent use of metaphors by members of the discourse community to describe or explain its understanding of the concept. For example, Booth (1996: 89) regards inclusive education as "an unending set of processes, rather than a state", and Sapon-Shevin (2007) entitles her book "Widening the classroom circle: the power of inclusive classrooms".

According to Fairclough (1992: 194), metaphors "structure the way we think and the way we act, and our systems of knowledge and belief, in a pervasive and fundamental way". Therefore, our choice of metaphor will determine how we construct or define reality (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 157). Inclusion metaphors are thus more than descriptive; they also determine how the concept of inclusive education is constructed. Inclusion is neither a physical entity nor a clearly defined scientific concept (Allan & Slee 2008: 2). What we understand inclusive education to be is constructed by a discourse community in a dynamic and interactive process that includes conceptualising and theorising, practice, reflection and research on practice. The metaphors used in this process help to construct our inclusion knowledge. Inclusive education becomes whatever the discourse community (authoritatively or repeatedly) states it is.

Metaphors also influence and determine action (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 3). Ways of thinking have a determining influence on ways of being and ways of acting, and the ways in which we think about inclusion will determine the way in which we practise inclusion (Brantlinger 2006: 46). South Africa is developing its own theory and practice of inclusive education which, while influenced by international perspectives and debates, also reflects its unique historical and educational context. The repeated use of metaphors is influential in this development and leads to a "collective bias" (Deignan 2005: 24) in our understanding. We concur with Lakoff & Johnson (2003: 243): "How we think metaphorically matters" and explore possible ways in which ways of thinking about inclusive education in South Africa (as revealed through metaphor) may influence ways of practising inclusive education at school level.

2. Aims

This article aims to identify the metaphors used for inclusive education in South Africa and to analyse these with a particular focus on possible implications for inclusive practice. It is not easy to determine what constitutes metaphor "use". Cameron (2003: 20) warns of "armchair reflection" methods of data collection for metaphor analysis whereby examples of metaphor use are recalled by native speakers. It is preferable to find examples of metaphor in actual use, rather than eliciting these from subjects in a research setting (Deignan 2005: 27). However, it is impossible to verify anecdotal evidence such as Thabo's teacher's use of metaphor. Corpus techniques that use software to scan large bodies of text for words can be used to identify metaphors in use. The corpus can be limited, depending on the aims of the investigation. For the purpose of this study, for a conceptual metaphor to have qualified as "in use" in South African inclusion discourse, it had to appear in the White Paper (as this country's seminal and directional document on inclusive education) and in subsequent departmental publications and/or academic writing.

3. Methodology

The qualitative research method draws on Schmitt's (2005) systematic metaphor analysis which is a step-by-step approach that facilitates "a systematic reflection of the metaphors in which, and through which, we perceive, speak, think, and act" (Schmitt 2005: 369). The first step in the process is to identify inclusion or inclusive education in South Africa as the target area. Schmitt's second step, namely unsystematic, broad-based collection of background metaphors, is narrowed to an initial search for metaphors for inclusion or inclusive education in the White Paper. The criteria for metaphor identification are that a word or phrase can be understood beyond its literal meaning in context, where the literal meaning arises from an area of sensory or cultural experience and is transferred to the target of inclusion or inclusive education (Schmitt 2005: 371). This broad definition of metaphor does not reflect the theoretical contests about the extent to which conventionalised metaphors should be included in a search for metaphor. However, as the aim of identifying metaphors is for analysis rather than for statistical purposes, this should not be deemed problematic (Deignan 2005: 33). In some instances, metaphors are not apparent in an A (target or topic) is B (vehicle) form as the target term (inclusive education) is implicit in the text (Cameron 2007: 117, Gibbs & Cameron 2008: 69).

The third stage involves the grouping of the individual instances of metaphorical idiom into metaphorical concepts or clusters using a process similar to that of the constant comparison method. The results of this categorisation suggest that the metaphorical concepts of inclusion as a goal, a building, a process, hospitality and a model are dominant in the White Paper. Before proceeding to the interpretation stage of metaphor analysis, these metaphorical concepts were sought in the South African literature (including official policy documents, speeches by government officials and academic writing) on inclusion in education since 2001. Inclusion as goal, building, hospitality and process are easily identified in the literature. Figure 1 summarises these findings, with the caveat that these instances of metaphor use are presented as illustrative, and do not purport

to be comprehensive or exhaustive. Anecdotal evidence gathered from our interaction with teachers and education managers suggests that these metaphor concepts are currently used in school contexts. These conceptual metaphors have been the focus of interpretation by exploring the strengths and resources that the metaphors offer together with the deficits or limits of the metaphor and the actions that the metaphor may motivate (Schmitt 2005: 375-8). Drawing on a discourse perspective, this article reflects the affective or sociocultural dimension of the metaphors by showing possible South African associations of metaphorical items. These contextual links may help to explain why these particular metaphor clusters (and not others) have become entrenched in inclusion discourse in this country. While the White Paper frequently uses "inclusion is a model", there appears to be little evidence of this metaphor in subsequent publications. This has been omitted from the present discussion.

The findings and discussion must be regarded as both tentative and subjective. As an exercise in interpretation, it is an "applied art" (Schmitt 2005: 369). It is acknowledged that the metaphors were found, read and interpreted within and through our own theories and assumptions. We are conscious of our own positions regarding inclusive education and are aware that we are not without ideological intent in our critique of metaphor in inclusion discourse (Allan & Slee 2008: 98). We use the very metaphors which we declaim, and we speak and write as members of the broad South African inclusive education discourse community. In order to enhance the trustworthiness of our findings, we observed the following guidelines in metaphor identification: the use, as far as possible, of the original language of the text to name metaphor categories or clusters, careful recording of the process and reasons for decisions made and inter-rater reliability checks between authors (Cameron 2007: 125, 126). In addition, we were concerned to find sufficient instances (or satiation) of the metaphors, such that we could be confident that we were dealing with "actual metaphorical projections" (Schmitt 2005: 381). Where we find metaphors to be problematic, we are concerned not to impute sinister motives to those who use them or in any way suggest that the users are deliberately undermining the inclusion effort. Instead, we

are concerned with the cumulative effect of a number of metaphors used across our chosen corpus.

4. Metaphor analysis

4.1 Inclusive education is a goal

The metaphorical concept of a goal refers to aims, destinations and targets, and implies the object of some effort to be achieved at some future or distant time. Probably originating from the Middle English *gol*, meaning boundary, the literal or sensory meaning of goal relates to the object of a football or other game – either the act of scoring, or the cage or posts to which the ball must be sent. The use of the goal metaphor for inclusion in South Africa reveals that its realisation is not regarded as an immediate possibility, given the legacy of the past and current contextual constraints. It is therefore an aim, something that should be worked towards and realised at a future date. In fact, the White Paper views inclusive education as a long-term goal to be achieved in twenty years (DoE 2001: 45). Teachers agree: "I [...] think Education White Paper 6 is realistic when it states that the process of infusing inclusive education is a twenty-year term. [... I]t is a process and it is not easy" (Stofile & Green 2007: 61). A goal metaphor resonates in South Africa where football (soccer) is the most popular sport (given particular emphasis by South Africa's hosting of the 2010 Soccer World Cup), and this positive affective association can be expected to reinforce and entrench the metaphor. In popular use, however, the expression of a goal does not necessarily have to imply effort; it can also be a desire or a dream. For this reason we have included the metaphorical instances of inclusion as a vision and an ideal in this metaphorical concept.

The goal metaphor must be problematised, however, given the immediate demands of the educational needs of children in South Africa. Not only has our system failed to accommodate the large numbers of out-of-school children and young adults (including those with disabilities), children within the system, like Thabo, and

the 196 164 Grade 12s who failed their matriculation examinations in 2009 (Mohlala & Dibetle 2010) are not receiving the support they require. Available capacity seems to determine what gets done in the implementation of inclusion, and when provincial education budgets are under strain, funding for inclusive education is curtailed. Despite the White Paper's clarity and criticism regarding the way in which the status quo perpetuates the marginalisation of learners, inclusive education "does not top the agenda of provincial education issues" (Wildeman & Nomdo 2007: 3, 18). It appears that when the goal metaphor is used to construct an understanding of inclusive education in South Africa, its practical result is delay and a lack of urgency in implementation at all levels.

An extension of the goal metaphor suggests possibilities to associate a sports team working together on a field with that of teachers in schools collaborating in the pursuit of effective inclusive teaching. However, the White Paper states: "Classroom educators will be our primary resource for achieving our goal …" (DoE 2001: 18). This highlights the role of teachers. Teachers do not own the goal; it belongs to the Ministry (or whoever "our" refers to). Teachers are distanced from direct responsibility for inclusion and are merely a resource to be used in the achievement of the goal. This marginalisation of teachers in the goal metaphor in the White Paper does not bode well for inclusive education. According to Howes *et al* (2009: 3), teachers are "so influential in schools that inclusion can only be addressed with their active engagement". This deficiency in the goal metaphor is compounded rather than corrected by the building metaphor.

4.2 Inclusive education is a building

South African policy documents make extensive use of building metaphors as they describe the implementation of inclusive education. Inclusive education is to be built, replete with foundations, frameworks and structures.[4] We suggest some reasons

4 Foundations, frameworks and structures are not always used in the White Paper as direct metaphors for inclusive education, but are used broadly in conceptualising aspects of the inclusive education system.

for the ubiquity of this metaphor category in inclusion discourse before raising concerns in terms of its influence on inclusion thinking and practice. Inclusive education was new to South Africa and the building metaphor usefully describes the need to form something where previously there was nothing. Building speaks of plans, a systematic approach, the application of skill and the creation of something permanent and useful, all apt for the task of transforming the South African education system. Building takes effort and the desired outcome is not achieved overnight. These characteristics can also apply to developing inclusive education. Building has particularly rich associations with South Africans in the post-apartheid era as the democratic government has built over 2.6 million new houses (Ndawonde 2009) and thus has positive connotations through its link with community, progress and upliftment. In many ways, building metaphors are helpful and valid in conceptualising inclusive education. But, perhaps more than any other metaphor for inclusive education in South Africa, this one contributes to the reification of the act of including.

If inclusive education is built, it becomes a building, and therefore a thing rather than an action – it has been reified. This is by no means unique to South Africa – "inclusion", the act of including, has become a discourse of its own, with definitions, debates, conferences, journals and contested theories and practices. The reification of inclusion involves the process of nominalisation (Thompson 1990: 66) by transforming the transitive verb "include", which requires a subject and an object (in other words, actors and agents) in time and space, into a noun. As a result, inclusive education becomes something with which teachers can agree or disagree or it becomes another programme to be implemented or resisted.[5] It is practically easier (and professionally acceptable) to say that our school is not

5 South African teachers' attitudes towards "inclusion" have been a rich line of academic enquiry, so much so that the 2006 Human Sciences Research Council and Disabled People of South Africa report (Lorenzo & Schneider 2006: 8) observed that studies have shown that teachers' negative attitudes and lack of preparedness for inclusion have been overemphasised.

concerned with inclusion, than it is to say that I do not include this learner in my classroom activities.

A second aspect of reification is that of passivisation (Thompson 1990: 66). There is a noticeable lack of individual or human agency in the building of inclusive education in the White Paper. The somewhat amorphous "Ministry" is the usual subject (for example, "[…] for the Ministry to establish an inclusive education and training system, it will […]" (DoE 2001: 27)); "we" is often the subject, and the "department of education" also features as the subject. The passive voice is often used, as in "An inclusive education and training system is organised […]" (DoE 2001: 16) and "These actions will be undertaken" (DoE 2001: 28). According to Thompson (1990: 66), the effect of nominalisation and passivisation is to "delete actors and agency and […] represent processes as things or events which take place in the absence of a subject who produces them". The combined effect of this is to distance individual classroom teachers from the responsibility to build inclusive education, as they are not the builders. Given this manner of writing about inclusive education, it is not surprising that Thabo's teacher is so confident in deflecting responsibility for inclusion to the department.

4.3 Inclusion is a process

The process, movement, step and journey metaphors for inclusion have been categorised together as they seem to be conceptually similar in their intent and effect. Journeys are evocative in the South African context. Nelson Mandela entitled his autobiography *Long walk to freedom* (1994) and as a result of migrant labour, forced relocation and urbanisation, journeys to various parts of the country are embedded in the South African experience. Movement or process metaphors for inclusion are not unique to South Africa and are used in the international literature on inclusion (*cf* Booth 1996: 89, Pijl & Frissen 2009: 370). The extensive use of this metaphor emphasises that inclusion in education does not happen instantly and that it is not an all-or-nothing concept. The process metaphor has been used to encourage efforts towards inclusion (*cf* Booth & Ainscow 2000: 12) and to rebut the detractors of

inclusion who found the general classroom not immediately prepared to support diverse learning needs. Steps, journeys, and processes are all metaphors that imply linear progression. This conceptualisation has led to efforts to locate schools on a continuum of progress towards greater inclusivity and responsiveness to learning needs (Giorcelli 2007: 154-5, Walton 2006: 164).

These metaphors are limited in that they fail to convey the messy and often contradictory nature of inclusion in a school. Thabo was excluded from meaningful participation in the numeracy lesson, but may have been socially included at break time on the soccer field. As much as Thabo's teacher was ignoring his learning needs, the teacher in the next classroom may have been successful in designing and delivering lessons relevant to all her learners. Benjamin *et al* (2003: 547) usefully call this "moments of inclusion and exclusion" as they describe how teachers and learners enact inclusion and exclusion moment-by-moment. Schools and even education systems may be sites of multiple inclusions and exclusions across time and place. In South Africa there are examples of independent schools that implement a variety of educational practices well suited to the support of learners with a wide range of learning needs. They would therefore regard themselves as inclusive. These same schools, however, exclude on the basis of religion or, because of their high fees, are inaccessible to all but the very wealthy (Walton 2006: 53). These contradictions expose the conceptual limitations of linear metaphors for inclusion.

In its application to practice, a shortcoming of the process/journey metaphor is that it is all-embracing. Because inclusion is the process or journey, and not the event or the destination, we can have a broad, diluted and very elastic notion of what inclusion is in practice. Lunt & Norwich (1999: 32) raised this concern ten years ago, saying that conceiving inclusion as an unending process it makes it "hard to apply the term", noting that "any educational practice which involves some, but not pure inclusive features, can come to be identified as exclusionary". We would suggest that the reverse is also true, in particular in South Africa. A process metaphor which allows any educational practice that involves some, but not pure inclusive features can be identified as inclusionary. For example, one

elite independent school for boys in Johannesburg maintains that it is becoming inclusive because it now admits a percentage of boys who are challenged by the demands of the academic curriculum. This sounds admirable, yet these "included" boys are consigned to a separate "stream" or "set" for a number of lessons where they receive instruction apart from their peers. The process metaphor allows this practice to be recognised (at least by the school) on the inclusion continuum because it is a step in the right direction. However, we question whether it should count as inclusion (Walton & Nel forthcoming).

Our conversations with teachers and education managers suggest that the process/journey metaphor is used to justify exclusion while ostensibly showing a commitment to inclusion. For example, a principal said: "We are not there yet" to explain why a learner with Down 's syndrome was refused admission to a school. This principal was able to locate the school on the inclusive journey (thus deflecting possible criticism) but rationalise exclusion in terms of limited progress thus far. A learner whose educational difficulties may have compromised a school's matriculation pass rate was referred to the school in the next neighbourhood because "they are further down the inclusion path, so they can help". Thus the process metaphors that are coined with the intention to promote or encourage inclusion are used to exclude.

4.4 Inclusion is hospitality

This conceptual metaphor reflects the cluster of metaphorical items of welcome, accommodation, service and catering, which are used extensively in the selected corpus. The term "hospitality", however, does not appear as a metaphorical item itself but, as a concept, we agree that it incorporates all the individual items. The prevalence of this metaphor is interesting, given that South Africans seem somewhat ambiguous about hospitality. The growing tourism industry is concerned to present South Africans as a warm and welcoming people, famous for their hospitality.[6]

6 Examples can be found at <http://celebrate.southafrica net; http://www.travel-wires.com/wp/2008/11/brush-up-on-famous-south-african-hospitality-sat-

Both in a domestic or commercial context, hospitality is positive in its association with welcome and a responsibility to meet needs, giving the hospitality metaphors for inclusion value. According to the Department's guidelines, inclusive schools welcome all learners within a culture that celebrates diversity and ensures that individual learning and needs for support are met (DoE 2009: 2).

Problems are associated with the hospitality metaphor for various reasons. Thinking of and practising inclusion as hospitality positions some learners as guests who do not belong by right, they have to be welcomed, accommodated, served and catered for. Significantly, only learners who have been identified as experiencing barriers to learning have to be accommodated. It is presumed that the remainder belong automatically. A sentence in the minister's introduction to the White Paper is telling in this regard:

> Let us work together to nurture our people with disabilities so that they also experience the full excitement and the joy of learning, and to provide them, and our nation, with a solid foundation for lifelong learning and development (DoE 2001: 4).

People with disabilities are, in this construction, "they" and "them", as distinct from "us" and "our", and are the objects of nurture. Not only does this assume that it is possible to divide people according to (dis)ability, it also positions people with disabilities as children who need the tender care of nurturing work. Thus the hospitality metaphor describes the education system as a gracious host, now expanding its capacity to receive and accommodate previously unwelcome guests. In fact, the extent to which learners would be welcomed in a school will be determined by the school's capacity to cater for them (DoE 2005: 11 & 2008b: 20). Extending the metaphor, some learners are guests, and their welcome conditional on the school's ability to cater for their (special) needs. Should those needs extend beyond the school's capacity to accommodate them, the learner-guest would no longer be welcome in that school.

welcome-campaign/>; <http://www.exploresouthafrica net/culture/; http://www.southafrica.info/2010/tourism-131109.htm>

The hospitality metaphor may thus contribute to an assimilationist model of inclusion in South Africa. When the education system is framed as a site of hospitality, it is difficult to apply critical, but necessary evaluation of that system.[7] Thus, while the focus remains on the accommodation of individual learners within the system, the system itself is exempt from examining and addressing the many ways in which exclusion is perpetuated. Much as the White Paper seeks to distance inclusive education from mainstreaming (enabling learners to fit in with an existing system), the hospitality metaphors undermine this intent by presenting the system as normative. The White Paper identifies some learners as having different learning needs as a result of the barriers to learning they experience. The education system thus represents the norm, or the ideal from which these learners differ. Like a host making accommodation and catering arrangements for invited guests, the inclusive education system will determine the support needs of these learners and accommodate them accordingly (DoE 2001: 15). As Allan & Slee (2008: 99) eloquently state (using metaphors themselves) "inclusive education requires reform that speaks to the architecture and grammar of schooling, not just to its inhabitants". Inclusive education should radically challenge systemic injustice and the ways in which power and privilege operate to marginalise and exclude people. But by using hospitality metaphors, we risk taming or domesticating inclusive education, making it a benign, if not paternalistic endeavour, rather than a radical force with "insurrectionary power" (Slee 2009: pp?).

Metaphor use is never static and an interpretation of the hospitality metaphor in the South African context cannot ignore recent violent xenophobic attacks by local people against *makwerekwere*, foreign nationals who have settled in South African towns and informal settlements.[8] These attacks were widely condemned, yet persist

7 We have been taught since childhood that it is rude to be ungrateful, complain or be critical about the meals, customs and arrangements when in other people's homes.

8 Comments on the xenophobia attacks can be found at <http://www.unitedforafrica.co.za>; <http://www.mg.co.za/article/2009-03-11-local-leadersbehind-xenophobic-attacks>

in sporadic incidents across the country, suggesting that, at least in some contexts, hospitality is extended to visitors and community members, not outsiders who presume to come and live in this country. Among the reasons suggested for the xenophobic attacks is the perception that foreigners take jobs and compete for limited resources, leaving less for South Africans.[9] In this context, inclusion as hospitality (welcoming and accommodating previously excluded learners) may ultimately be a self-defeating metaphor. Many South African classrooms are crowded, with low teacher-to-pupil ratios. Additional learners, with additional support needs, may simply not be welcome in classrooms where human and material resources are already overtaxed. In this regard, Engelbrecht (2006: 260) documents "discriminatory practices towards 'outsiders' and those who are 'different'", noting that "... children with disabilities [...] are viewed by both teachers and learners as 'different'" and that "[t]hey are bullied". With regard to limited resources, Loebenstein (2005: 146) reports a teacher as saying: "How does the department expect that we have inclusive education when we have such large class sizes? [... W]e can't even give the attention to the students who need a little extra attention". In our work in South African schools, we have heard parents complain that learners with disabilities in inclusive classrooms take up more than their fair share of teachers' time and attention.

The South African ambivalence about hospitality, especially when it comes to sharing scarce resources with those perceived to be outsiders, considerably limits the value of this metaphor for inclusion in this country. Having explained the four dominant metaphors for inclusive education, we find that these metaphors are not merely inadequate, but potentially counter-productive in the inclusive endeavour in this country. Danforth & Kim (2007: 61), writing in the context of ADHD metaphors, suggest intentionally cultivating alternative metaphors that contain the elements missing in the conventional metaphors. When we speak of inclusive education in South Africa, we need metaphors that convey the urgency of our situation. We are gratified to note the Minister of Education's recent

9 *Cf* Xenophobia South Africa <www.xenophobia.org.za>

statement of commitment to inclusive education and the allocation of funds for the expansion of inclusive education, but find that to date only eight schools in the country have completed their physical conversion to being full service schools, equipped to meet a variety of learning needs (Motshegka 2010a & 2010b). Because we believe that every child in South Africa has the right to a quality education, we need metaphors that make inclusion an imperative, not an ideal. We believe that we could co-opt aspects of the language of the struggle against apartheid with its passion, commitment and radical critique of the existing system to frame inclusion discourse. Those opposing apartheid rejected the limited participation offered in the homeland system or the tri-cameral parliament of 1984, and refused to compromise until full racial equality and universal suffrage was achieved. It is perhaps time for more militant metaphors that challenge our thinking about who can belong in South African schools, who decides and whose interests are served by these decisions.

5. Conclusion

This article attempted to show that inclusion in South Africa is described by metaphor and that the metaphors we use determine how we think about and therefore practise inclusion. The limitations inherent in any one metaphor used in connection with a target are often overcome by other metaphors used for that target. It is to be expected that the limitations of the goal metaphor, which locates the realisation of inclusion in a future time, should be offset by the process metaphor, which makes inclusion the ongoing and incremental reduction of exclusionary pressures and practices. In practice in South Africa, however, both these metaphors, and that of inclusion as building, work against positioning inclusion as an urgent imperative for classroom teachers, education managers and department officials. In addition, the hospitality metaphors have the potential to reduce our thinking about inclusive education to a question of whether or how previously excluded learners can now be accommodated in a largely unreconstructed education system. New metaphors that address the scandal of exclusion in our schools are needed in the

South African construction of the concept of inclusive education. These new metaphors need to be aggressive, demanding and urgent if they are to make up for the shortfalls of our current metaphors. This is not to suggest that political will, funding, human and technical resources, facilities, training, community partnerships and other levers are not important – these are all vital if inclusion is to be implemented effectively in South African education. But attention needs to be paid to the metaphors in the way we talk and write about inclusion, because these metaphors influence the way we think about inclusion, and ultimately, help to determine if and how we include.

Bibliography

Allan J & R Slee
2008. *Doing inclusive education research*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Benjamin S, M Nind, K Hall, J Collins & K Sheehy
2003. Moments of inclusion and exclusion: pupils negotiating classroom contexts. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 24(5): 547-58.

Booth T
1996. A perspective on inclusion from England. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 6(1): 87-99.

Booth T & M Ainscow
2000. *Index for inclusion.* Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Booth T & M Ainscow (eds)
1998. *From them to us. An international study of inclusion in education*. London: Routledge.

Brantlinger E
2006. The big glossies: how textbooks structure (special) education. Brantlinger (ed) 2006: 45-76.

Brantlinger E (ed)
2006. *Who benefits from special education? Remediating (fixing) other people's children*. Mahwah, state?: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cameron L
2003. *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London: Continuum.

2007. Confrontation or complementarity? Metaphor in language use and cognitive metaphor theory. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistic* (5): 107-35.

Cameron L & A Deignan
2006. The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics* 27(4): 671-90.

Clark C, A Dyson & A Millward (eds)
1995. *Towards inclusive schools?* London: David Fulton Publishers.

Danforth S
2007. Disability as metaphor: examining the conceptual framing of emotional behavioral disorder in American public education. *Educational Studies* 42(1): 8-27.

Danforth S & T Kim
2008. Tracing the metaphors of ADHD: a preliminary analysis with implications for inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 12(1): 49-64.

Danforth S & S Naraian
2007. Use of the machine metaphor within autism research. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities* 19(3): 273-90.

DEIGNAN A
2005. *Metaphor and corpus linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (DoE)
2001. *Education White Paper Six: special needs education: building an inclusive education and training system*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

2002. *Revised national curriculum statement grades R-9: overview*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

2003. *Revised national curriculum statement grades R-9: teacher's guide for the development of learning programmes: languages*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

2005. *Curriculum adaptation guidelines of the revised national curriculum statement*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

2007. *Guidelines to ensure quality education and support in special schools and special school resource centres*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

2008a. *National strategy on screening, identification, assessment and support.* Pretoria: Department of Education.

2008b. *Inclusion today*. Newsletter of the Directorate: inclusive education 1(1).

2009. *Guidelines for full-service/ inclusive schools.* Pretoria: Department of Education.

2010. *Curriculum and assessment policy statement. Social sciences intermediate phase. Final draft*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

DONALD D, S LAZARUS & P LOLWANA
2002. *Educational psychology in social context.* 2nd ed. Cape Town: Oxford Southern Africa.

DU TOIT P & C FORLIN
2009. Cultural transformation for inclusion: what is needed? A South African perspective. *School Psychology International* 30(6): 644-55.

ENGELBRECHT A & H SWANEPOEL
2009. *Inclusion: a never ending journey*. Silverton: Corporate Assessment Solutions.

ENGELBRECHT P
2006. The implementation of inclusive education in South Africa after ten years of democracy. *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 21(3): 253-64.

2009. Inclusive psychology and social transformation: responding to the challenges of the new South Africa. Hick *et al* (eds) 2009: 108-16.

ENGELBRECHT P & L GREEN (eds)
2007. *Responding to the challenges of inclusive education in Southern Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

ENGELBRECHT P, M OSWALD & C FORLIN
2006. Promoting the implementation of inclusive education in primary schools in South Africa. *British Journal of Special Education* 33(3): 121-9.

FAIRCLOUGH N
1992. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

GABEL L & S DANFORTH (eds)
2008. *Disability and the politics of education: an international reader.* New York: Peter Lang.

GEE J
2005. *An introduction to discourse analysis theory and method*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

GIBBS R & L CAMERON
2008. The social-cognitive dynamics of metaphor performance. *Cognitive Systems Research* 9(1/2): 64-75.

GIORCELLI L
2007. Making inclusion work: improving educational outcomes for deaf and hard of hearing students in regular classrooms. Power & Leigh (eds) 2007: 150-60.

GREEN L & P ENGELBRECHT
2007. An introduction to inclusive education. Engelbrecht & Green (eds) 2007: 2-9.

HALL R
2002. Implementing inclusive educational practices through partnerships. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 16(3): 31-7.

HICK P, R KERSHNER & P FARRELL (eds)
2009. *Psychology for inclusive education*. Oxon: Routledge.

HOWES A, S DAVIES & S FOX
2009. *Improving the context for inclusion: personalising teacher development through collaborative action research*. Abingdon: Routledge.

KITTAY E
1987. *Metaphor. Its cognitive force and linguistic structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LAKOFF G
1993. The contemporary theory of metaphor. Ortony (ed) 1993: 202-51.

LAKOFF G & M JOHNSON
2003. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LOEBENSTEIN H
2005. Support for learners with intellectual disabilities in the transition to secondary school. Unpubl PhD (Specialised Education) thesis. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.

LORENZO T & M SCHNEIDER
2006. Critical issues in disability research – taking the field forward. Unpubl report compiled on the roundtable discussion organised by the Human Sciences Research Council and Disabled People South Africa and funded by the National Research Foundation.

LUNT I & B NORWICH
1999. *Can effective schools be inclusive schools?* London: Institute of Education, University of London.

MANDELA N
1994. *Long walk to freedom*. London: Abacus.

MASONDO G
2008. Three years in rural inclusion. Unpubl presentation at the Southern African Association for Learning and Educational Differences Conference: from inclusion to belonging – widening the classroom circle. The Forum, Bryanston, Johannesburg, 9-12 July 2008.

MCLESKEY J & N WALDRON
2006. Comprehensive school reform and inclusive schools. *Theory into Practice* 45(3): 269-88.

MITCHELL D
2005. *Contextualizing inclusive education*. Milton Park: Routledge.

MOHLALA T & M DIBETLE
2010. Second chance for those who failed matric. *Mail & Guardian*. <http://www.mg.co.za/article/2008-01-04-second-chance-for-those-who-failed-matric>

MOTSHEGKA A
2010a. National Council of Provinces: reply to question 91 asked by Mr M J R de Villiers (Democratic Alliance – Western Cape) (Internal Question Paper: 5-2010). <http://www.inclusion.co.za/media/docs/WQ%2091%20NCOP%20Learners%20with%20disabilities%20in%20mainstream%20schools%5B1%5D.pdf>

2010b. Reply to question 526 asked by Mrs P C Duncan (Democratic Alliance). <http://www.inclusion.co.za/media/docs/WQ%20526%20NA%20Invlusive%20education%5B1%5D.pdf>

NAICKER S
2005. Inclusive education in South Africa: an emerging pedagogy of possibility. Mitchell (ed) 2005: 230-52.

NDAWONDE PN
2009. South Africa: over 2.6 million houses built since 1994. *Architect Africa Online.* <http://architectafrica.com/node/913>

Ngcobo J & Z Muthukrishna
2008. Teachers' dominant discourses of inclusion and disability. Gabel & Danforth (eds) 2008:19-24.

Ortony A (ed)
1993. *Metaphor and thought.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pijl S & P Frissen
2009. What policy makers can do to make education inclusive. *Educational Management Administration Leadership* 37(3): 366-77.

Pottas L
2004. Inclusive education in South Africa: the challenges posed to the teacher of the child with a hearing loss. Unpubl DPhil thesis in Communication Pathology. Department of Communication Pathology, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.

Power D & G Leigh (eds)
2007. *Educating deaf students: global perspectives*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Prinsloo E
2001. Working towards inclusive education in South African classrooms. *South African Journal of Education* 21(4): 344-8.

Republic of South Africa (RSA)
2010. *Action Plan to 2014: towards the realisation of Schooling 2025*. Notice 752 of 2010. Government Gazette 33434. Cape Town: Government Printer.

1996a. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996*. Act No 108 of 1996. Government Gazette 378 (17678). Cape Town: Government Printer.

1996b. *South African Schools Act, 1996*. Act No 84 of 1996. Government Gazette 377 (17579). Cape Town: Government Printer.

Sapon-Shevin M
2007. *Widening the circle: the power of inclusive classrooms*. Boston: Beacon.

Schmitt R
2005. Systematic metaphor analysis as a method of qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report* 10(2): 358-94.

Shaddock A, L Giorcelli & S Smith
2007. *Students with disabilities in mainstream classrooms: a resource for teachers*. Commonwealth of Australia. <http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/D3113371-7E2C-49FE-8017-8495030736BF/19755/InclusiveClassroomTeacherResource-Final1.pdf>

Slee R
2009. Audio interview with Roger Slee, Editor, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, at the Institute of Education, London. Routledge Education Arena. <www.educationarena.com/pdf/rslee_transcript.pdf>

Stofile S & L Green
2007. Inclusive education in South Africa. Engelbrecht & Green (eds) 2007: 52-65.

Sukhraj P
2006. The implementation and challenges to inclusive education policy and practice in South Africa. Presentation at a conference of The International Council on Education of Visually Impaired Persons, Kuala Lampur, Malaysia, 16-21 July 2006. <http://www.icevi.org/publications/icevi_wc2006/09_inclusive_educational_practices/Papers/afr_006_praveena%20sukhray.pdf>

Swart E, P Engelbrecht, I Eloff & R Pettipher
2002. Implementing inclusive education in South Africa: teachers' attitudes and experiences. *Acta Academia* 34(1): 175-89.

Swart E, P Engelbrecht, I Eloff, R Pettipher & M Oswald
2004. Developing inclusive school communities: voices of parents of children with disabilities. *Education as Change* 8(1): 80-108.

Swart E & M Oswald
2008. How teachers navigate their learning in developing inclusive learning communities. *Education as Change* 12(2): 91-108.

Thompson J
1990. *Ideology and modern culture.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Tomlinson C, K Brimijoin & L Narvaez
2008. *The differentiated school*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

UNESCO
2009. Education for all. Global monitoring report 2009. Regional overview: sub-Saharan Africa. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001784/178418e.pdf>

University of the Western Cape (UWC)
2002. Resource and training programme for educator development: building an inclusive education and training system. End-term National Quality Evaluation. Final Report. Cape Town: Education Policy Unity, University of the Western Cape.

Vislie L
1995. Integration policies, school reforms and the organisation of schooling for handicapped pupils in Western societies. Clark *et al* (eds) 1995: 42-53.

Vosloo S
2009. The functioning of primary school learners with paraplegia/paraparesis in mainstream schools in the Western Cape, South Africa. An exploratory study. *Disability and Rehabilitation* 31(1): 23-31.

WALTON E
2011. Getting inclusion right in South Africa. *Intervention in School and Clinic* 46(4): 240-5.

2011. 'They discluded me': possibilities and limitations of children's participation in inclusion research in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education* 29(1): 83-92.

2006. The extent and practice of inclusion in independent schools (ISASA members) in Southern Africa. Unpubl DEd thesis in Inclusive Education. Faculty of Education, University of South Africa, Pretoria.

WALTON E & N NEL
Forthcoming. What counts as inclusion? *Africa Education Review.*

WALTON E, N NEL, A HUGO & H MULLER
2009. The extent and practice of inclusion in independent schools (ISASA members) in Southern Africa. *South African Journal of Education* 29(1): 105-26.

WAY E
1991. *Knowledge representation and metaphor*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

WILDEMAN R & C NOMDO
2007. Implementation of inclusive education: how far are we? *Occasional Papers: IDASA – Budget Information Service*: 1-35. <http://www.idasa.org/media/uploads/outputs/files/inclusive%20Education%20Occasional%20Paper%202007.pdf>

WILLIAMS E, T OLIVIER & C PIENAAR
2009. A model to revitalise teacher competence. *Acta Academica* 41(4): 195-217.

Figure 1: Table of metaphors used in South African inclusive education discourse

Conceptual metaphor	Metaphorical item	Source	Context
Inclusive education is a goal	Goal	The White Paper (DoE 2001)	"our policy goal of inclusion" (2, 22) "our goal of an inclusive education and training system" (18) "our long term goal of an inclusive education and training system" (45)
		Prinsloo 2001	"South Africa has set a firm foot on the road towards realizing this goal [...of] providing quality education for all learners within the mainstream of education" (344)
		Naicker 2005	"The social goal, which is inextricably linked with the educational goal, provides a platform for creating inclusive spaces in South African educational institutions" (250)
		Guidelines (DoE 2009)	Everyone at schools is responsible for the education of each learner and introducing reasonable accommodations with are "in keeping with the goals of full inclusion" (7)
	Vision	The White Paper (DoE 2001)	"[T]he education and training system should promote education for all and foster the development of inclusive and supportive centres of learning [...] The principles guiding the broad strategies to achieve this vision include [...]" (6) "The vision and goals outlined in this White Paper reflect a 20-year developmental perspective." (45)
		Pottas 2004	"... the vision for inclusive education" (71)
		Engelbrecht 2009	"... the vision of an educational system that not only recognises the wide diversity of children's educational needs but also expects schools to meet these diverse needs" (111)
		Guidelines (DoE 2009)	"A full-service school seeks to embrace the vision of a society for all" (7)
	Ideal	Prinsloo 2001	"... realising the ideals of inclusive education" (345)
		Sukhraj 2006	"... inclusive education would indeed be the ideal" (1)

Inclusive education is a process	Journey/ steps	The White Paper (DoE 2001)	"The White Paper [...] lists the key steps to be taken in establishing an inclusive education and training system for South Africa" (5)
		Prinsloo 2001	"South Africa has set a firm foot on the road towards realizing this goal [...of] providing quality education for all learners within the mainstream of education" (344)
		UWC 2002	"'Inclusion is never a static outcome. It is an objective that is constantly being worked towards. This means that the emphasis should be on identifying the signs that indicate we are 'on the way' [...]" (151)
		Swart *et al* 2004	"the journey towards inclusive education" (105)
		Engelbrecht & Swanepoel 2009	"Inclusive education: a never-ending journey" (Title of prescribed textbook for postgraduate students at the University of Pretoria)
		Motshegka 2010a	"the department has already introduced several steps to address the capacity of ordinary schools to include learners with disabilities" (pp no?)
		Motshegka 2010b	"The Department is taking gradual steps to ensure that there are sufficient schools with the required, structural and communication accessibility for children and youth with disabilities" (pp no?)
	Process	The White Paper (DoE 2001)	"... a realistic and effective implementation process that moves responsibly towards the development of a system that accommodates and respects diversity [...]" (12)
		Donald et al 2002	"full implementation [of inclusive education] will be a long term process" (298)
		Engelbrecht et al 2006	"Achieving an inclusive school community ... implies a process" (122)
		Guidelines (DoE 2009)	"Inclusion should [...] be seen as a process rather than an event" (8)
	Movement towards	Green & Engelbrecht 2007	"the movement towards inclusive education" (8)
		Inclusive Education Directorate (DoE 2008b)	"Moving ahead with inclusion in South Africa" (Newsletter headline)

Inclusive education is a building	Build (ing)		The White Paper (DoE 2001)	"Build(ing) an inclusive education and training system" (4, 6, 16, 17, 30, 32, 50)
			Swart & Oswald 2008	"building inclusive learning communities" (104)
			Ngcobo & Muthukrishna 2008	"This requires communities to build a school environment in which the needs of every child are accommodated" (36)
			Guidelines (DoE 2009)	"building an inclusive education system" (1) "building an inclusive environment" (16)
		Foundations	The White Paper (DoE 2001)	"laying the foundations of the inclusive education and training system" (46)
		Structures	The White Paper (DoE 2001)	"The White Paper proposes a mix of institutional structures [...] to meet the challenges of provision within an inclusive system" (38) "Inclusive education and training is about ... enabling education structures" (16)
		Framework	The White Paper (DoE 2001)	"policy framework for establishing an inclusive education and training system" (23) "accommodation within an inclusive education and training framework" (25)
			Engelbrecht & Swanepoel 2009	"The inclusion education framework" (68)
			Guidelines (DoE 2009)	"[T]he guidelines ... are designed to provide a practical framework for education settings to become inclusive institutions." (2)