

#SayTheWord: Is Disability Included in Diversity Training for Social Work Educators?

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Millersville University of Pennsylvania

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Social Work

By Carrie Elizabeth Blakesley Snyder

April 15, 2022

This Dissertation for the Doctoral Social Work Degree by
Carrie Elizabeth Blakesley Snyder
has been approved on behalf of the
Millersville University Doctor of Social Work program by

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Laura Brierton Granruth
Dr. Laura Brierton Granruth, Chair

Dr. Karen Rice
Dr. Karen Rice

Dr. Thomas Neuville
Dr. Thomas Neuville

April 15, 2022
Date

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

#SayTheWord: Is Disability Included in Diversity Training for Social Work Educators?

By

Carrie Elizabeth Blakesley Snyder

Millersville University, 2022

Directed by Dr. Laura Brierton Granruth, Ph.D.

Students with disabilities are enrolling in institutions of higher education, and in the human services fields, at increasing rates. Not only are social work educators expected to effectively teach disabled students, but under the diversity mandates of the EPAS, they are also expected to include disability in their curricula. The phenomenological study explored the experiences of social work educators in higher education settings and the diversity trainings received at their institutions to determine how inclusive these trainings were of disability. This investigation sought to develop an understanding of how the social work educators perceived that the trainings prepared them to teach students with disabilities and to incorporate disability into their curricula. The study found that while institutions are not offering much in disability diversity training, social work educators are seeking out training elsewhere to prepare them to both teach disabled students in their class and to be inclusive of disability in their coursework.

Keywords: social work education, diversity training, disability

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to disabled doctoral students, disabled social work students, and any disabled students who have ever doubted themselves, or who were told that their dreams were just too difficult to achieve due to their disabilities. We *can* do it. It may take us longer, and our journeys may look different, but our dreams *are* achievable. To those who blazed the trail before me, and to those who come after me, thank you. I am forever grateful for our community.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people to thank, for without them I would not be where I am, or who I am, today:

My mother, Gayle, who always believed that I could do anything, and instilled a strong work ethic in me. You were my first, and fiercest, cheerleader. And my husband, Wayne, who joined the cheer squad and supported me through all the long days and nights of classes and writing, even bringing me dinner at my computer to make sure I would eat. You both sacrificed so much to help me achieve my goals. My grandmother, Shirley, who has always supported my endeavors, and has never missed a chance to tell others how proud she is of her granddaughter, even as her other memories are fading. My friend and mentor Cliff, who was not only a fantastic cheerleader, but without whom I would never have found my disability identity and voice. My friend Shin, who was not only my peer reviewer, reading endless drafts of chapters, but cheered me on through texts and phone calls when things got tough. And my friend Stacy, who not only battled with NVivo 12 on my behalf but was there to celebrate my victories and to empathize with my frustrations. You were another tireless cheerleader. Who knew that we'd both end up here when we happened to next to each other at a conference?

Thank you to my chair, Dr. Granruth, for your guidance and support, and for stepping in when I needed someone to assist me on this journey of ups and downs. Thank you, Dr. Rice, for listening and being proactive. Dr. Neville, thank you for sharing your knowledge and perspective on disability. I really had an amazing committee.

And finally, I want to recognize and thank my cohort, my DSW family. Through classes, group projects, and chats, you kept me on track and let me know that I wasn't alone on this

journey. We started out strangers, and experienced some bumps in the road, but through it all we supported each other. I know I have some friends and colleagues to whom I can reach out for advice and resources as we end our academic time together.

Table of Contents

Abstract of the Dissertation	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	xii
A note about language and disability identity.....	xiii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Problem Statement	1
Faculty Development and Diversity Training.....	4
Relevance to Social Work Education	5
Theoretical Framework.....	9
Critical Disability Theory	9
Disability as Multiculturalism.....	11
Intergroup Contact Theory.....	14
Aim and Research Questions	15
Chapter 2: Literature Review	17
Diversity Training.....	17
Diversity Training in Higher Education	18

Disability Diversity Training	20
Social Work Education and Disability.....	22
Students with Disabilities in Social Work Programs.....	22
Universal Instructional Design	23
Students with Mental Health Disabilities	25
Disability in Social Work Curricula	27
Disability Culture.....	28
Medical Model vs Social Model.....	29
Coursework in Disability	30
Diversity Training for Social Work Educators.....	31
Training for Field Instructors.....	31
Training for Classroom Instructors.....	33
Adventure Education	35
Intergroup Dialogue	36
Gaps in the Literature.....	37
Chapter 3: Methodology	39
Research Design.....	39
Phenomenological Design	39
Trustworthiness.....	41
Sampling.....	42

Research Sample.....	42
Data Collection	44
Semi-structured Interview Protocol	44
Confidentiality	46
Data Analysis	46
Coding.....	47
Reflexivity Statement.....	50
Chapter 4: Research Findings	51
Demographics of Participants.....	52
Results in Context of Research Questions	54
Is the diversity training offered to social work educators by their postsecondary institutions inclusive of disability?	55
Lack of Disability Inclusion in Diversity Trainings Offered by the Institution	55
Inclusion of Disability Trainings at the Departmental Level.....	57
Models or Perspective of Disabilities Included in Trainings.....	58
Changes in Perception of Disability	59
Obtaining Training Elsewhere for Personal Development	61
How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to include disability in the social work curriculum?	62
Course Design.....	63

Curriculum Design.....	64
How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to work with students with disabilities in their classes?.....	64
Accommodations	65
Course Material Accessibility.....	66
Universal Instructional Design (UID).....	67
Additional Training Needed	67
Theory	68
Understanding the Students’ Perspective.....	68
Technology	68
Introspective Learning	69
Universal Instructional Design	70
Accommodations	70
Summary of Findings.....	71
Chapter 5: Discussion, Implications, and Conclusions.....	72
Research Summary and Conclusions.....	72
Is the diversity training offered to social work educators by their postsecondary institutions inclusive of disability?	72
Lack of Disability Inclusion in Diversity Trainings Offered by the Institution	72
Inclusion of Disability Trainings at the Departmental Level.....	73

Models or Perspective of Disabilities Included in Trainings.....	73
Changes in Perception of disability	74
Obtaining Training Elsewhere for Personal Development.....	75
How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to include disability in the social work curriculum?	77
Course Design.....	77
Curriculum Design.....	77
How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to work with students with disabilities in their classes?.....	78
Accommodations	78
Course Material Accessibility.....	79
Universal Instructional Design	79
Additional Training Needed	79
Theory.....	79
Understanding the Students’ Perspective.....	80
Technology	80
Introspective Learning	81
Universal Instructional Design	81
Accommodations	81
Discussion of Results in Context of Theoretical Framework	72

Critical Disability Theory (CDT).....	82
Disability as Multiculturalism.....	83
Intergroup Contact Theory.....	84
Implications.....	84
Implications for Institutions.....	85
Institutions.....	85
Social Work Departments.....	86
Implications for Professional Organizations.....	87
Strengths and Limitations	88
Recommendations for Further Study	90
Conclusion	90
References.....	92
Appendix A: Informed Consent Form	103
Appendix B: Semi-structured Interview Protocol.....	106
Appendix C: A Priori Codes and Subcodes.....	110
Appendix D: Full List of Codes and Subcodes.....	113

List of Tables

Table 4.1 Demographics of Participants 53

Table 4.2 Themes 54

A note about language and disability identity: Human services professionals have been taught that the appropriate way in which to discuss disability is to use person-first language, that is, to refer to individuals with disabilities, or a person with a disability (Dunn & Andrews, 2015; Flink, 2021). This practice has even been a convention endorsed by the APA when it comes to professional writing (Dunn & Andrews, 2015; Flink, 2021). In contrast, identity-first language places the disability first, referring to individuals with disabilities, or a disabled person (Flink, 2021). Individuals within the disability community may prefer both, or one over the other (Dunn & Andrews, 2015) and certain communities, such as the Deaf community have a tendency toward identity-first language (Flink, 2021). In order to be respectful of all those in the disability community, this paper will utilize both person-first and identity-first language throughout.

Chapter 1: Introduction

When discussing diversity in mission statements or diversity statements, institutions of higher education often neglect to include disability, even though doing so would reduce the stigma so often seen around disability in the higher education setting (Scheef et al., 2020). Social work education, with its focus on the strengths perspective and social justice, is uniquely poised to lead higher education in the inclusion of disability as a component of diversity in discussions not only in the classroom, but on campuses as a whole for students with disabilities.

Two main factors contribute to the capacity for social work educators to promote disability as diversity for the population of disabled students. First is the mandate from the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) to include disability in the curriculum (Council on Social Work Education [CSWE, 2015]. Social work educators are preparing future social workers to work with a variety of clients, including those with disabilities. Second, the population of students with disabilities enrolling in postsecondary institutions is steadily increasing (De Los Santos et al., 2019; Rocco & Delgado, 2011). Social work educators will encounter disabled students in the classroom and these students will feel more welcome if they are recognized as part of the diverse campus community (Kim & Sellmaier, 2020).

Problem Statement

Students with disabilities are enrolling in institutions of higher education at a steadily increasing rate over the past twenty years (De Los Santos et al., 2019; Rocco & Delgado, 2011). According to Snyder et al. (2019), disabled students accounted for 19.4% of students enrolled in undergraduate courses in the 2015-16 academic year, and 11.9% of graduate students in that same year. Of students studying human/behavioral studies at the undergraduate level, 21.8% identified as having a disability, compared to 17.5% at the graduate level (Snyder et al., 2019).

Disabled students have expressed concern that their faculty may not understand their needs or the best manner in which to accommodate those needs (De Los Santos et al., 2019). Students with disabilities also reported that interactions with faculty members related to their disability can have a great impact on a student's retention at the institution. Positive interactions with faculty around disability are often reflected in a student remaining at the institution, while negative interactions often resulted in a student dropping out (De Los Santos et al., 2019). Kattari (2015) concurred, finding that students also report a lack of faculty awareness related to disability. This lack of awareness can lead to a lack of understanding of the necessity of accommodations, leaving students' accommodation needs unaddressed more than half the time (De Los Santos et al., 2019).

Instructors may be unaware of their obligations to disabled students, as well as how to interact with them. Furthermore, some members of the faculty are uncomfortable with classroom practices, such as provision of accommodations, being dictated by members of the disabled student services office, in part due to apprehensions about decrease of the rigor of their courses (Sniatecki et al., 2015). Sniatecki et al. (2015) also reported that faculty members generally have a more negative attitude about the provision of accommodations to students with psychological disabilities in comparison those with physical disabilities, while also tending to expect students with psychological disabilities to have poorer outcomes in terms of college success than those with physical disabilities.

However, it was reported that instructors exhibited more positive outlooks toward students with disabilities after receiving training about disability and provision of accommodations (Sniatecki et al., 2015). Indeed, faculty are requesting access to information related to working with disabled students and the provision of accommodations, yet many

institutions fail to provide this training, resulting in faculty being unfamiliar with how to best educate these students (De Los Santos et al., 2019; Sniatecki, et al., 2015). Roth et al. (2018) also found that faculty members are requesting more training after initial exposure, and that prior to training faculty demonstrate a lack of understanding as to their responsibility to disabled students. Trainings which provide education about disabilities, accommodations, and the needs of disabled students can boost disability awareness and allyship among faculty and staff, which in turn will allow them to better meet the needs of students with disabilities (Hutcheon & Wolbring, 2012; Moraña et al., 2020; Roth et al., 2018). This finding supported is by Lombardi et al., (2013) based on faculty trainings related to disability at two separate postsecondary institutions.

College instructors also have indicated not only a lack of awareness related to disability, but feelings of “pity,” (Bruder & Mogro-Wilson, 2010, p.7) as well as “awkwardness, and/or embarrassment” (Bruder & Mogro-Wilson, 2010, p.7) when interacting with someone with a disability. Social work instructors who are not comfortable engaging with disabled students may not be able to effectively teach these students, nor will they model appropriate behaviors for social work students to interact with clients with disabilities (Fox, 2013). According to Keisel et al. (2018) students with disabilities in social work programs frequently experience faculty and field instructors who are unaware of how to accommodate disabled social work students. Furthermore, stigma around disabilities, especially invisible disabilities, remained a concern for these students (Keisel et al., 2018). Armour et al. (2004) found that social work educators - namely social work field instructors - have indicated that they do not feel comfortable, nor prepared, to address diversity, which should include disability, in supervisory situations. Amour et al. (2018), recommend training for social work educators and field instructors on diversity,

while Keisel et al. (2018) further suggest that the training is inclusive of disability. Keisel et al. (2018) also note that working with disabled students helps to combat these issues.

Diversity training, which includes disability, can assist in preparing social work educators to work with students with disabilities in their classes, as well as incorporating disability into the curriculum to prepare students to work with disabled clients in their future careers (Garran et al., 2014; Wynants & Dennis, 2017). Many higher education institutions already incorporate diversity training for faculty and staff (Bezrukova et al., 2016; Booker et al., 2016) but the diversity training which social work educators receive might not always be inclusive of disability (De Los Santos et al., 2019; Lombardi et al., 2013).

In the past, motivated social work educators might have sought disability diversity training outside of their institutions at workshops or conferences, however recent budget cuts across the board at postsecondary institutions are making travel and conference fees prohibitive (Whitford, 2020), forcing instructors to rely only on professional development within their institutions.

Faculty Development and Diversity Training

Lewis (1996) described the first faculty development programs as sabbaticals, first established at Harvard in 1810, and continuing as the classic style of faculty professional enrichment for 150 years, allowing professors to complete research in other locations to broaden their knowledge in their field. It was not until the 1960s and 1970s that faculty development programs began to focus on improving faculty instruction (Lewis, 1996). During the 1970s programs were structured similarly to the in-service model used by the K-12 school systems (Lewis, 1996). The financial crisis of the 1980s brought another shift in the offering of faculty development to one more focused on wellness programs, including workshops concentrating on

various stages of life and career adjustment (Lewis, 1996). Diversity training was finally introduced near the end of the 20th century, in the form of sensitivity training associated with multicultural diversity to ensure that professors could effectively teach a broadening population of students (Lewis, 1996).

Current diversity trainings tend to include cultural, ethnic, and racial communities, as well as the LGBT community, however, the disability community is still often overlooked (Bezrukova et al., 2012). Even faculty members tend to think of “race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual preference” (Booker et al., 2016, p. 3) as the primary considerations for diversity training when asked.

Diversity training in higher educational settings may manifest in various forms, including a training centering on one type of diversity (such as race) or an inclusive training which discusses various forms of diversity and perhaps intersectionality (Bezrukova et al., 2016). Trainings may be a one-time workshop, or many sessions held over a long duration, and may emphasize raising awareness, changing behavior and actions, or a blend of both elements (Bezrukova et al., 2016). Finally, the way the material is presented may vary from lecture-style, interactive, or simulation-based (Bezrukova et al., 2016). Regardless of the type of training offered, the goal is to provide educational opportunities which will assist faculty in diversifying their instructional practices (Booker et al., 2016), due to fact that many faculty members indicated feeling under-prepared to address diversity, specifically disability as diversity, in the classroom.

Relevance to Social Work Education

That disability is important in social work curriculum is not disputed. CSWE utilizes the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) in the review process for accreditation

of social work education programs, currently operating under the 2015 standards (Council on Social Work Education [CSWE], 2015). The EPAS established nine competencies which determine educational outcomes for students graduating from CSWE accredited programs (CSWE, 2015). CSWE has released the draft EPAS for 2022, which is due for final release in summer of 2022 (CSWE, 2022).

In the 2022 draft EPAS, disability is mentioned three times, as opposed to only twice in the current 2015 EPAS (CSWE, 2015; CSWE, 2021b). First, in “Competency 3: Engage Anti-racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Practice” (CSWE, 2021b, p. 5), disability is mentioned when enumerating the various aspects of diversity and indicating that those working in the social work profession should:

- Demonstrate anti-racist and anti-oppressive social work practice at the individual, family, group, organizational, community, research, and policy levels; and
- present themselves as learners and engage clients and constituencies as experts of their own experiences; and
- Demonstrate cultural humility by applying critical reflection, self-awareness, and self-regulation to manage the influence of bias, power, privilege, and values in working with clients and constituencies, acknowledging them as experts of their own lived experiences (pp. 5-6)

In the next mention of disability in the draft 2022 EPAS, CSWE (2021b) emphasizes the importance of accredited entities including disability in the curriculum by discussing it under “Educational Policy 2.0—Anti-racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ADEI)” (p.10). This policy makes clear that “programs provide the context through which students learn about their positionality, power, privilege, and difference and develop a commitment to dismantling systems

of oppression, such as racism, that affect diverse populations” (p.10) in both their implicit and explicit curriculum.

Finally, in the appendix, the draft EPAS for 2022 contains a glossary. The entry for diversity specifically lists disability as a component of diversity, along with other identities and characteristics (CSWE, 2021b).

While CSWE recognizes disability as diversity, there is a question as to whether it is recognized as such in social work higher education (Abes & Wallace, 2018; Rocco & Delgado, 2011) and in social work education curricula, specifically (Ballan, 2008; Bean & Hedgpeth, 2014; Goulden, 2020). Ballan (2008) believed that field education is an ideal opportunity for students to be exposed to disability in the curriculum, and Goulden (2020) agreed, but proposed that students should be equipped with coursework prior to entering their field placements.

Ogden et al. (2017) highlighted instructors’ unfamiliarity with disability, along with a dearth of available resources related to disability, as further indication that disability content is still lacking in social work curriculum. In a study with instructors at CSWE accredited institutions, Ogden et al., (2017) found that material relating to disability was either difficult to find, or that which was available may have been “flawed and problematic” (p. 367) making it difficult to incorporate into the coursework. For example, materials may not be inclusive of various types of disabilities, may not represent intersectionality, and may not embrace the social work strengths perspective. Additionally, some respondents indicated a lack of knowledge or interest in disability amongst the social work faculty at their institution (Ogden et al., 2017).

When disability is included in the social work curriculum, it often reflects the medical model, which focuses on deficits, impairment and needing to fix the disability (Charles et al., 2017; Dupré & Carty, 2016; Goulden, 2020; Ogden et al., 2017) rather than the more recent

theories that view disability as a social construct (Coriale et al., 2012), or as an identity or culture (Gilson & DePoy, 2002). This approach can have an impact on how students who will interact with disabled clients in the future will treat those clients. Learning the medical model may result in viewing clients from a deficit perspective rather than the strengths perspective by which social workers are defined. It also does not promote social worker engagement in social justice related to disability issues and ableism (Gilson & DePoy, 2002). While social work educators need to train future social workers to engage with clients with disabilities, these instructors also must be prepared to teach students in their classes who have disabilities. This population should be approached with the strengths perspective embraced by the social model, rather than a deficit perspective espoused by the medical model (Kim & Sellmaier, 2020).

Disability diversity training, that is diversity training centered on disability, which includes the various models of disability and ableism can help social work educators create a welcoming environment for students with disabilities. Studies have shown that diversity training can not only improve faculty members' comfort with teaching issues of diversity in the classroom and in field placement, but also enhances educational outcomes for students (Armour et al., 2004; Booker et al., 2016). Students of faculty who participate in diversity training programs report feeling more empowered and respected in that instructor's class, while the faculty member was able to provide more inclusive opportunities for learning (Booker et al., 2016). In a social work education setting, when faculty include disability in the curriculum in a manner that which values disability as diversity, it not only benefits disabled students in the classroom but also models appropriate disability etiquette and allyship for all of the students in the class to practice with their future clients (Keisel et al., 2018).

Theoretical Framework

Disability and diversity training as they relate to social work education can be viewed from multiple theoretical perspectives. Disability as a concept has many theories and models surrounding it (Dupré, 2012; Gilson & DePoy, 2002; Mackelprang & Salsgiver, 2016). While diversity training has been criticized in the past for not being theory driven (Bezrukova et al., 2016; Paluck, 2006), it has become more grounded in theory in recent years (Bezrukova et al., 2016).

Because this study focused on disability and diversity training in the context of preparing social work educators to both incorporate disability into their curriculum and to teach students with disabilities, three theories were identified: Critical Disability Theory, Disability as Multiculturalism perspective, and Intergroup Contact Theory. Both Critical Disability Theory and disability as multiculturalism/diversity are discussed as these theories embrace the social work strengths perspective and fit well with the CSWE EPAS mandate of disability being incorporated in the curriculum with diversity (CSWE, 2021). Additionally, Intergroup Contact Theory is discussed in the context of diversity training and how a majority group can become more understanding toward a marginalized group, such as the disability community.

Critical Disability Theory

Critical disability theory (CDT), derived from critical race theory (CRT), was developed in the eighties by Derrick Bell and other law scholars (Olmsted, 1998; Onwuachi-Willig, 2009). CRT is itself historically rooted in critical theory, a theory which analyzes the shared characteristics of a marginalized group to understand the causes of oppression with the goal of freeing the group from this oppressive hierarchical arrangement (Hosking, 2008). Scholars of

disability studies utilized CRT to build the CDT as a theory based on the shared experiences of individuals with disabilities which embraces several basic principles:

- disability is a complicated experience with its own voice;
- disability is a spectrum of diverse human existence;
- disability is created by an external social construct, not an internal impairment;
- ableism is so commonplace that it is not noticeable;
- all individuals have the right to self-determination, or control over their own choices; and
- creating an economic structure based on disability has served to keep those with disabilities marginalized and oppressed (Rocco, 2005).

CDT can benefit social work educators in their teaching in both curriculum development and their teaching practice. Social work educators prepare future social workers to practice with diverse populations, including individuals with disabilities, though a future social worker might assume they will not encounter clients with disabilities if they choose not to work with that specific population. However, according to the American Community Survey in 2019, nearly 13% of the population reports having a disability (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). Regardless of the population with which a social worker chooses to work, there is a likelihood that the practitioner will encounter clients, or even colleagues, with disabilities, whether the disabilities are visible or invisible (Goulden, 2020; Kim & Sellmaier, 2020; Mary, 2007). Additionally, social work educators themselves work with students who may have disabilities. According to Snyder et al. (2019) students with disabilities accounted for 21.8% of undergraduate students and 17.5% of graduate students enrolled in human/behavioral studies majors. Therefore, it is important for social work educators to understand relevant disability theories.

While little contemporary literature provides a critique of CDT, perhaps due to the recentness of the theory, critiques of critical disability studies (CDS) are presented. Based on the link between disability studies and CDT in Rocco (2005) and the mention of Hosking (2008) in the critique of CDS, a link can be made between the two for the purpose of critiquing CDT.

One common criticism related to CDS, and by extension, CDT, is that of exclusion. While intersectionality is explored as an identity theory, CDT still focuses on the common experience of disability, and as such excludes those who do not share that experience (Goodley et al., 2019; Meekosha & Shuttleworth, 2009). Another criticism is the distinct difference between ability and disability, and a complete rejection of the medical model of disability, with little room in the middle, leaving individuals feeling a need to choose sides, when they may view disability as a spectrum, rather than a dichotomy (Meekosha & Shuttleworth, 2009).

Disability as Multiculturalism

The perspective of disability as multiculturalism or diversity is similar to CDT in that it does not have a specific founder, but rather evolved from the works of many scholars, although Connor and Gabel (2010) do credit Simi Linton (1998) with discussing disability and diversity in her book *Claiming Disability: Knowledge and Identity*. However, disability as multiculturalism/diversity does also differ from CDT. That is, while CDT examines many aspects of disability, disability as multiculturalism/diversity theory focuses specifically on disability as a shared cultural experience (Gilson & DePoy, 2000; Tainter et al., 1995) and views individuals with disabilities as an essential component of cultural diversity (Bryan, 2007). Gilson and DePoy (2000) indicate that the factors determining culture are identity, language, community, and how a group is positioned relative to other groups. One shared characteristic with CDT is disability identity defining who belongs in the group and who does not. Disability

identity can be socially constructed or based on internal factors of functional limitations (Gilson & DePoy, 2000; Rocco, 2005). Furthermore, “cultural identity or the elements that are ascertainable that signify belongingness, frames much of the current narrative of oppressed cultures and affords advantages of membership, as well as recognition.” (Gilson & DePoy, 2000, p.210).

Disability language is not the language of a specific country or motherland that one might typically associate with a culture, but a language of common experiences including oppression (Gilson & Depoy, 2000; Heumann, 1993; Linton, 1998). This includes reclaiming language which nondisabled people may consider offensive, such as “crip” (Gilson & DePoy, 2000, p. 212), as well as the shunning of euphemisms used by nondisabled individuals such as “physically challenged, able-disabled, differently abled, handi-capables, and people with differing abilities” (Heumann, 1993, p. 261). Instead, people with disabilities developed their own terms and phrases within the community with which to refer to themselves and their experiences, such as crip, Deaf with a capital ‘D’ to indicate members of the Deaf Community, and disability (or identity) first language (Gilson & DePoy, 2000; Linton, 1998; Mackelprang & Salsgiver, 2016).

Community consists of well-defined “political, cultural and social relationships” (Gilson & DePoy, 200, p.213). Belonging to the disability community fosters the development of a disability identity, as does any identity of a one who belongs to a marginalized community (Gilson & DePoy, 2000). Disabled individuals face the same discrimination and prejudice as other marginalized populations (Gilson & DePoy, 2000; Tainter et al., 1995; Wolfensberger, 2013), which Wolfensberger (2013) refers to as groups that are devalued by society. Tainter et al. (1995) propose that these shared experiences of marginalization, and being discounted by the

majority, are what build community among individuals from those oppressed groups, including person with disabilities.

While inclusion and exclusion of individuals based on identity is important in group positioning relative to community, the concept is more complex. Power structures and struggles play a role, such as the struggle between those in the medical field, who may perceive disability from a deficit viewpoint, and those who embrace the self-determination perspective of disability (Gilson & DePoy, 2000). Together, identity, language, community, and group positioning work to give the disability population status as a marginalized culture.

Similar to CDT, disability as multiculturalism/diversity may benefit social work educators not only in curriculum development, but also in working with disabled students in their classrooms. Recognizing disability as multiculturalism may lead to including it naturally in the course plan with diversity, as mandated by CSWE in the EPAS (CSWE, 2021b). Moreover, disability as multiculturalism/diversity enables instructors to view disability as another facet of diversity when working with students from various backgrounds in the classroom, rather than from a medical perspective which may focus on the students' deficits rather than strengths.

One of the main critiques of disability as multiculturalism/diversity is that it fails to recognize individualism within the community (Anastasiou & Kauffman, 2012), by focusing on shared characteristics rather than diversity among group members. Due to this, an emphasis is placed on activities such as cultural discourse and disability rights activism (Gilson & DePoy, 2000). Gilson and Depoy (2000) pointed out that this results in a danger of a hierarchy being established within the community as some members, such as those with developmental or mental health disabilities, may not be able to fully participate. In addition, similar to CDT, defining

disability as multiculturalism is not just inclusive, but also exclusive and can cause friction over who is included and who is not (Gilson & DePoy, 2000).

Intergroup Contact Theory

Intergroup contact theory is a social psychological theory first conceived by Gordon Allport in 1954 and originally consisted of personal conversations with members of outgroups, which resulted in improved attitudes towards those groups (Hässler et al., 2021; Paluck, 2006; Paolini et al., 2021; Pettigrew, 2021; Zhou, 2020). It now includes:

- (a) direct friendship, which is having cross-group friends; (b) extended contact, which is knowing that another ingroup member has cross-group friends; (c) imagined contact, which is imagining oneself conversing with an outgroup member; and (d) media contact, which is consuming media that features outgroup members” (Zhou, 2020, p. 1)

While Allport and Zhou were discussing natural intergroup interactions, research has demonstrated that benefits can also be derived from deliberate intergroup contact (Boin et al., 2021; Hässler et al., 2021; Paluck, 2006). Boin et al. (2021) stated that prejudice can be reduced through intergroup contact as it serves to not only improve the attitude of the majority group toward the outgroup member met during the encounter, but toward the entire outgroup.

The benefits of intergroup contact extend beyond prejudice reduction, however. According to Hässler et al. (2021) intergroup contact interventions can not only decrease prejudice but also work to increase the privileged groups’ commitment to social change for less advantaged groups. Boin et al., (2021) found that the workplace is an ideal setting in which to employ interventions utilizing intergroup contact, such as diversity training, thus enabling intergroup contact to be used for diversity training in various employment environments,

including higher education. Paluck (2006) agreed, emphasizing the value of diversity training based on the concept of intergroup contact in the workplace due to increasingly diverse contact occurring in work settings. Paluck (2006) additionally found that the union of intergroup contact theory and diversity training is logical because they both utilize understanding of groups other than ones' own as a method to reduce prejudice and bias.

While positive intergroup interactions can reduce prejudice, one criticism of intergroup contact theory is the concern that negative intergroup interactive will perpetuate biases and stereotypes (Paolini et al., 2021). Positive interactions can be purposeful through interventions, but it is impossible to avoid naturally occurring negative interactions. Another critique is that intergroup contact theory focuses on individual outcomes rather than systems change (Paolini et al., 2021). While changing individual attitudes is important, dealing with systemic “-isms” (racism, sexism, ableism, homophobia, etc.) is also an important aspect of diversity training.

Finally, Boin et al. (2021) raise the issue of how difficult it can be to change attitudes, including those of prejudice, once one becomes an adult and patterns are established, as compared to changing attitudes in children who are still developing their personalities and attitudes. However, adult attitude change, while more difficult to achieve, may be more enduring than that of a child, whose attitude may change several times as they grow.

Aim and Research Questions

The aim of this research study was to explore diversity training for social workers and the inclusion of disability in these trainings, and how social work educators perceive this prepares them to meet the requirements of the EPAS to include disability in the social work curriculum and to teach students with disabilities. The following research questions were considered in the study:

1. Is the diversity training offered to social work educators by their postsecondary institutions inclusive of disability?
2. How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to include disability in the social work curriculum?
3. How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to work with students with disabilities in their classes?

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This study explored the inclusion of disability in diversity training for social workers, and how social work educators perceive this prepares them to both meet the requirements of the EPAS to include disability in the social work curriculum and to teach students with disabilities. Therefore, the literature review focused on two main themes: diversity training, and social work education and disability. As the literature review progressed, subtopics developed within these themes, further breaking diversity training into diversity training in higher education and disability diversity training. Because social work education and disability is such a broad theme, this has been subdivided to discuss disabled students in social work programs and disability in social work curricula. Finally, the two themes are united to discuss literature surrounding diversity training in social work education.

Diversity Training

Employers utilize diversity training to develop a more productive workforce which will enhance their organization (Bezrukova et al., 2012; Bezrukova et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2016). Phillips et al. (2016) further clarified the specific goals of diversity training as reducing biases, modifying employee actions toward those belonging to groups that are marginalized, ensuring compliance with regulations, and promoting a better work environment. Trainings may be focused on a specific group or inclusive of all forms of diversity, may be designed to raise awareness or to change behaviors (or both), may be strictly lecture or interactive, and may be a one-time workshop or an ongoing initiative (Bezrukova et al., 2012; Bezrukova et al., 2016). Phillips et al., (2016) explained that most diversity training tends to focus on “gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation” (p. 265) with little attention to individuals with

disabilities, possibly because disability is often viewed as a deficit that requires accommodation instead of as a form of diversity (Phillips et al., 2016).

Diversity Training in Higher Education

Bezrukova et al. (2012) discussed diversity training in higher education but focused primarily on training for students. Diversity training in post-secondary settings is intended to ready students for civic engagement outside of the college setting by providing them with knowledge and skills in the multicultural arena, as was noted in a comparison of diversity trainings in higher education to other workplaces by Bezrukova et al. (2012). Diversity training for students may include semester long courses, a curriculum devoted to diversity, or workshops which may be offered to the entire student population, or targeted to incoming students (Bezrukova et al., 2012). The purpose of diversity training in higher education differs from that in other workplaces. The goal of diversity training in the campus setting tends to be to acquire knowledge about biases and prejudices, then demonstrate understanding through practical education experiences and purposeful interactions with members of groups other than one's own (Bezrukova et al., 2016). Because of the educational aspect of diversity training, it may be better received in a post-secondary setting (Bezrukova et al., 2016) as opposed to other organizations in which diversity training may not appear to align with the organization's mission. Hudson (2020) described her and her cohort's experiences with a diversity training at her institution of higher education called "Teaching Inclusion and Diversity Everywhere" (TIDE) (p. 1). TIDE is a competitive program in which faculty apply to participate and are awarded a stipend for their time. The program met for an initial four days in early summer, with online assignments throughout the summer and regrouping in August to discuss course design. The training continued into the fall semester with several short follow-up meetings (Hudson, 2020).

The training influenced Hudson (2020) to add a diversity statement to her syllabus and incorporate inclusive practices in her instruction. Feedback from other participants indicated that they also learned strategies to be more inclusive in instruction and that the majority of participants found ways to do so. Ninety-one percent of respondents indicated feeling better equipped to moderate discourse related to racism and other sensitive topics in class, and 100% of respondents would recommend TIDE to be used for diversity training at other post-secondary institutions (Hudson, 2020). Furthermore, Hudson (2020) found that her students noticed an improvement in her instructional practices, as demonstrated by the evaluations received from her students after her TIDE participation, which included comments about the inclusive environment she had created. This research demonstrated that a well-designed diversity training in higher education can have an impact not only on the faculty receiving the training, but also on the students with whom they interact.

Booker et al. (2016) conducted a similar qualitative study to determine the effects of a week-long intensive diversity training. This study consisted of focus groups with not just the faculty members participating in the training, but the students in their classes, as well. Faculty members reported that the training affected their ideology by not only emphasizing difference and diversity, but the importance of recognizing both as aspects of identity. This allowed the faculty to be more thoughtful about incorporating diversity into coursework and ensuring an inclusive environment in their classes, including highlighting diversity in their syllabi, and utilizing course material that encompassed diverse experiences (Booker et al., 2016). Students of faculty involved in the training reported benefits such as learning how to incorporate diversity into their own professional experiences based on the diverse curricula, feeling “included, visible

and valued in the class” (Booker et al., 2016, p. 6), and an attitudinal shift to being more aware of diversity issues (Booker et al., 2016).

Disability Diversity Training

When disability training is included in diversity training, these interventions provide an opportunity to tackle myths and misunderstandings that lead employers to misperceive disability as an impairment or issue, instead of recognizing it as an aspect of human diversity (Phillips et al., 2016). A primary topic suggested by Phillips et al. (2016) that should be covered in disability diversity training is addressing fictitious beliefs about individuals with disabilities, such as the misconception that they are not as qualified as those who are not disabled. Likewise, the training should include content on the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and language to use when speaking about or to someone with a disability. Finally, involving leaders with disabilities in the training is essential for developing a positive outlook among participants about the capability of disabled individuals (Phillips et al., 2016). In a systemic review of disability diversity trainings, Phillips et al. (2016) determined that interactive interventions were shown to be more effective compared to those in which facilitators only lectured at participants or utilized videos without discussions.

Wynants and Dennis (2017), in their investigation of the impact of an online disability awareness training, found that postsecondary faculty do not tend to receive pedagogical instruction, nor are they mandated to attend workshops or seminars related to development of instructional approaches to assist them in working with students with disabilities. This is especially concerning as faculty attitudes toward disabled students have an impact on these students’ success in the post-secondary setting (De Los Santos et al., 2019; Wynants & Dennis, 2017). Wynants and Dennis (2017) conducted a mixed methods study of an online disability

awareness training, which covered disability laws, services available on campus, policies regarding accommodations, universal design for learning, and instructional accessibility. Based on pre- and post-tests given in association with the training, faculty attitudes, knowledge, and comfort levels increased after the training. Faculty also indicated that they had altered their coursework and instructional materials subsequent to the training, and many had plans for additional changes to improve the accessibility of their courses (Wynants & Dennis, 2017).

Aquino (2016) discussed disability as diversity in post-secondary institutions as, unlike other aspects of diversity, being rarely included and when it is, as an afterthought rather than deliberately. In order for disabled students to have better opportunities for access and success at the post-secondary level, Aquino (2016) insisted that they must be allowed to overcome the stigma of disability and introduce it as an aspect of diversity, rather than as a deficit. The prevalence of the medical model, however, makes it difficult for students to do so (Aquino, 2016).

Aquino (2016) thus proposed a new framework for integrating disability into diversity within higher educational settings. The Disability-Diversity (Dis)Connect Model (DDDM) approaches the post-secondary environment as an opportunity for students with disabilities to integrate with other students by viewing disability as another aspect of diversity on campus. When disability is viewed as such, disabled students feel a connection with their classmates and the campus. The connection leads disabled students to be more likely to aspire to participate in campus activities and to pursue academic achievement (Aquino, 2016). Through the proposed DDDM framework, disability can be accepted as diversity on college campuses, providing students with disabilities a more equitable experience than when they are perceived through the lens of the medical model.

Social Work Education and Disability

Social work educators need to prepare for disability in the classroom in a dual manner. They are expected to address it as a component of diversity as mandated by the EPAS (CSWE, 2021), covering issues of diversity, oppression, and diversity in the curriculum (Bean & Hedgpeth, 2014; Dupré, 2012; Goulden, 2020). Simultaneously, they will also be teaching disabled students, some who may self-identify as having a disability (Kim & Sellmaier, 2020; Pardeck, 2001) and some who may choose to not identify, for a variety of reasons, including stigma or the barriers to obtaining documentation required to register with the institutions' disability office (Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005). Instructors are expected to be prepared to provide accommodations for students with disabilities (Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005; Pardeck, 2001) while teaching about disability.

Students with Disabilities in Social Work Programs

As mentioned previously, social work educators need to be prepared to teach students with disabilities in their classes. Disabled students in social work classes enter with their own perspectives, goals, and backgrounds (Pardeck, 2001). Essentially, the diversity in the classroom, including disability, reflects the diversity of the population of clients with which students will work as future practitioners. Because modeling is such an important aspect of teaching as a social work educator (Fox, 2013), how the instructor interacts with disabled students in the classroom will demonstrate to other students how they should relate to their future clients with disabilities.

Kim and Sellmaier (2020) pointed out that students who enroll in social work programs may find themselves either missing from the curricula or misrepresented in their courses:

The inclusion of ability or disability is about more than what is taught in the classroom. Some social work students are members of the disability community and may find themselves and their experiences either not represented in their social work education, or if people with disabilities are represented, their needs, concerns, and potential may be minimized, devalued, or othered (pp. 496-497).

Kim and Sellmaier (2020) concluded that in order to be welcoming of students with disabilities in social work classrooms, disability would need to be deliberately included in all aspects of the program, ensuring access not only for students, but for faculty and staff, as well. This would require analyzing not only the program's explicit curriculum, what is taught in classes and assigned as learning activities, but also the implicit curriculum, which "includes recruitment, retention, or admissions policies procedures, administrative structure, and resources that influence the education experience for students, staff and faculty" (Kim & Sellmaier, 2020, p. 497). After the analysis, it would be important to determine if the program is inclusive of disability, and if not, how to make it inclusive in a manner that infuses disability into all aspects, implicit and explicit (Kim & Sellmaier, 2020).

Universal Instructional Design

Universal Instructional Design (UID) is an important consideration for social work educators and social work programs to be welcoming of students of all abilities, and to utilize Kim and Sellmaier's (2020) suggestions. UID entails designing a curriculum and course that is accessible for all students, rather than trying to retrofit accommodations to match the needs of a students with disabilities (Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005). Lightfoot and Gibson (2005) identified four areas which social work programs could incorporate UID to provide access for all students:

1. Develop a welcoming classroom and field environment;

2. Focus on essential components of course and field curriculum;
3. Use multi-modal instructional method and incorporate natural supports; and
4. Provide flexible means of evaluation (p. 272)

In developing a welcoming classroom and field environment, instructors should ensure that they include accommodation statements on their syllabi which include information on contacting the disability services office. Additionally, providing students with various forms of communication, including electronic and in person, provides everyone with access to the instructor and each other. Finally, clear expectations are essential to ensuring students understand what they need to do to be successful in class. However, social work education is not limited to the classroom. Many of these adjustments can be made in field placements, as well as instructing field instructors about their obligations under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the philosophy of UID (Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005).

Lightfoot and Gibson (2005) also suggested focusing on the essentials of the curriculum to ensure that all students can access them equally, thus meeting program standards and accreditation requirements. If needed, the manner of instruction should be altered to provide the highest level of accessibility to the greatest number of students possible. This leads to a discussion of multi-modal instructional methods. Students have various learning styles, and often accommodations used by disabled students can be incorporated into UID in a manner which benefits learning styles of various students. Lightfoot and Gibson (2005) provided an example of posting lecture notes ahead of time for all students, which allows those with reading disabilities access prior to class, but also benefits students for whom English is not their native language, or students who may struggle with taking notes due to manual dexterity issues. Field instructors can also incorporate different manners of instruction to account for various learning styles, “such as

modeling skills, providing written feedback, or allowing students to audiotape supervisory meetings for future reflection” (Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005, p. 274). Finally, evaluating students in flexible ways would include providing students with various means to demonstrate knowledge of topics. Assessment does not just need to be through exams, but can also be through in-class activities, written assignments, and interactive online activities (Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005).

In a study comparing two four-year institutions of higher education, Lombardi et al. (2013) found that disability training, whether formal (workshops and seminars) or informal (reading books and articles) could increase faculty attitudes toward a variety of factors relating to students with disabilities. The factors relevant here included inclusive assessments, inclusive classrooms, and accessible course materials, (Lombardi et al., 2013), all of which are components of UID (Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005).

Students with Mental Health Disabilities

Holley et al. (2020) explored students with mental health disabilities in social work programs relative to the supports and gatekeeping they experienced from faculty, staff, and administrators, utilizing a mixed methods study. While social work educators may not always be aware of disabled students in their classes, the authors contended that students with mental health disabilities might display behaviors in class that would indicate their mental health status, requiring the instructor to take notice, and perhaps intervene. The study revealed that almost all the programs involved (96.7%) had students with mental health disabilities enrolled at some point. About half of the programs would share the information with instructors dependent on certain factors (diagnosis, severity of impairment, and condition management), while approximately 25% definitely would share the information, and 21% definitely would not (Holley et al., 2020). This indicated that many instructors were unaware of the status of students

with mental health disabilities in their classroom, unless the student chose to self-identify, or if the student demonstrated certain behaviors, such as disrupting the class, sharing too much in class discussions, especially pertaining to their mental health status, walking in and out of class, or behaving in a manner that could be interpreted as aggressive toward peers and instructors. Inappropriate behaviors were also noted in field, including not completing work, failing to meet supervision expectations or incorporate feedback, and not maintaining boundaries with not only clients, but co-workers and managers (Holley et al., 2020).

Participants discussed various policies related to how students who demonstrated disruptive behaviors would be responded to, including formal and informal policies. Policies included working with students to find resources including counseling, providing accommodations, gatekeeping procedures, such as counseling students to withdraw from the program, suspension, and termination (Holley et al., 2020). Holley et al. (2020) recommended training for social work educators in understanding the issues faced by students with mental health disabilities and responding to students who need assistance.

Mazza (2015) also investigated social work educators working with students with mental health disabilities but analyzed the phenomenon from the perspective of the instructors. Similar to Holley et al. (2020), Mazza (2015) found that students did not always identify as having mental health disabilities to their social work instructors, however, students' behavior could be interpreted to indicate that they had such disabilities.

With a lack of clear program policies related to how to intervene with students demonstrating such behaviors, Mazza (2015) noted that faculty reacted in a variety of ways. Most of the faculty recognized a responsibility to clients that students would be working with, and a need to ensure that students are capable of working with these clients in the field and as

future professionals. Faculty also felt a responsibility to the students, as a marginalized group, however, some were not comfortable intervening with students. Other faculty revealed that they were unfamiliar with how to interact with students with a mental health disability regarding their disability. Some of these faculty members would reach out to colleagues for advice, mostly those working in small to medium-sized programs (Mazza, 2015). Based on the lack of clear directives, as well as faculty unfamiliarity on working with students with mental health disabilities in social work programs, Mazza (2015) suggested that schools of social work develop plans to deal with these issues in order to ensure that students with mental health disabilities can be supported in social work programs.

Disability in Social Work Curricula

While it has been established that the EPAS require accredited schools of Social Work to incorporate disability into their curricula in accordance with the diversity component (CSWE, 2021b), this process has not been seamless (Bean & Hedgpeth, 2014; Dupré, 2012; Goulden, 2020). Bean and Hedgpeth (2014) found that courses on disability within social work programs are minimal, and therefore, social workers graduate with limited knowledge of disability. Students who did receive information about disability indicated that it was from diversity classes in their social work program (Bean & Hedgpeth, 2014). Because social workers will be working with individuals with disabilities, regardless of the area of practice they choose, it is important that they have positive perceptions and attitudes towards their future clients (Mary, 2007). In order to determine how these attitudes are developed as social work students, Bean and Hedgpeth (2014) conducted a study with social work students at both the undergraduate and graduate level to assess the effects of their social work program and personal self-esteem on their attitudes toward individuals with disabilities. The study found that education about disabilities

increased the students' confidence about working with disabled clients and also improved attitudes towards those with disabilities. However, 60% of the participants in the study revealed that their social work program had not trained them to confidently work with the disabled population. This may be because the study also discovered that low self-esteem could mitigate the effectiveness of coursework in providing students with confidence and a positive attitude about working with those with disabilities (Bean & Hedgpeth, 2014).

Disability Culture

Both Dupré (2012) and Tower (2003) determined that disability culture—the shared experiences and beliefs of individuals with disabilities (Tower, 2003)—is lacking from social work literature. Dupré (2012) examined the various theoretical perspectives of disability, such as the transcultural approach, cultural pluralism and collective resistance, as well as disability culture theories, including the “historical/linguistic, socio/political and personal/aesthetic” (p. 178) perspectives which provide context for teaching disability culture in social work education beyond the deficit/diagnostic approach of the medical model. This allows students to understand disability from the perspective of an oppressed minority group. Dupré (2012) stressed strongly that current social work education tends to view disability from the medical model, rather than focusing on disability culture. Analyzing disability culture would provide students an opportunity to understand the systemic oppression faced by individuals with disabilities, which manifests as ableism (Dupré, 2012). This would also allow students to understand how the majority group contributes to the oppression of the minority group (Dupré & Carty, 2016). Tower (2003) also recommended teaching social work students about not only oppression, but also the stigma and economic hardships associated with disability. These practices are in keeping with Dupré's (2012) conclusion that coursework in social work education must include critical

study of all areas of disability in order for future practitioners to be equipped to address the inequities faced by those in the community.

Medical Model vs Social Model

Goulden (2020) agreed that social work as a profession tends to view disability from a medical perspective, which can perpetuate stigma around disability, because the medical model focuses on deficit and treating the condition. In contrast, the social model of disability recognizes disability as a diverse human condition and acknowledges the social impacts of oppression and marginalization on those with disabilities. Social work students may enter their education with pre-conceived stigmas about disability, and if their experience in the classroom and field placement is from the medical perspective, little may happen to change these preconceptions and to enable them to view disability from a strengths perspective (Goulden, 2020). However, if students are exposed to field placements in which clients with disabilities are empowered as collaborators in their service planning, then biases and stigma have shown to be reduced (Goulden, 2020).

While many discussions on college campuses about multiculturalism have begun to include disability, Gilson and DePoy (2002) found that social work curricula were still considering disability as a deficit, rather than as diversity. The authors conducted a literature review to determine the predominant theories in social work as a best fit for social work curricula. Theories identified ranged from diagnostic and prescriptive, viewing disability as an internal impairment requiring treatment, to social constructionist, viewing disability as caused by external environmental barriers. Gilson and DePoy (2012) suggested a model curriculum utilizing both approaches, believing that each has merit, and describing how each theory can be used in various courses such as practice courses, research courses, policy courses and human

behavior and the social environment courses. By providing students with both perspectives, Gilson and DePoy (2012) determined that they would be best prepared to work in various settings with clients with disabilities in the future, more so than by only learning the medical model as currently taught in many programs.

Coursework in Disability

Social workers will indeed encounter individuals with disabilities as they work in the field, whether they choose a practice with a focus on disabilities or not (Mary, 2007). Mary (2007) asserted that it is therefore imperative that social workers become familiar with disability and disability culture prior to beginning work as practitioners. This could be accomplished through field placements but recognizing that not all students would have this opportunity, Mary (2007) recommended coursework specifically devoted to introducing students to disability. This elective course would cover disability definitions and history, various perspectives and models of disability, and best practices for working with individuals with various types of disabilities including “physical, developmental and cognitive, and psychiatric disabilities” (Mary, 2007, pp. 7-8). Dispelling myths and stereotypes about disabled individuals would also be an important focus of the course (Mary, 2007), enabling future social work practitioners to enter the field with reduced biases about their clients with disabilities. Mary (2007) also emphasized the strengths and empowerment perspectives when working with clients with disabilities in an attempt to ensure that practitioners provide clients with the opportunity for self-determination and stressed the fact that this must be taught in any coursework in social work education.

In a mixed methods study, Ogden et al. (2017) sought to determine how common disability coursework is in social work programs. They found that when courses dedicated to disability were offered, it was less frequently in schools of social work and more often in other

programs at an institution. When disability was included in other courses in schools of social work, it was most often found in diversity courses (Ogden et al., 2017). Ogden et al. also found that participants indicated that more assistance was needed in the areas of sample syllabi and training on disability content in order for them to include disability in their social work courses.

Diversity Training for Social Work Educators

Ogden et al. (2017) were not alone in discovering that social work educators lack training in disability content. In discussing working with students with disabilities in social work classrooms, Pardeck (2001) pointed out that disability should be included in diversity training for social work educators. This is crucial in ensuring that disabled students are included and accommodated in social work programs. Such training should include information about discrimination, changing one's mindset, and increasing awareness of disability topics (Pardeck, 2001). The lack of training for field instructors (Armour et al. 2004; Keisel et al., 2018) and classroom instructors (Daniel, 2011; Garran et al., 2004) has further been noted in the literature.

Training for Field Instructors

Armour et al. (2004) noted that while there has been effort to ensure cultural competence for students heading into social work practice, little has been done to ensure that field instructors have training in cultural diversity and the incorporation of it into the supervision of interns. Furthermore, field instructors indicated that despite a desire to address diversity issues with interns, they felt unable to do so. The authors conducted a study with a model diversity training for field instructors which could be utilized to discuss a range of diversity, including: "race, ethnicity, national origin, color, gender, sexual orientation, age, marital status, political belief, religion, family structure, or mental or physical disability" (Armour et al., 2004, p. 27). The training allowed field instructors to analyze their own diversity and stereotypes about other

groups, to learn how to address diversity with interns, and to explore how to feel empowered around diversity issues within their own agencies. Survey results showed an increase in attitudes and behaviors demonstrated immediately after the training and in a six-month follow up; the authors surmised it was due to the participants utilizing the skills they had learned with the new interns. Although an assumption had been made that field instructors were prepared to address diversity with supervisees, by their own admission they were not, and diversity training assisted them in becoming better equipped to assist future social workers to be ready to work with diverse clients (Armour et al., 2004).

Additionally, Keisel et al. (2018) found that field instructors are unaware of how to accommodate disabled students in field. Utilizing a disability as diversity perspective, Keisel et al. (2018) interviewed disabled individuals about their experiences in both social work field education and employment roles, specially related to accommodations, course work, and barriers and opportunities they experienced as a disabled social worker. Findings showed that those with visible disabilities needed to initiate a discussion about accommodations early in the field placement process. However, those with invisible disabilities often waited to disclose their disability status, or never discussed their disability, and found little guidance around when or how to request accommodations (Keisel et al., 2018). Keisel et al. (2018) also discovered that not only were students confused about the accommodation process, but the field placement settings and field offices at the social work programs also lacked familiarity with the process. Keisel et al. (2018) concluded that social work educators related to field education require more training related to disability and accommodations, as well as working as a disabled professional in the field, in order to better assist students with disabilities to prepare for a professional career.

Training for Classroom Instructors

While diversity is considered important to both social work practice and education, Daniel (2011) and Garran et al. (2014) pointed out that it is not a topic area that social work educators necessarily know how to address with their students, particularly in the areas of working with clients from diverse backgrounds or dealing with oppression as a topic.

Social work students from minority backgrounds observed that faculty were often uneasy facilitating discussions around marginalization and multiculturalism. This was most frequently noted in white instructors and often led to either avoidance or minimalization of the topics (Daniel, 2011). This not only limits the knowledge imparted to social work students, but also can affect the understanding of multiculturalism passed on to the students (Daniel, 2011). Daniel (2011) also indicated that the students revealed that their social work curricula were lacking representation of the experience of people of color, including texts assigned, resulting in students learning a white Eurocentric perspective in working with clients.

Moreover, many of the discussions served to perpetuate stereotypes, such as that of the Black “welfare mother” (Daniel, 2011, p. 258), often with little intervention from faculty during discussions to correct assumptions. However, if students of color were to try to add their perspective, they often found their white peers reacting negatively. Students of color decided to form their own spaces to hold discussions about academic and racial issues without fear of repercussions (Daniel, 2011). Daniel (2011) suggested that social work faculty require continuing training on how to incorporate multiculturalism and marginalized voices into the curriculum, and social work programs need to develop a cohesive vision as to what it means to have a multicultural focus in both education and practice.

There also is a lack of consensus as to whether diversity and social justice should be incorporated in all the courses in a social work program or taught as a single class with these topics as the primary focus (Garran et al., 2014). Perhaps due to this uncertainty, these topics are not the focus of training for social work faculty; Garran et al. (2014) indicated that at CSWE's 2012 Annual Program Meeting only seven of the 600 workshops offered were aimed at how to teach diversity. Additionally, social work educators are often not given any guidance or training about how to approach teaching these topics to their students (Garran et al., 2014).

In order to remedy this situation, social work schools can offer diversity training to social work educators. Garran et al. (2014) outlined such a program, known as Pedagogy and Diversity (P&D), which provides an opportunity for peers to work together to determine best practices for incorporating social justice and diversity into the social work curriculum during a two-semester timeline. The program is run by interracial co-facilitators who are themselves social work educators with extensive knowledge in the topics being discussed. Utilizing multiple facilitators allows for varying viewpoints to be presented based on their diverse backgrounds and personal experiences. This is a voluntary training, run as an open group, so participants may attend as many sessions during the academic year as they choose. The training incorporates a peer consultation model, so the participants are learning from each other, as well as the facilitators (Garran et al., 2014).

Participants have benefitted by developing new methods for teaching diversity, improving their pedagogical techniques, sharing resources, and developing a collaborative atmosphere for mutual assistance. The social work school has gained a process in which to help develop curricula related to diversity, as well as a place for doctoral students, adjunct faculty, new faculty, and tenured faculty to all receive training on the topic in a collaborative,

noncompetitive environment. The authors theorized that implementing this program at other schools could help reduce faculty turnover and would benefit students, who would learn how to work with diverse populations in their future practice (Garran et al., 2014).

Adventure Education

Although Reyneke's (2016) study on the use of adventure education in promoting conversations about diversity in social work education involved students rather than instructors, the technique used would need to be taught to social work educators in some form of diversity workshop or training in order to be incorporated into a social work education program. While "adventure" evokes images of outdoor challenges, this qualitative study explored the use of experiential-based education with BSW students to initiate dialogue about diversity through metaphors based on the exercise. Reyneke (2016) found that the majority of students, felt that the activity which used apples and pears, would be useful to explain diversity to others. Only a few participants did not feel that it enhanced their own understanding of diversity, and many of those felt that they had a good grasp of diversity before the activity; one participant felt that the issue was too complicated to discuss in class. The remainder of the participants felt that their understanding of their own biases was enhanced, and their definition of diversity was broadened to include more than just race. Participants also indicated that the activity created a safe atmosphere to discuss sensitive subjects through the use of the objects—apples and pears—rather than discussing people. Finally, the activity was enjoyable, which allowed participants to relax while discussing diversity (Reyneke, 2016). Training social work educators to use adventure/experiential-based activities in the classroom can help them, and their students, to become more comfortable discussing difficult topics related to diversity, such as biases, prejudice, marginalization, and oppression.

Intergroup Dialogue

Another form of diversity training that can be utilized with social work educators is intergroup dialogue (Dessel et al., 2006). According to Nagda et al. (1999), intergroup dialogue consists of bringing together groups from differing backgrounds for a facilitated meeting in a safe space to discuss issues related to social justice and diversity by communicating with others, reflecting alone or in a small group setting, and engaging in participatory activities. While these dialogues can occur in a variety of settings, Dessel et al. (2006) specifically mentioned academic settings in their discussion of the use of intergroup dialogues in promoting social justice by social workers. Institutions of higher education have already employed this method, including the University of Michigan, the University of Washington, and the University of Illinois (Dessel et al., 2006). The program at the University of Washington is sponsored by the department of social work, while at the University of Michigan and the University of Illinois, social workers collaborate with other campus partners.

As a result of their review of various programs incorporating Intergroup Dialogue, Dessel et al. (2006) determined that the method leads to an increased understanding of differing groups and marginalization, as well as more self-awareness of identity and a commitment to social justice. Furthermore, social work students engaged in the program demonstrated better preparation for working with clients in a professional manner that embraced cultural understanding (Dessel et al., 2006).

In a study conducted by Nagda et al. (1999), the benefits of incorporating intergroup dialogue into classroom instruction for social work students was demonstrated. These benefits included understanding of the lived experiences of individuals from other backgrounds, respecting others' perspectives, recognizing how membership in various social groups affects

one's identity development, and developing an appreciation for the distinction between dialogue and debate (Nagda et al., 1999). In order to implement the course, Nagda et al. (1999) recommended that social work educators participate in a train-the-trainer course to prepare themselves to teach the course to their students.

Gaps in the Literature

Much of the literature that discusses diversity training, especially diversity training in higher education, neglects to include disability (Phillips et al., 2016; Wynants & Dennis, 2017). Literature regarding disability diversity training in higher educator does not specifically address social work educators (Aquino, 2016; Phillips et al., 2016; Wynants & Dennis, 2017), although it is possible that they participate in training offered to all faculty at their institutions of higher education. However, social work educators in CSWE accredited programs have a specific mandate for incorporating diversity, including disability, in their curricula (CSWE, 2015; CSWE 2021b), in addition to working with the diverse population with which their colleagues work. Because social worker instructors are preparing future social workers to practice with diverse and marginalized populations, including individuals with disabilities, they may require targeted training.

The literature discussing students with disabilities in social work programs offers strategies and frameworks for working with this population (Holley et al., 2020; Kim & Sellmaier, 2020; Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005), but does not examine how social work educators should obtain the training to effectively serve these students. The literature also shows that disability is often neglected in social work curricula (Bean & Hedgpeth, 2014; Goulden, 2020), or only presented from one perspective (Dupré, 2012; Gilson & DePoy, 2012). Again, though,

while offering remedies, it does not supply suggestions for training for the educators who are to implement the curricula changes.

There is a paucity of literature related to social work educators and disability diversity training. The studies which exist appear to be focused on diversity in general, and do not discuss disability specifically, while studies on disability do not relate it to training. More research is needed on how social work educators receive training on working with disabled students and implementing disability in their curricula.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Design

The design for this study was qualitative, specifically a phenomenological design. Qualitative design was selected over quantitative for this research as qualitative research tends to be more focused on people rather than variables, deciphering the context in which a phenomenon occurs, according to Padgett (2017). While a quantitative study could inform whether or not disability is included in the diversity trainings attended by social work educators, it would not adequately address their perception as to how the inclusion, or lack thereof, affects their ability to teach disabled students or to effectively teach disability as part of their curricula.

Phenomenological Design

A phenomenological design was selected for this study as Creswell and Poth (2018) described phenomenology as finding commonality in a shared experience of a particular phenomenon. For this study, the phenomenon was disability diversity training and the study analyzed participants' experiences with the training, as well as the impact on their teaching of students with disabilities and incorporation of disability into their curricula. Creswell and Poth (2018) further explained that defining characteristics of a phenomenological study include an exploration of both what participants experience and how they experience it, which was encompassed in the research questions.

Other qualitative methods were considered, and rejected, for this study. Grounded theory was a strong contender, as constant comparative analysis could have been employed in this type of study (Creswell & Poth, 2018). However, according to Creswell and Poth (2018), the purpose of grounded theory research would be to develop a theory which does not currently exist about the phenomenon, and that was not the purpose of this particular study. A collective case study

analysis was also considered but dismissed as Creswell and Poth (2018) indicated that case studies must begin with the researcher already having identified cases which would fit within the boundaries of the study. For this study, the parameters were broad—social work educators in a post-secondary setting—and did not seem to fit within the boundaries of a case study. Neither narrative research nor ethnographic research were considered, as the former focuses on life stories and how they are told, and the latter considers cultural phenomena (Padgett, 2017), neither of which were applicable to this study. Dismissing these methods assisted in solidifying phenomenology as the preferred qualitative method for this study.

In discussing the design phase of a phenomenological study, Creswell and Poth (2018) outlined the following steps. First is to ascertain phenomenology is the best approach to use for the research in question. Creswell and Poth (2018) stated that this method works best when attempting to “understand several individuals’ common or shared experiences of a phenomenon” (p. 78), perhaps to change procedures or implement new policies. This study examined if disability was included in diversity training, and how that had an effect on social work educators’ perception of their ability to teach students with disabilities and effectively incorporate disability into their curricula, therefore an understanding various individuals’ perspectives of the phenomenon was important. Furthermore, this study could inform the policies of schools of social work regarding providing disability and diversity training for instructors.

The next steps in design of a phenomenological study, according to Creswell and Poth (2018) were to determine what phenomenon would be studied and to provide a description of that phenomenon and the philosophy surrounding it. As previously explained, the phenomenon being researched in this study was diversity training experienced by social work educators, specifically the inclusion or exclusion of disability in the training, and if it was included, how.

Once these steps were completed, the researcher prepared for the data collection. While data collection will be described in detail in a later section, it should be noted here as part of the design that data was collected through semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions in keeping with phenomenological design (Padgett, 2017) which allowed the researcher to ask follow-up questions based on the participants' answers in a conversational manner and delve more deeply into certain aspects of the phenomenon.

Trustworthiness

In order to determine the rigor, or trustworthiness, of a qualitative study, Guba and Lincoln (1989) developed four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. One of the methods for establishing credibility recommended by Guba and Lincoln (1989) is a member check in which members of the stakeholder community providing the data are solicited for feedback related to the data. In this study, participants were given the opportunity to review interview transcripts to ensure accuracy; none of the participants chose to utilize this option, however. Additionally, coding was reviewed by a social work educator who formerly worked in disability services. This IRB approved secondary coder reviewed three of the six interviews (50%) utilizing the researcher's codebook to both code the transcripts and develop themes, in order to establish intercoder reliability.

In discussing transferability, Guba and Lincoln (1989) state that the qualitative researcher may not be able "provide an index of transferability; it is his or her responsibility to provide the data base that makes transfer ability judgments possible on the part of potential appliers" (p. 316) and recommend purposive sampling as one technique in which to do this. Sampling will be discussed in a later section; however, it is to be noted here that purposive sampling was employed in this study as per the suggestion of Guba and Lincoln (1989).

Dependability and confirmability, in addition to credibility and transferability can simultaneously be established through reflexive journaling. Guba and Lincoln (1989) recommend tracking the daily agenda and logistical items important to the research, personal information related to the study, as well as a log of methodological decisions, and the reasoning behind the decisions. This allows the researcher to document both methodological information and personal decision-making information, thus tracking the day-to-day logistics of the study to establish trustworthiness in all four domains (Lincoln & Guba, 1989). In this study, the researcher employed the use of a reflexive journal and memoing (described in detail in the data analysis section) to establish both dependability and confirmability, as well as reaffirming credibility and transferability.

Sampling

Research Sample

The sampling method chosen for this study was purposive sampling, which involves identifying study participants who are able to provide information related to the phenomenon being studied (Padgett, 2017) and is commonly used in qualitative research design. Purposive sampling is appropriate for this study as it was important to select participants who are social work educators in CSWE accredited programs, as these individuals are required to adhere to the EPAS in their instruction (CSWE, 2021b). Additionally, because training may occur at an institution on an annual basis, it was important to select instructors who have been in their position at their current institution for at least a year. Creswell and Poth (2018) refer to this as criterion sampling, a specific type of purposive sampling, as the participants must meet specific criteria to be included in the sample.

In order to obtain the sample, or participants, schools of social work with Bachelor's and Master's level programs accredited by CSWE in New York State were contacted via the email contact listed on the Directory of Accredited Programs webpage on the CSWE website (CSWE, 2021a) in accordance with approval from the proposal submitted to the Millersville University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The contact at each school was asked to distribute an invitation to social work instructors with more than one year of experience at their institution to participate in virtual interviews via Zoom. When the recruitment from New York institutions did not yield any participants, an amendment was submitted to the same IRB to solicit participants from additional states, beginning with Pennsylvania, the hope being that program directors would be more receptive to an email from a school they recognized as being from their state, especially those within the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education, as is Millersville. Subsequent emails were sent to other states in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic based on number of accredited CSWE programs within the states, beginning with the highest number. This method still did not yield enough participants, so an additional amendment was submitted to the Millersville University IRB to recruit faculty members directly via email, rather than through the program contacts from the CSWE website.

Padgett (2017) recommends a sample size of 6 to 10 participants for a phenomenological study, while Dukes (1984) suggests 3 to 10 participants. Because of the possibility of participants dropping out during the process, the goal was recruit ten participants from different institutions, to ensure that there will be a sufficient number of participants for the study. A larger sample size than three recommended by Dukes (1984) would have also allowed for the opportunity for more diversity among the participants. After the various adaptations to recruitment methods, six

participants ($N=6$) were recruited for interviews, which falls within both Padgett's (2017) and Dukes' (1984) recommendations.

Data Collection

Semi-structured Interview Protocol

A semi-structured interview protocol is recommended for phenomenological studies as it gives the interviewer a predetermined set of questions related to the phenomenon but still allows flexibility for exploration of topics brought up by the interviewees (Billups, 2021). In semi-structured interviews it is recommended that the researcher establish an interview guide or protocol which consists of predetermined questions and probes for the interviewer to follow. This assists in ensuring consistency in the interviews but will still allow for follow up questions as they arise (Billups, 2021; Creswell & Poth, 2018; Padgett, 2017).

For this study, participants were identified through a purposive, criterion sampling method and were selected from CSWE accredited social work programs in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic—specifically in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. In order to be representative of the programs, participants were selected from public and private institutions, from institutions that offer only undergraduate programs, as well as those offering graduate programs, from smaller and larger institutions, and from those in urban, suburban and more rural settings.

Zoom was used as the platform for interviews as it allowed visual contact with interviewees who were located at a distance, as well as the ability to record both video and audio. Zoom also supplied a rough transcript which could be edited, rather than using the audio to develop a transcript (Zoom, 2021). Participants signed a consent form (see Appendix A) prior to the interview. The interviewer utilized an interview guide with predetermined questions and prompts (see Appendix B) to guide each interview but was able to ask follow-up questions as

topics were brought up by participants in keeping with a semi-structured interview method. As is the norm in such interviews, the questions were open-ended in order to elicit narratives from the participants relative to the phenomenon (Billups, 2021; Creswell & Poth, 2018; Padgett, 2017). Questions and probes for the interview guide were developed based on the literature review to ensure relevancy to the phenomenon being studied and were approved by the IRB prior to the study. While the interviews were recorded, the interviewer still maintained notes during each interview, especially to indicate follow-up questions that may have arisen.

The semi-structured interview began with an introductory question intended to develop a rapport between the researcher and the participant (Billups, 2021). The first introductory question asked the participants to discuss their role as a social work educator, such as the length of time they have worked at their current institution and what courses they teach, in order to learn about their background.

Following the introductory question came the key interview questions, which delved into the research topic (Billups, 2021). The first key interview question asked the participants to describe diversity trainings offered by their higher education institution in which they have participated. Follow-up prompts explored whether the trainings were voluntary or mandatory, the duration of the trainings, and the modality in which they were offered. The next question centered on asking participants to describe how disability was integrated into the trainings previously described. The third question asked participants to describe any additional trainings centering on disability that were offered by either their institution or social work department. Follow-up prompts mirrored those asked previously, but also asked whether those facilitating the trainings identified as disabled or able-bodied. The next question asked participants to describe the disability models and perspectives included in the trainings previously discussed. The

following two questions focused on how the social work educators have used the trainings in developing curricula for their social work courses, specifically as it pertains to incorporation of disability in their courses, and how they felt that the trainings have prepared them to work with students with disabilities. Finally, the participants were asked to describe any additional trainings they feel they might need to assist them in incorporating disability into their curricula or in teaching students with disabilities. Demographic questions, including questions about the participant's institution were asked toward the end, in keeping with the recommendation by Dillman et al. (2009) to put sensitive questions near the conclusion of an interview. Billups (2021) recommended concluding with a debriefing question to allow participants an opportunity to share any additional ideas or to clarify previous statements. The final question was in keeping with that practice, by asking participants if they have anything else they would like to add or share regarding the topic.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality of participants was maintained by assigning each participant a pseudonym which was used in all notes, transcripts, and coding. All electronic documents have been kept on a password-protected computer, and all hard copies of transcripts have been kept in a locked filing cabinet in a locked office. After three years, all of the records containing identifying information will be destroyed, in accordance with IRB regulations.

Data Analysis

The researcher utilized NVivo 12 software to code and analyze the transcripts of the interviews. Padgett (2017) and Billups (2021) suggested using qualitative data analysis (QDA) software such as NVivo to assist with data analysis due to its functionality in organization of

large volumes of qualitative data and assistance with coding. Creswell and Poth (2018) also found NVivo to be secure, as the databases and files are combined and stored as a single file.

Coding

NVivo allowed the researcher to code the interviews and develop a codebook to assist in analyzing the data. NVivo allows for the development of both codes and subcodes, and an individual piece of data can be assigned more than one code (NVivo, n.d.). A priori codes tend to be theory-driven and structural, as they have been developed based on the theoretical framework and the literature review (See Appendix C). However, data-driven, in vivo codes were created as the data was reviewed (Billups, 2021; Decuir-Gunby et al., 2010). The full list of codes and subcodes can be found in Appendix D.

Prior to coding the researcher read over the transcripts and notes in what is known as the immersion phase, which allows researchers to begin deciphering and interpreting data prior to analysis (Billups, 2021). During this stage the researcher also participated in the memoing process. The memoing process entailed writing short notes, or memos, on the transcripts and researcher's notes. Creswell and Poth (2018) described these memos as "short phrases, ideas, or key concepts that occur to the reader" (p. 187) while reviewing the notes and transcripts. According to qualitative research experts, memos are an important aspect of the initial review of the data (Billups, 2021; Creswell & Poth, 2018). The researcher participated in what Moustakas (1994) refers to as "horizontalization" or reviewing each individual piece of data that is relevant to the experience, recognizing that each piece of data has equal value and adds to the whole experience. The codes that are related to the experience are referred to as horizons (Eddles-Hirsch, 2015).

In the second stage, which Billups (2021) referred to as the data reduction stage, coding began with the a priori codes. To sort the data into the a priori codes, deductive analysis was used, as the categories were pre-established, therefore the content needed to be analyzed to match it with the categories. Additionally, as the initial coding occurred, the in vivo codes were also developed. Establishment of the in vivo codes required inductive analysis on the collected data which did not match the pre-established categories and codes (Padgett, 2017). The codebook was developed from these codes, and revised as codes were consolidated and changed, and categories were combined and eliminated during the secondary coding process. Per Moustakas' (1994) recommendation, data that did not describe the experience or phenomenon, or that could not be extracted and labeled was eliminated from the data set. Additionally, any repetitive statements from individual participants were eliminated (Eddles-Hirsh, 2015; Moustakas, 1994). Coded data was then assigned into clusters of related data groups, which then was grouped based on core themes for each participant (Eddles-Hirsh, 2015; Moustakas, 1994).

The next stage was creating the textural and structural descriptions, which began with developing an individual textural description for each participant. This included exact verbiage from the transcripts, to describe the phenomenon from the perspective of each participant (Eddles-Hirsh, 2015; Moustakas, 1994). Composite textual descriptions were developed from the individual textual descriptions, describing the phenomenon as a whole. This was done by analyzing common themes (Eddles-Hirsh, 2015; Moustakas, 1994). Moustakas (1994) then recommended developing individual structural descriptions of the phenomenon which depict the fundamental bases of the experiences related to the phenomenon, such as feelings and thoughts associated with the experience. Each individual structural description was then combined with the textural description for each participant to develop a textural-structural description. Each of

these individual descriptions were then combined into the final composite description that captures the group's experience of the phenomenon (Eddles-Hirsh, 2015; Moustakas, 1994).

To ensure intercoder reliability, coding of three of the six interviews was conducted by a social work educator at the University of North Alabama, who formerly worked as the Assistant Director in the Office of Disability Support Services and who has an MSW and Ed.D. The secondary coder used this coding to develop themes, as did the researcher. While little research exists to help determine acceptable intercoder reliability for phenomenological studies (Marques & McCall, 2005), a system for determining reliability was utilized based on research from Marques and McCall (2005) which recommended an interrater reliability of two-thirds, or 66.7% based on themes developed by the raters. Only themes associated with the interviews coded by both raters were used to determine the intercoder reliability for this study.

The researcher determined eight themes for the three interviews, while the secondary coder determined ten. Of these, they agreed on six. The researcher developed one theme which the secondary coder did not, and the secondary coder determined four themes not considered by the researcher. This accounted for a total of eighteen themes between them. Often, discrepancies resulted when a coded item, such as closed captioning, could be considered part of two different themes, such as accommodations, or Universal Design for Learning.

Marques and McCall (2005) explain several methods for determining interrater reliability based on common themes; the simplest being to add the number of agreed upon themes from each of the raters (6+6), then divide by the total number of themes developed by both raters (18) and multiply by 100. So, for this study, $[(6+6)/18] * 100 = [12/18]*100 = .66666*100 = 66.67\%$. This is considered to be an acceptable interrater reliability for phenomenological studies as established by Marques and McCall (2005).

Reflexivity Statement

The researcher has several perspectives that may influence biases in conducting this research. The researcher is currently enrolled in a doctoral social work program and, as a disabled student, is registered to receive accommodations with disabled student services (DSS). This was also true for both the Bachelor's and Master's level social work programs. During the study, the researcher also currently works as an Assistant Director in a DSS office and often interacts with social work educators regarding the provision of accommodations to students with disabilities. Additionally, as an adjunct instructor for American Sign Language at another higher education institution, the researcher is aware of the types of diversity trainings offered at both the primary and secondary employment setting.

Acknowledging that there may be bias related to certain social work educators with whom the researcher interacted as either a student or a coworker, these institutions were not included in the invitation for the study. Additionally, the other institution at which the researcher has been employed was also eliminated.

Chapter 4: Research Findings

This chapter discusses the findings from the research and the phenomenological descriptions that developed from the interviews. These descriptions are considered in the context of the research questions:

1. Is the diversity training offered to social work educators by their postsecondary institutions inclusive of disability?
2. How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to include disability in the social work curriculum?
3. How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to work with students with disabilities in their classes?

The purpose of this research study was to explore the inclusion of disability in diversity training for social workers, and how social work educators perceive this prepares them to both meet the requirements of the EPAS to include disability in the social work curriculum and to teach students with disabilities. This study investigates both trainings offered at the institutional level and the departmental level based on the personal narratives of social work educators.

During the winter of 2021/2022, emails were sent to CSWE accredited programs throughout the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions to recruit social work educators as participants. Six social work educators from Pennsylvania and Massachusetts agreed to participate in semi-structured interviews via Zoom, which were taped and transcribed using Zoom's autotranscript feature. The transcripts were later edited for accuracy based on the tapes. The edited transcripts were used for data analysis, from which the phenomenological descriptions were developed, which include participants own statements.

Demographics of Participants

Table 4.1 shows the demographic details of the participants and the institutional information. Each of the six participants, as well as the institutions at which they were employed, were assigned pseudonyms to protect their confidentiality. The majority of the participants ($n=5$) identified as female, with one participant ($n=1$) identifying as male. While the majority of the participants did not identify as having a disability ($n=4$), two ($n=2$) did identify as disabled. Participants were asked to identify their race and ethnicity without predetermined categories; two ($n=2$) identified as white/Caucasian, two ($n=2$) identified as white, one ($n=1$) identified as Black/African American, and the final participant ($n=1$) identified as white Hispanic.

Participants were asked to share information about the institutions at which they were employed and their roles as social work educators. All but one were permanent employees ($n=5$); the exception being an adjunct instructor. Roles included not only professor, but also field director, field liaison, and interim dean. While three participants ($n=3$) are from the same institution, the adjunct participant worked at three institutions, although only two were discussed in context of the questions, so five ($N=5$) total institutions were represented by the six participants. One participant ($n=1$) was employed at a private university, while the others ($n=5$) worked at public institutions. Participants reported three institutions as having enrollments of 5,000 or less ($n=4$), one as having between 5,000 and 10,000 students enrolled ($n=1$), and one as having over 10,000 students ($\sim 30,000$) enrolled ($n=1$).

Table 4.1*Participant Information*

on	Demographics <i>Race/ethnicity</i> <i>Gender</i> <i>Disabled/nondisabled</i>	Role(s) in School of Social Work	Courses taught per semester	Level(s) taught <i>(BSW, MSW, DSW)</i>	Institution <i>Pseudonym</i> <i>Size</i> <i>Public/Private</i> <i>Location</i>
P1	White/Caucasian Female Nondisabled	Permanent, field director, Ass't professor	3-4/ semester	BSW	Inst A ~2500 Private PA
P2	White Female Disabled	Permanent, full professor	3-4/ semester	MSW	Inst B ~6500-7000 Public MA
P3	White Hispanic Female Nondisabled	Permanent, tenure track	4/ semester	BSW/MSW	Inst C ~4300 Public PA
P4	Black/African American Female Nondisabled	Interim Dean, Permanent, tenure track	1/year	BSW/MSW	Inst B ~6500-7000 Public MA
P5	White/Caucasian Male Nondisabled	Permanent, full professor	3/ semester	MSW	Inst B ~6500-7000 Public MA
P6	White Female Disabled	Adjunct	4-6/ semester	BSW/MSW	Inst D ~30,000 Public PA Inst E ~3000-5000 Public PA

Results in Context of Research Questions

As the results were analyzed, themes developed around each of the research questions. Participants were also asked a follow-up question regarding what additional training they felt that they would need to better prepare them to incorporate disability into their courses or curriculum, or to help to better prepare them to teach students with disabilities. As themes were also revealed around this question, it is included in this section. Table 4.2 shows the themes for each research question and the subthemes discovered through the follow-up question.

Table 4.2

Themes

Research Question	Themes
1. Is the diversity training offered to social work educators by their postsecondary institutions inclusive of disability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of Inclusion of Disability Training at the Institutional Level • Inclusion of Disability Trainings at the Departmental Level • Models or Perspective of Disabilities Included in Trainings • Changes in Perception of Disability • Obtaining Training Elsewhere for Personal Development
2. How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to include disability in the social work curriculum?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course Design • Curriculum Design
3. How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to work with students with disabilities in their classes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodations • Course Material Accessibility • Universal Instructional Design
Subtopic	Subthemes
Additional training needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theory • Understanding the Students' Perspective • Technology

-
- Introspective Learning
 - Universal Design
 - Accommodations

Is the diversity training offered to social work educators by their postsecondary institutions inclusive of disability?

The first research question investigates whether social work educators are exposed to disability in the diversity training that their institutions offer. The interview questions related to this research topic asked participants to describe diversity trainings offered by their institution. If the participant did not specifically mention disability, a follow-up question was asked to determine if disability was included in any of the trainings. Participants were also asked about trainings offered at the social work department level. To delve further into how disability was discussed or portrayed, participants were asked about models and perspectives of disability included in the training(s). Finally, participants were given an opportunity to discuss if their perception of disability changes after the training(s) and if so, how.

Lack of Disability Inclusion in Diversity Trainings Offered by the Institution

Themes that emerged around this topic centered on the lack of specific disability training at the institutional level, which was brought up by five of the six participants ($n=5$; 83.3%). The sixth participant ($n=1$; 20%), P6, as an adjunct, admitted to not participating in much training offered by the institutions at which she works, mostly due to her work schedule, and was not sure what types of trainings may have been offered, although she did recall one training that was inclusive of disability at Inst D, one of the universities at which she teaches. Additionally, “*we talk about disability a lot at Inst D ... we do like an orientation every semester and we talked a lot about disability during those trainings. Even though they aren't specifically diversity trainings.*” She also described taking a course related to online accessibility at another institution in order to obtain certification for online instruction.

P1 indicated that, at Inst A, *“We haven't had any diversity training, as it relates to our general student body who have accessibility needs or disability accommodations.”* She further elaborated that faculty had been presented with some training related to Universal Design for Learning (UDL), especially related to their online learning management system (LMS) to ensure access for various students, but nothing about disability itself.

At Inst B, P2 discussed the lack of disability inclusion in diversity trainings, specifically as it relates to intersectionality:

I think there's a lot of fear of equating race and disability and I think folks need to think more intersectionally, only you know I do a lot of times I'm...I'm bringing out my intersection lens in those moments and saying, 'What about the fact that one in four members of the black and African American Communities are disabled; three in 10 members of the American Indian Alaska native communities are disabled, you know.' I forget the other statistics, but you know, I go through the whole CDC count on you know racial and ethnic groups, and disability. You know, we've got to start seeing things intersectionally; we are the same communities, we have to see race, we have to see disability; we have to see racism, we have to see ableism.

P2 further revealed how she would attempt to bring disability into discussions during diversity trainings and how that was received,

Whenever I go to a diversity training it...it never mentions disability and I'm always the one raising my hand asking the question about disability, “Why are we not looking at disability as a metric? Why are we not looking at disability as a cultural group and educating the group about that?” And often getting pushed back.

P3 described online diversity trainings required by the institution every two years for faculty and staff which included only very general information about disability which could easily be “*clicked through*,” thus not offering any real education on the topic. P4 agreed that disability was not a focus of the institutional training offered at her institution, Inst B, and that most disability training was obtained through her own search through professional development in a desire for personal edification. Although, as will be discussed later, Inst B did provide disability training at the Social Work departmental level. P4 also discussed some ADA training offered for supervisors but explained that it was mainly from the employer/employee relationship perspective and not with a focus on working with students. P5, also from Inst B, agreed that there was a lack of disability inclusion in diversity trainings offered by the institution:

You know, we get weekly updates on like any workshops or trainings, and I don't recall really getting anything on that. Maybe informal information coming from our... students with disabilities office...will sometimes send out little tips and tricks and things like that, so it's much more informal.

While there was an overall lack of disability inclusion in specific diversity trainings, disability did seem to be included in other manners at several of the institutions.

Inclusion of Disability Trainings at the Departmental Level

It appears that Inst B is the only institution ($n=1$; 20%) to have made a concerted effort to include disability in diversity trainings in the social work department. P2 provides much of the training for the department, based on her identity as a disabled social worker and social work educator. Both P4 and P5 mentioned the trainings provided by P2, not only the formal trainings, but also the informal information passed on, such as emails with information regarding best practices in working with students with disabilities and resources that can be taken back to the

classroom. P4 described a “*Disability 101*” training provided by their colleague, which included “*broader thinking about disability, especially in the context of the United States, historically and currently... And then also how we as educators, need to be thinking about disability and course design and accessibility, and engagement with students and colleagues.*”

The other departments at the other institutions ($n=4$; 80%) did not engage in disability diversity training. P1 explained, “*We're a department of two,*” at her small, private institution, and further discussed that much of their training is obtained from outside sources, such as regional consortiums and national conferences. P3 stated that she could not think of any trainings related to disability that were offered by her department, and P6 had a similar response for the two institutions at which she worked that were discussed, although she admitted that as an adjunct, she may not have been aware of everything that was offered.

Models or Perspective of Disabilities Included in Trainings

Half of the respondents ($n= 3$; 50%), those who did not work at Inst B, reported that there were no models or perspectives of disability included in any of the trainings in which they participated that they could recall. However, after thinking for a moment, P1 remembered participating in a training on UDL, and considered that a theme, if not necessarily a model. Participants from Inst B did recall models being discussed.

P2, in recalling an ADA training she attended at her institution, stated that it was rooted in the medical model. She also stated how she included models and perspectives in the trainings she offered, including at Inst B:

I explain the medical model. I explain the social model. I juxtapose them. I talk about the personal tragedy theory of disability and how both are sort of you know, related to the personal tragedy theory of disability. And how the Disability Community, or people that

culturally identify as disabled, really want us to move beyond that. And how there is a rich life to be lived as part of the Community, although not everyone has a disability identity, but this is a resource that social workers can connect people to if they're not identified as disabled.

P4 did recall this, indicating that she remembered both the social model and the medical model being explained in trainings offered in her department, which included “pros and critiques of both of those models.” P5 knew that models had been discussed in the trainings but could not remember the names of the specific models, however, did recall discussions about viewing disability from a strengths perspective:

For example, sometimes students will say, “Oh, I had a client who was wheelchair bound.” And so, we talked about language in it and thinking about how from strengths perspective, how that actually is a strength that they're able to have some independence and freedom, by using a wheelchair, and so we don't use that language.

Changes in Perception of Disability

Half of the participants ($n=3$; 50%) reported that they did not have changes in their perception of disability related to trainings obtained at their institution. Two participants, P4 and P5, both from Inst B, reported a shift in perspective which was directly related to the trainings in which they participated in their department. P4 described her change in perspective as follows:

I think that the shift was really about questioning my own socialization and assumptions around disability... I think there's absolute sort of knowledge gained and some answers to questions, but even more so, a sense of the need to continue to question...an awareness of just the extent to which certain messages and narratives about disability were messaged to me throughout my whole lifetime.

P5 discussed his change in perception of disability as enhanced awareness of accommodations and how he teaches his class, which will be discussed in the next sections. He further described that it changed his manner such that *“in the forefront of my thinking and awareness in teaching class...listen and observe with other students as well, in terms of how they're thinking about and talking about disability.”*

P1 answered the question affirmatively by discussing the fact that the UDL training had increased her creativity and diversity in presentation of course materials, which will lead into the questions related to how it changed her teaching style and curriculum. She did not actually discuss a change in perception of disability itself, however, but more in how she addresses it in the classroom.

P2 was very direct in that the trainings had no impact on her perception of disability. As she explained, *“My view didn't shift at all, because I knew more about disability than they did, frankly.”* P3 also indicated that her perception of disability did not change from the training, because the training focused on *“if somebody was sexually harassed, if you know...if these negative situations happen, then, how do we handle that not as much about what... do we do for students with disabilities... or even to educate you about a disability.”*

P6 discussed the fact that any changes in perception of disability came from her own research, as opposed to the trainings she attended. As with other participants, she spoke about the trainings and how they influenced her teaching, which again will be explored in the other two research questions:

I think more that's what shaped my... disability knowledge is like my own reading and stuff like that...I wouldn't say that any...I think training sometimes helped me think about what I need to be doing to make my classrooms more accessible.

Obtaining Training Elsewhere for Personal Development

One common theme that emerged from the interviews was that most of the participants, five of the six ($n=5$; 83.3%), sought out disability training on their own, whether through formal or informal methods, to supplement the trainings offered by their institutions which were often not inclusive of disability.

P2 was perhaps the most outspoken about this, describing it as:

Everything I do is centered around how to be more inclusive, how to undo my own ableism, even as a disabled person. I mean, that's my goal, right, is to keep chipping away at my ableism, my racism...my heterosexism...is to figure out how to do that, so...I mean the trainings didn't help me much but that's my life's work.

P4, who works at the same institution as P2, and has attended the trainings presented by P2, also shared her tendency for exploring the topic of disability on her own, “*for my own sort of edification, you know, I've been able to access other trainings and resources, but they've not necessarily been sponsored by or promoted by the institution.*” She further elaborated on why this is important to her:

There's the formal training...but I think some of what we can learn from more informal can be just as powerful and important and so that's just something I'm also trying to continually remind myself of and prompt myself to do is to continue to be open, continue to be, you know curious. And allow that openness and curiosity, to support my growth and development and help me to push back against some of that ableist sort of thinking and behaving that is a part of my socialization.

Because Inst A houses an integrated studies program for developmentally disabled students, there is a voluntary disability training that is offered to faculty and staff who work

within the program. P1 discussed choosing to participate in the training, due to being on the admissions committee for the program, despite never having had one of the students in her class. Seeking training outside of the institution was also mentioned by P1, especially as she works for a small institution with a social work department that only employs two full-time faculty. She discussed the various types of training that she attends outside of the institution, including local consortia, NASW, and CSWE: *“Maybe like four years ago I went to a couple sessions on the disability track of CSWE. And one was about working with students with autism, and the other was about micro aggressions related to students with disabilities.”* So, while her institution does not offer much in the way of diversity trainings inclusive of disability, she is able to attend disability training outside of the institution.

Both P3 and P6 sought accessibility courses outside of their institutions. P3 enrolled in a course in universal design while working on her DSW, and P6 took a course in online accessibility at another institution to assist in obtaining her online teaching certification. P6, who identifies as a person with a disability, discussed how she engages in informal education around disability: *“Learning about like disability as a construct it's been more, like, on my own.”*

How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to include disability in the social work curriculum?

Participants were asked to describe what changes, if any, they may have incorporated into their curriculum and/or courses to be inclusive of disability after taking the training(s). In the answers, there was some overlap between the answers that stemmed from this research question, and the next, which relates to working with students with disabilities. P2 stated that the trainings did not influence her curriculum/courses, because

the trainings that I attended were so bad that they didn't give me anything that would change my courses, but because I am a scholar in disability studies on my own that has greatly informed my work and my teaching.

Other participants did feel that there was some change in their course design and/or curriculum design based on trainings in which they participated. P6's answers to this question seemed to fall more into the themes for the next question, related to how teaching style was changed after the training, so her answers will be documented in the next section.

Course Design

Four of the participants ($n=4$; 66.7%) discussed changes in their course design. P1 described having various types of assessments during the semester, including papers, quizzes and exams, and presentations, as well as assigning both individual and group work to have inclusive courses. P3 does not include exams in her class, which eliminates the need for testing accommodations for students, but also because she does not see the “*need to regurgitate information in order to be a decent social worker.*” She stated that her goal is to set up activities in which all students can be included without having to leave the classroom for accommodations. P4 also referred to more consideration around designing assessments and

how I'm thinking about my own assumptions, right, about class participation and...the pedagogical elements there. I think I've definitely shifted after being exposed to, you know, some of these trainings, and then the attendant resources that have been shared via the trainings.

P5 discussed being more conscious of disability, “*not only how I prepare my class and how I deliver it but also how students in class think about and talk about disability.*” Discussions around the use of language and disability are now a part of the course. Some discussions

included talking about person-first and disability-first language; others may have centered on language that is no longer considered acceptable. For example:

Some students may use the word “handicapped,” which is really no longer kind of in our language base so...it definitely puts it in...the forefront of my thinking and awareness in teaching class, like, listen and observe with other students as well, in terms of how they're thinking about and talking about disability.

Curriculum Design

Curriculum design changes were discussed by two of the six participants ($n=2$; 33.3%). P3 explained this from a broader perspective of the social work department as a whole, being mindful of the needs of students and that they “*try to be as inclusive as possible*” including online and asynchronous courses, and “*giving them the time they need to either make up or do assignments while also keeping standard.*”

Content was a focus of P4’s answer to this question, and she explained the importance of being aware of resources, such as

Disability Advocacy groups and movements, and like, important and key advocates in the Community. So, being able to go and sort of, hear first person accounts, and hear examples, and hear like, really good arguments being made about why we need to be shifting our thinking around things, and then being able to take that back to the classroom and say “Hey, look at this! Let's look at this together.”

How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to work with students with disabilities in their classes?

For this question, participants were asked to describe what changes, if any, they might have incorporated into their teaching style to be inclusive of students with disabilities after taking

the training(s). Again, P2 indicated that her teaching style had not changed due to trainings she had taken, but rather that,

when I'm crafting the trainings on disability cultural competence, I'm always rethinking how I'm doing those trainings and it's always making me think about how I teach, how I write, how I research. And so, it definitely informs my work but that's me crafting those trainings and when I'm giving those trainings to other social workers it's always informing what I do.

As previously mentioned, there was some commonality in the discussion that developed between this research question and the one pertaining to coursework/curriculum. Several themes emerged from this question, including accommodations, accessibility, especially with course materials and online format, and Universal Design for Learning (UDL).

Accommodations

Half of the six participants ($n=3$; 50%) specifically addressed accommodations when discussing how their teaching style may have changed since participating in training. P1 referred to the fact that it was not necessarily a change, however *"I've always you know, obviously followed the accommodations that students have, you know, in their plan and that we get copied on"* and continued to do so after any training. P6 spoke about ensuring that students accommodations were met in her classroom *"I make sure that I'm really proactive on those and giving them whatever it is that they need, like, I try to make it as easy on them as possible to get their accommodations."* She provided a specific example of setting up Zoom in the classroom for a student who was immunocompromised and could not return to school during the pandemic. The accommodation included setting up a microphone in the center of the classroom, *"not just giving her access to class, but making her feel engaged."*

P5 spoke at length about accommodations, giving some specific examples such as allowing students to have scrap paper when taking a multiple-choice exam, or to write on case studies to help them focus. These were not accommodations recommended by the DSS office, but accommodations that he made for students based on requests in order to ensure that they can learn according to their learning style, according to P5.

Course Material Accessibility

As far as digital and online accessibility, five of the six participants ($n=5$; 83.3%) spoke to this as an area in which they made changes. P1 indicated gaining knowledge of ensuring that students are able to access content by *“making sure that the content is not too busy on your screen, you know, to make sure that it's streamlined, and simplified, and that links open up in a new window.”* She also mentioned using captioning for Zoom sessions.

P3 discussed using PDFs rather than Word documents and checking for accessibility before distributing them, and ensuring that students can download materials, as well. Checking for accessibility in course materials appeared to be a common change in teaching style to ensure inclusion, as it was also mentioned by P4 as one of the *“pedagogical elements there I think I've definitely shifted after being exposed to, you know, some of these trainings.”* P5 explained that Canvas, their online learning management system has a function to check for accessibility that he used to ensure his materials meet standards, as well as ensuring uploaded materials are accessible to screenreaders (software that reads text aloud). Additionally, he discussed using closed captioning for videos for a student who needed access due to a hearing loss.

P6 specifically attended a training on course accessibility at another institution in order to get certified to teach online. This training enabled her to incorporate digital accessibility such as *“typing the words in for the links...instead of just the link itself.”* She continued to explain, *“that*

training was really helpful in learning about all the different challenges that people with disabilities face when they're using the computer and what we need to do to make it accessible for them.”

Universal Instructional Design (UID)

Half of the participants ($n=3$; 50%) discussed including UID in their teaching style after participating in trainings. P1 indicated that she is more aware of accessibility such as ensuring that videos are captioned, and *“upload[ing] my PowerPoints before a lecture so that students can follow along visually if it helps them instead of just listening.”*

P3 also discussed incorporating universal design into her teaching, as did her colleagues: *I think the perspective of not just talking about self-care, but actually allowing them self-care, so I have built in, and many of our faculty have, late periods...that they can use without being penalized...you don't have to explain to me why, just that you're going to use a late pass.*

Both P3 and P6 indicated that they had taken a course on UDL and accessibility outside of their institution, which enhanced their ability to bring it into the classroom and be inclusive of all students. P6 discussed why UDL is practical: *“We should just make things like that, like, just make things accessible in general right for everyone, and then we don't have to be like ‘well, we have to do this special thing for somebody.’ No, you're just doing it.”*

Additional Training Needed

Participants were also asked what additional training they felt that they would need to better prepare them to incorporate disability into their courses or curriculum, or to help to better prepare them to teach students with disabilities. All of the participants ($n=6$; 100%) offered suggestions of trainings that they would find beneficial. Themes that developed from this question included theory, understanding the students’ perspective, technology, introspective learning, and accommodations.

Theory

Two participants ($n=2$; 33.3%) indicated an interest in learning more about theory. P1 stated that it would be important to have training on Critical Disability Theory or other theoretical frameworks that guide evidence-based practice, based on the literature. P6 also expressed an interest in learning more about theory and theoretical perspectives, *“because it’s like a whole like paradigm in itself that I’m not really familiar with it all, and so learning about like, that theory I think would be really helpful for me.”*

Understanding the Students’ Perspective

One-third ($n=2$; 33.3%) of the respondents were interested in participating in training that would give them insight into disabled students’ perspective. P1 mentioned that training which helped faculty members to understand the lived experiences of students with disabilities would be useful, such as *“role plays or simulated types of settings.”* P6 indicated a desire to learn about how to support her students in the classroom from the students themselves, as she explained:

What kind of challenges they face in the classroom, like what irks them, you know, like what kind of things are challenges for them, or what kind of discriminatory types of things they face? Like, I’d like to know more about their actual experience, so I think that would help me do better, and it would just help me have a deeper understanding of, um, disability and as it pertains to education, particularly.

Technology

Half of the participants ($n=3$; 50%) discussed further training on technology as an area of interest. P2 mentioned that she had actually been discussing a potential training with the DSS services office at Inst B related to technology and online teaching, which would include

making a PowerPoint accessible, getting your closed captioning worked out, getting your images accessible with the alternative you know, text, making documents accessible, like all that technical stuff ...there's no one central place where you can learn how to do that.

P5 also discussed more training in technology and how that would enable him to assist his students, especially in terms of resources he could recommend: *“I know there’s like apps and different programs that will actually read documents out loud, you know, kind of like the reader and, which ones work? Are they free? Do they cost money?”* He also recalled having a student who needed captioning and that it would have been helpful to know more about how to obtain reliable captioning for videos.

P6 brought up the concern of how to ensure that her courses were accessible for students with low vision and stated that she has been working on the accessibility of her courses, but that a training would be useful before she has a student who needs the accessibility, so she can be sure of full accessibility.

Introspective Learning

Two participants ($n=2$; 33.3%) demonstrated an interest in introspective learning. A training that P2 discussed was examining one’s own ableism and how to dismantle that, especially in the context of the classroom. Even though P2 discussed conducting trainings around the topic herself, she admitted that this is an area on which she was still working.

P4 expressed a desire to set up a learning community, rather than a training, where she could work collaboratively with colleagues to explore disability, in a manner where *there's more accountability there and there's more shared inquiry, collaboration. And I think, especially in something like teaching and education, where there's so much learning that can happen from sharing “this went well, and this didn't go so well.” And normalizing I think the challenges of growth. So, that's what actually comes to mind when you asked that is what I would*

benefit from, and I think what other faculty would benefit from is more opportunities for that deeper, like work of community reading, group learning, community series.

P4 also expressed a desire to continue informal education about disability in an effort to “*allow that openness and curiosity, to support my growth and development, and help me to push back against some of that ableist sort of thinking and behaving that is a part of my socialization.*”

Universal Instructional Design

Universal Instructional Design (UID) was a training mentioned by two respondents ($n=2$; 33.3%) as an area of additional need. While P3 discussed incorporating UID into her own teaching, she believed that training on UDL, especially as more courses are being taught in hybrid or “hyper-flex” modalities, would be beneficial. She explained, “*people forget that there are different learning styles, so you know that some people that you need to do both visual and audio and incorporate different ways for students to learn.*”

In discussing making her courses accessible, P6 brought up UDL, and stated that if courses were accessible for everyone from the start, then special accommodations would not need to be made for individuals and everyone would automatically have full access immediately. Trainings to help instructors set up courses that way would benefit all students.

Accommodations

In addition to learning more about technology, one participant ($n=1$; 16.7%), P5 expressed interest in learning more about accommodations for students in his classes:

I think it'd be helpful to have more training and education around the accommodations that students receive because it to me they seem very limited. Usually, in my case it's extra time on a test, um, or exams, and maybe a note taker for class, but there's really nothing about giving extended time on assignments, and things like that. So, for me, to

have another little bit more conceptual understanding as to how those decisions are made.

Summary of Findings

This phenomenological study yielded several themes for each research question. For the first research question, which asked the diversity training offered to social work educators by their postsecondary institutions inclusive of disability, themes of a lack of inclusion of disability at the institutional level, inclusion of disability at the departmental level, models/perspectives of disabilities included in trainings, changes in perception of disability and obtaining training elsewhere emerged. The second research question examined how social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to include disability in the social work curriculum, and yielded two themes, one centered on course design and the other on curriculum design. The final research question inquired as to how social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to work with students with disabilities in their classes. The question raised themes around accommodations, course material accessibility, and Universal Instructional Design (UID). Finally, while not all of the participants received disability diversity training at their institution, all indicated an interest in additional training, with themes centered on theory, understanding the perspectives of the students, technology, introspective learning, UID, and accommodations.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Implications, and Conclusions

This qualitative research study analyzed perspectives from various social work educators related to their experiences with diversity training and the inclusion of disability at their institutions. In keeping with phenomenological design, the experiences of the participants were analyzed to determine a textural-structural description for each participant, which was then merged into a composite of the overall experiences of the participants. This chapter will synthesize the results discussed in the previous chapter and discuss the implications for social work education, limitations of the study and discuss recommendations for further study.

Research Summary and Conclusions

In summarizing the research, the same approach will be taken as in reporting the results, by utilizing the research questions and the themes discovered within each question, through the phenomenological composite developed from the coding and analysis process. These themes will also be discussed in context of the literature and theoretical frameworks previously presented. Conclusions were drawn from the information collected within the phenomenological composite, based on each theme.

Is the diversity training offered to social work educators by their postsecondary institutions inclusive of disability?

Lack of Disability Inclusion in Diversity Trainings Offered by the Institution

Five of the six participants ($n=5$; 83.3%) indicated a lack of inclusion of disability in the diversity trainings offered by their institutions. One participant noted that disability was discussed in the adjunct trainings at one of the institutions at which she worked, but that this was for orientation purposes and was not really diversity training. This is in keeping with the findings of Phillips et al. (2016), as well as Wynants and Dennis (2017), in that diversity training rarely

includes individuals with disabilities. By not including disability, institutions are missing the opportunity to dispel myths around disability (Phillips et al., 2016) and are leaving out a significant portion of the student population with whom not only social work educators, but all instructors work (Snyder et al., 2019).

Inclusion of Disability Trainings at the Departmental Level

Only one institution ($n=1$; 20%) included disability as part of diversity training at the social work departmental level. Three of the participants ($n=3$; 50%) were employed at this institution, but each had a different perspective to offer on the training. One participant ($n=1$; 16.7%), who identified as disabled, discussed offering the trainings, as well as having to fight to get disability included in the curriculum. Having a trainer with a disability is consistent with the recommendations of Phillips et al. (2016) who indicated that having disabled trainers would be essential for participants to develop a positive outlook regarding the capability of disabled individuals. This also incorporates intergroup contact theory, as the participants are interacting with a member of the disability community, which should work to decrease prejudice towards the community as a whole (Boin et al, 2021; Hässler et al., 2021), including the students with whom they work.

While that institution did provide training at the departmental level, the remainder of the institutions ($n=4$; 80%) did not. These social work educators were left to seek out disability diversity training on their own, if it was not offered at the institutional level, as many mentioned that they did.

Models or Perspective of Disabilities Included in Trainings

Only one institution ($n=1$; 20%), Inst B, included models or perspectives of disabilities in the trainings. While one participant from the institution recalled models having been discussed at

the trainings, he could not remember the specific models. P2, the participant who also serves as a trainer mentioned that one training in which she participated shared solely the medical model; Dupré (2012) and Goulden (2020) found that this is a common perspective in social work curricula, and it may be surmised that if social work instructors are receiving training from that perspective, it would be passed on to students.

When facilitating training, however, this participant ensures that she discusses both the medical and social model, allowing those participating in the training to learn the differences in the models and how the disability community views themselves in regard to the models, thus demonstrating Gilson and Depoy's (2012) recommendation of sharing both models. P4, who participated in trainings facilitated by P2, was able to articulate the two models presented, and discussed the disability community and the importance of learning from its members. Without discussing the theories specifically, P2 brought forth the essence of both CDT and disability as multiculturalism, by recognizing that disability is a complicated experience with its own voice and is a shared cultural experience within a community (Gilson & DePoy, 2000; Rocco, 2005; Tainter et al, 1995).

Changes in Perception of disability

Half of the respondents ($n=3$; 50%) indicated that there was no change in their perception of disability after participating in trainings at their institution; two of these respondents had stated that disability was not included in the trainings, while P2 explained that the one training that was inclusive of disability provided information which she knew to be incorrect and therefore did not change her perspective.

Half of the participants ($n=3$; 50%) responded that there was a change in their perception. Of those three, two were from Inst B, where they were exposed to disability diversity trainings

facilitated by a self-identified member of the disability community. Their change in perception is predictable given intergroup contact theory and the assertion by Boin et al. (2021) of improvement of attitudes towards those of the group with which contact is made with a single member.

The final participant whose perspective changed discussed involvement in a training on Universal Design contributing to her awareness of the accessibility needs of her students. Her change in perception was not so much of disabled individuals, but more as to her own awareness of how to accommodate them within her classroom settings, and to provide an environment that was accessible to all of her students.

Obtaining Training Elsewhere for Personal Development

Five of the six ($n=5$; 83.3%) participants discussed seeking disability training, often outside of their institution, for their own personal development, whether formally or informally. Formal training included taking courses on accessibility, as well as workshops centered on disability offered by other sources, including at conferences. Additionally, participants described reading and intentionally exposing themselves to information on an informal basis in order to learn about disability. For three of the participants, this appears to be in response to a lack of training offered by their institution, a situation predicted by Philips et al. (2016), and Wynants and Dennis (2017).

One participant indicated that she pursues additional education for personal edification and the ability to analyze her own internalized beliefs related to disability beyond what she receives from the trainings offered at her institution. This participant has been exposed to trainings presented by a disabled facilitator, and her behavior seems to be supporting the view of

Hässler et al. (2021) related to intergroup theory that intergroup contact can increase commitment to social change on the part of the more privileged group.

For the other participant searching for outside education, it is to not only to prepare to train others about disability, but also for the self-awareness described by the previous participant, including breaking down her own ableism. As this participant identifies as disabled, her participation in self-education can be attributed to both CDT and Disability as Multiculturalism.

Ableism, marginalization, and oppression are significant aspects examined in CDT (Rocco, 2005), and this participant discussed developing a training related to these topics after meeting *with the master's program on the fact that all the disabled students are coming to me talking to me about all the ableist incidents that they're facing at the hands of the faculty and what to do about that. So, I sort of gave them "Disability 101: How to Undo Your Ableism."*

Additionally, she discussed working with faculty on understanding language related to disability identity and various models and theories, which is related to Disability as Multiculturalism, in looking at not only disability identity, but the disability community and culture (Gilson & DePoy, 2000; Tainter et al., 1995):

When I do offer trainings, I explain the medical model; I explain the social model. I juxtapose them. I talk about the personal tragedy theory of disability and how both are sort of you know, related to the personal tragedy theory of disability.: And how the Disability Community or people that culturally identify as disabled really want us to move beyond that. And how there is a rich life to be lived as part of the Community, although not everyone has a disability identity.

It is apparent that, whether through formal or informal means, participants in this study at the various institutions were seeking out information related to disability of their own accord, even when they had access to training at their institutions.

How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to include disability in the social work curriculum?

Course Design

Of the four participants, two thirds of the total ($n=4$; 66.7%), who discussed course design changes, three focused on the changes related to accommodations and ensuring equal access within the course design itself, essentially incorporating universal design into their courses, whether through how the course was taught or assessed. In doing so, these three incorporated Lightfoot and Gibson's (2005) suggestions for how to incorporate Universal Instructional Design (UID) into social work programs, specifically as related to varying instructional and evaluative methods.

The fourth participant explained that he designed his course to include discussions around the use of language related to disability and disability identity. While this participant did not expressly mention Disability as Multiculturalism theory, these discussions relate back to the theory by focusing on identity and language related to the disability community, two of the essential components of the theory (Gilson & DePoy, 2000).

Curriculum Design

Two of the respondents ($n=2$; 33.3%) indicated that they had incorporated changes to their curriculum after participation in the trainings. One focused on inclusion, while the other discussed content. Inclusion was described as being mindful of the needs of all students, such as integrating online synchronous and asynchronous course offerings to allow students to work

from home if needed, and allowing for late assignments when needed, for example. Lightfoot and Gibson (2005) suggested ensuring that the learning environment is welcoming and inclusive for all students, and that it utilizes a students' support systems. This curriculum design allows for both, incorporating UID.

The other participant discussed her changes being more content related, as in bringing first-person accounts into the curriculum as part of discussions related to disability. This honors the shared experience of disability as discussed in both CDT (Rocco, 2005) and Disability as Multiculturalism (Gilson & DePoy, 2000; Tainter, 1995). When these first-person accounts are given by the actual person as a guest in the classroom, then the students are also exposed to a member of the Disability Community, giving them an opportunity to interact with a member of a marginalized group and develop an understanding of their perspective, bringing Intergroup Contact Theory into play, as well (Boin et al., 2021; Hässler et al., 2021; Paluck, 2006).

How do social work educators perceive that the diversity training offered by their institution prepares them to work with students with disabilities in their classes?

Accommodations

Half of the participants ($n=3$; 50%) referred to accommodations in the discussion of how their teaching style may have changed since participating in trainings. This included close adherence to the formal accommodations recommended by the DSS office, as well as informal accommodations to ensure that students were able to access the course in the manner most appropriate for them. This is related to Lightfoot and Gibson's (2005) suggestion in the UID concept that instructional methods should be altered in a manner to provide the greatest number of students the highest level of accessibility possible.

Course Material Accessibility

Closely related to accommodations is ensuring that course materials are accessible to all students. This was a major area of change in that five of the participants ($n=5$; 83.3%) discussed it. This was also discussed in the context of Universal Design, as each of the five respondents spoke about course accessibility in a general sense, ensuring that the materials were accessible prior to the beginning of the course, rather than making materials accessible for one student with accessibility needs (Kim & Sellmaier, 2020; Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005)

Universal Instructional Design

While the two previous themes incorporated Universal Design, three participants ($n=3$; 50%) specifically addressed including it in their teaching style after exposure to content relating to UID in trainings. These participants discussed how they integrated UID into their teaching style to ensure accessibility not just for disabled students, but for all students in their courses. This embraced the four principles outlined by Lightfoot and Gibson (2005) which included ensuring the classroom is welcoming, focusing on the important elements of the course, incorporating various methods of instruction and evaluation.

Additional Training Needed

Each participant ($N=6$; 100%) indicated a need for additional training related to disability, even the participant who facilitated disability trainings herself. This supports previous findings (Roth et al., 2018) which demonstrated that after exposure to disability trainings faculty members would request more information and training.

Theory

One-third of the participants ($n=2$; 33.3%) stated that they had an interest in further training related to disability theory. One specifically mentioned CDT, while the other was

interested in theoretical perspectives in general. Education in the various theoretical perspectives of disability would enable social work educators to teach about disability with an understanding of disability from different models, embracing Dupré's (2012) suggestion for approaching teaching disability from a variety of contexts.

Understanding the Students' Perspective

Two of the participants, or one-third ($n=2$; 33.3%), stated that further training that assisted them in understanding the perspective of their students with disabilities would be helpful. One participant recommended role-playing or simulations, similar to the suggestion of Bezrukova et al. (2016). However, simulations are not generally recommended for disability awareness training, as they can invoke complicated feelings, such as pity, fear of becoming disabled, and discomfort about discussing disability, not just the hoped-for awareness (Leo & Goodwin, 2013; Nario-Redmond et al., 2017). The other participant who wanted to understand the student perspective suggested learning it firsthand, from disabled students directly.

Technology

Learning more about technology related to disability and accessibility was a training area brought up by half of the participants ($n=3$; 50%). This included accessibility of PowerPoints and documents, as well as ensuring that formatting was accessible for screenreaders, and that captioning was accessible and accurate. Additionally, understanding the various forms of assistive technology available to students, including apps was mentioned. This again, could fall under the context of UID, as ensuring document accessibility and provision of assistive technology can not only assist those with disabilities, but those without, as well (Lightfoot & Gibson, 2005).

Introspective Learning

One-third of the participants ($n=2$; 33.3%) discussed wanting to examine their own attitudes and understanding of disability in a deeper manner. While one spoke of doing this independently, and the other spoke of a collaborative environment, both spoke about undoing their own ableism and the misconceptions they had been taught about disability. Analyzing the impact of ableism and internalized ableism embraces CDT in recognizing the impact of ableism and that disability is a diverse experience with its own voice (Rocco, 2005).

Universal Instructional Design

Two participants, or one-third ($n=2$; 33.3%), of the total sample, indicated an interest in further training related to Universal Instructional Design. One participant was thinking from the aspect of online and hybrid courses, while the other had the viewpoint that developing courses with a UID perspective from the onset would be beneficial for all of the students in her course, not just those identifying as needing accommodations due to a disability. Both educators were viewing course design as need to benefit all students with differing learning styles, in accordance with the varied modes of instructional design principle of UID discussed by Lightfoot and Gibson (2005). However, both respondents recognized that they needed more education in the concept.

Accommodations

While accommodations were a theme of change for many of the participants, it was also an area in which one of the participants ($n=1$; 16.7%) expressed a desire for more training. He indicated that he was unfamiliar with how decisions about accommodations were determined, beyond ADA compliance, and what accommodations were available beyond extended time on exams and note takers. This supports the findings of Wynants and Dennis (2017) that disability

awareness training, including information about accommodations can increase faculty attitudes, knowledge, and comfort levels. Faculty are recognizing gaps in this area and asking for trainings like this to increase their awareness.

Discussion of Results in Context of Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study was based on Critical Disability Theory (CDT), Disability as Multiculturalism, and Intergroup Contact Theory. Each theory and perspective offers a unique lens through which to view the inclusion of disability in diversity training for social work educators. While only three of the participants, all from the same institution, were either exposed to, or facilitated, disability diversity training, even those participants who were not involved in the training offer some perspective within the theoretical framework.

Critical Disability Theory (CDT)

In analyzing the results in the context of CDT, the participant who functions as a facilitator for trainings within her school of social work utilizes the concepts of the theory, even though she didn't specifically name the theory. For example, she brings up ableism at trainings that mention other -isms, works on understanding and undoing her own ableism, and conducts trainings centered on ableism. One of the principles of CDT is that ableism is prevalent and often difficult to recognize (Rocco, 2005). Both she and one of the participants who was exposed to her trainings expressed a desire to obtain more introspective learning centered around disability and an understanding of internal attitudes and ableism, which also demonstrates recognition of the CDT principle of the prevalence of ableism.

The influences of CDT were evident in responses from participants who were not exposed to disability diversity training at their institutions, as well. One mentioned wanting more training in disabled theory, and specifically mentioned CDT as one of the theories. Additionally,

both she and another participant, who identifies as disabled herself, mentioned wanting additional training which would assist them in better understanding the perspective of the students with disabilities with whom they work. This subscribes to the principle of CDT which acknowledges that disability is a unique experience with its own voice (Rocco, 2005)—these participants want to hear that voice firsthand.

Disability as Multiculturalism

All of the interviews indicated that disability is not included in diversity trainings at the institutional level, indicating that at these five institutions, at least, disability is not viewed through the lens of this perspective. Subscribing to this perspective would mean that institutions would include disability when discussing cultural diversity and providing programs related to such, as disability as multiculturalism views the disability community as an essential component of cultural diversity (Bryan, 2007).

However, at the departmental and individual level, the interviews revealed a different viewpoint. At one institution, at the departmental level, disability was included in the diversity training, and one of the participants provided trainings. Participants discussed trainings which included not only discussions about ableism, but also language and learning from the disability community itself. This is in keeping with the principles of the perspective of disability as multiculturalism which recognize a disability community (Gilson & DePoy, 2000) and the language used by that community (Gilson & Depoy, 2000; Heumann, 1993; Linton, 1998). Individually, participants indicated that they had brought these concepts into their courses, through having discussions related to disability language, and utilizing first-hand accounts of the disability perspective from members of the disability community.

Intergroup Contact Theory

Intergroup Contact Theory states that interaction with a member of an outgroup will lead to more positive attitudes toward that group from members of the ingroup (Boin et al., 2021; Hässler et al., 2021; Paluck, 2006). One institution implemented this in their trainings at the departmental level, by having an individual who identifies as disabled facilitate disability diversity trainings. The two respondents who had participated in the training both indicated a change in perception of disability. The first discussed that she questioned what she had been previously socialized to believe about disability, and the second stated that he was more aware of the needs of disabled students in his class.

Two participants who had not experienced disability diversity training indicated a desire to learn from disabled students. Without directly referencing Intergroup Contact Theory, these respondents were drawing on the principles of the theory in recognizing that they could learn more about a marginalized group by interacting directly with the group (Boin et al., 2021).

Implications

This study has several implications for social work education, determined by the percentages of responses within the themes. In order to be considered within the implications, a theme needed to have more than a 50% response rate, for participants, $n=4$; for institutions, $n=3$.

Based on the narratives of the six participants, discussing five different institutions, there did not appear to be an institutional emphasis on disability diversity training. Furthermore, only one institution provided such training at the departmental level, while the remainder did not. Additionally, the majority of the respondents indicated seeking training outside of their institutions. Despite the fact that the CSWE EPAS require social work educators to incorporate disability into their curricula under the diversity component (CSWE, 2021) and that disabled

students are present in social work classrooms (Kim & Sellmaier, 2020; Pardeck, 2001), it is unclear as to how social work educators are to obtain the training necessary to simultaneously teach about disability and teach students with disabilities.

Implications for Institutions

All but one of the participants indicated that while their institutions provided various forms of diversity training, none of it at the institutional level was inclusive of disability. This is consistent with the findings of Bezrukova et al. (2016) and Booker et al. (2016), and therefore does indicate implications for institutions that should be examined.

Institutions

The implications for institutions reach beyond the schools of social welfare and social work educators. Enrollment of students with disabilities continues to increase at the post-secondary level (De Los Santos et al., 2019; Rocco & Delgado, 2011; Snyder et al., 2019). These students, however, are reporting that faculty appear to be unaware of disability needs (Kattari, 2015) meaning that their accommodation needs may be unaddressed more than half of the time (De Los Santos et al., 2019).

The findings of this study support those of De Los Santos et al. (2019) and Sniatecki et al. (2015), both of which stated that institutions are failing to provide disability diversity training to faculty members, which in turn results in faculty unfamiliarity with how to best educate disabled students. This study also supports the findings of Roth et al. (2018) in indicating that faculty members who are exposed to disability awareness training will request more training.

Institutions expecting faculty of all disciplines to effectively teach students with disabilities should provide professional development and diversity training that incorporates not

only disability, but also ableism and its impact on students. This can lead to increased awareness and allyship among faculty and staff toward students with disabilities, allowing them to better meet the needs of this population (Lombardi et al., 2013). Higher education institutions already provide diversity trainings for their faculty and staff (Bezrukova et al., 2016; Booker et al., 2016); it simply needs to be updated to include disability to improve faculty and staff attitudes and comfort in interacting with students who have disabilities (Sniatecki et al., 2015).

Social Work Departments

According to Kim and Sellmaier (2020), disabled students enrolled in social work programs do not feel adequately represented in their courses. This is not surprising, given that several studies (Bean & Hedgpeth, 2014; Dupré, 2012; Goulden, 2020) found that programs incorporating disability into their curricula has been challenging. Additionally, social work educators need to understand how to teach students with disabilities entering their classroom, who may have differing needs and perspectives than their nondisabled peers (Pardeck, 2001).

Of the five institutions included in the study, only one included disability training within the social work department. The social work educators working at this institution also reported the trainings being facilitated by a trainer who identified as disabled, which is not only recommended by Phillips et al. (2016) but also follows the concept of Intergroup Contact Theory (Boin et al., 2021; Paluck, 2006). However, while this one institution offered disability diversity training at the departmental level, the remaining four institutions did not.

If institutions are not offering diversity training inclusive of disability, it may be incumbent upon schools of social work to take the lead and offer such trainings to their faculty in order to fulfill their obligations to their students and to the EPAS (CSWE, 2015; CSWE 2021b; Pardeck, 2011). If the departments do not have faculty members with disabilities who are

qualified or willing to facilitate the trainings, as one of the participants pointed out, the recent use of online and virtual meetings due to the COVID-19 pandemic has led to the ability to receive training from outside sources: “*We could still contract with them, and they could still provide us, you know, supports and services, even though they weren't local. So, it expanded the folks and the resources we're able to have access to.*” Regardless of the manner in which the trainings are offered, schools of social welfare can use the model demonstrated by the department discussed above to develop their own training agenda.

Implications for Professional Organizations

As one participant pointed out, when working for a smaller institution with a very small social work department, it may be that social work educators rely on outside sources, such as professional organizations to receive professional development, including diversity training. One participant mentioned that their state chapter of National Association of Social Workers (NASW) had established a Disability Justice Shared Interest Group to provide advocacy and programming for members in the state. Another participant mentioned that she had gone to the CSWE conference in the past but not noticed much as far as disability offerings. CSWE has shown its commitment to a policy of including disability as diversity and infusing it into the curricula at accredited social work programs, as seen in the draft of the 2022 EPAS (CSWE, 2021b).

However, to ensure that social work educators are prepared to uphold the EPAS, education must be offered to them related to disability and how to incorporate it into social work curricula, as well as enhancing the current offerings centered on teaching disabled students. At the 2020 CSWE Annual Program Meeting, the Disability Issues Track consisted of nine sessions, out of over eight hundred educational opportunities (CSWE, 2020). Three discussed accommodations or inclusion in higher education. One was entitled “Undoing Ableism in Direct

Social Work Practice: Strategies for Social Work Educators” (CSWE, 2020, p. 150), which appeared to educate social work instructors about a specific curriculum. These offers should be expanded to assist social work educators in meeting not only the EPAS, but also the needs of their disabled students.

Additionally, in order to supplement what is being offered, or not, at the institutional level, local and state professional organizations can offer workshops, tracks at conferences, webinars, and self-directed online trainings related to disability diversity for social work educators. This will not only benefit current social work educators, but also the future social workers whom they are educating. Social work educators who are exposed to disability diversity training can model the principles learned for their students. Modeling is an effective tool which social work instructors can use with their students to demonstrate behaviors to be used in interactions with future clients (Fox, 2013).

Strengths and Limitations

In examining the study, several strengths and limitations can be identified. One strength of the study is that the recommendation for sample size for a phenomenological study is between three to ten participants (Dukes, 1984; Padgett, 2017) and this study recruited six participants. Despite over two hundred recruitment emails being sent, and sixteen individuals expressing interest in participating, these were the six who followed through.

However, a limitation of the study was that three of the participants were from the same institution, although one participant was an adjunct and able to speak about two different institutions, bringing the institutional representation to five. Unfortunately, there was not much diversity among the five institutions. Only one was a private institution, and only one institution

had fewer than 3,000 students, while only one had more than 10,00 students. Additionally, all of the institutions, except the one with three participants, were located in Pennsylvania.

The identities of the participants can also be considered as both a strength and a limitation. In analyzing the strengths, there was variation among the participants as far as their roles in social work education, including an interim dean, a field director, and an adjunct instructor, as well as full-time faculty. Two of the participants, or one-third, identified as disabled.

However, a limitation is that none of the participants worked as field instructors, although one was a field director. Furthermore, the majority of the participants, five of the six, identified as female, with only one participant identifying as male. None of the participants identified as non-binary or transgender.

In analyzing limitations, biases must also be considered in qualitative studies, especially those involving interviews (Chenail, 2011). Because the researcher identifies as a disabled woman and works in disabled student services in higher education, this could be considered a potential for bias and a limitation of the study. To combat this, the researcher set up two methods to establish trustworthiness: review by a secondary coder and member checks. Review by a secondary coder was completed and can be considered a study strength. Unfortunately, the member checks were not finished, as none of the participants accepted the offer of reviewing their transcripts, so this may be seen as a limitation of the study. The researcher had been engaging in both journaling and memoing, however, and was able to use this as a backup method to establish trustworthiness, which can be viewed as another strength of the study.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study provides several options for further study. It is recommended that this study be reproduced with a larger sample size. This would provide the opportunity to diversify the participants' identities, as well as vary the types of institutions involved in the study.

Another recommendation for further study is to expand the study beyond social work educators to all faculty in higher education. De Los Santos et al. (2019) described the effect that faculty interactions can have on students with disabilities and the retention of this population at the post-secondary level. Since faculty may be unaware of how to work with disabled students and are requesting training (De Los Santos et al., 2019; Sniatecki, et al., 2015), and as institutions of higher education are providing faculty with diversity training (Booker et al., 2016; Hudson, 2020) investigation as to whether this training is inclusive of disability would be important.

Finally, a study of the disability trainings being offered should be conducted to determine what is being taught and by whom. The one participant who discussed receiving training from her institution explained that much of the information she received was wrong, which she was able to articulate as member of the disability community. She also indicated that the training only portrayed the medical model of disability, without exploring other models, a common issue according to Aquino (2016). Intergroup Contact Theory (Boin et al. 2021; Paluck, 2006) and Phillips et al. (2016) indicate that having a facilitator with a disability will yield better outcomes.

Conclusion

Social work educators are expected to both teach students with disabilities and include disability in their curriculum. This study sought to determine how social work educators perceive that the training they are receiving at their institutions is preparing them to do each of these tasks.

Through a phenomenological method, this study revealed themes centering on a lack of institutional provision of disability diversity training, and a lack of departmental training of the same, except at one institution where a disabled social work educator took the responsibility to train her coworkers. However, another emerging theme was one of the desire to learn more about disability, both through formal and informal means, by the participants, who described both what they have been doing to enhance their knowledge and what types of training they believe would help them in the future.

Students with disabilities will continue to enroll in social work programs, and social work program graduates will continue to work with disabled clients. In order to serve both populations, current students and future clients, social work educators need to be equipped with the resources to teach all of their students with disabilities and about disability.

References

- Abes, E. & Wallace, M. (2018). "People see me, but they don't see me": An intersectional study of college students with physical disabilities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 59, 545-562. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2018.0052>
- Anastasiou, D., & Kauffman, J. (2012). Disability as cultural difference: Implications for special education. *Remedial and Special Education*, 33(3), 139–149.
- Aquino, K. C. (2016). A new theoretical approach to postsecondary student disability: Disability-Diversity (Dis)Connect Model. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 29(4), 317–330.
- Armour, M., Bain, B., & Rubio, R. (2004). An evaluation study of diversity training for field instructors: A collaborative approach to enhancing cultural competence. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 40(1), 27–38.
- Ballan, M. (2008). Disability and sexuality within social work education in the USA and Canada: The social model of disability as a lens for practice. *Social Work Education*, 27(2), 194–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615470701709675>
- Bean, K., & Hedgpeth, J. (2014). The effect of social work education and self-esteem on students' social discrimination of people with disabilities. *Social Work Education*, 33(1), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2012.740454>
- Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K., & Spell, C. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11, 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2008.0090>
- Bezrukova, K., Spell, C., Perry, J., & Jehn, K. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40

- years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(11), 1227–1274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000067>
- Billups, F.D. (2021). *Qualitative data collection tools: Design, development, and applications* (Kindle Book). Sage.
- Boin, J., Rupar, M., Graf, S., Neji, S., Spiegler, O., & Swart, H. (2021). The generalization of intergroup contact effects: Emerging research, policy relevance, and future directions. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(1), 105-131.
- Booker, K., Merriweather, L., & Campbell-Whatley, G. (2016). The Effects of Diversity Training on Faculty and Students' Classroom Experiences. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 10(1),1-7.
- Bruder, M., Mogro-Wilson, C. (2010) Student and faculty awareness and attitudes about students with disabilities. *Review of Disability Studies: An International Journal*, 6(2), 2–14.
- Bryan, W. V. (2007). *Multicultural aspects of disabilities: A guide to understanding and assisting minorities in the rehabilitation process*. (2nd ed.) Charles C Thomas.
- Charles, J. L. K., Holley, L. C., & Kondrat, D. C. (2017). Addressing our own biases: social work educators' experiences with students with mental illnesses. *Social Work Education*, 36(4), 414-429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2017.1297393>
- Chenail, R. J. (2011). Interviewing the investigator: Strategies for addressing instrumentation and researcher bias concerns in qualitative research. *Qualitative Report*, 16(1), 255–262.
- Connor, D. J. & Gabel, S. L. (2010). Welcoming the unwelcome: Disability as diversity. In T. Chapman & N. Hobbel (Eds.), *Social justice pedagogy across the curriculum* (pp. 201-220). Erlbaum.
- Coriale, L., Larson, G., & Robertson, J. (2012). Exploring the educational experience of a social

- work student with a disability: A narrative. *Social Work Education*, 31(4), 422-434.
- Council on Social Work Education. (2015). *Educational policy and accreditation standards for baccalaureate and master's social work programs*. Alexandria, VA: CSWE.
<https://www.cswe.org/getattachment/Accreditation/Standards-and-Policies/2015-EPAS/2015EPASandGlossary.pdf.aspx>
- Council on Social Work Education. (2020). *Leading critical conversations: Diversity, equity, & Inclusion. 66th Annual Program Meeting final program*. <https://www.cswe.org/Events-Meetings/2020-APM/APM-2020-Final-Program.aspx>
- Council on Social Work Education. (2021a). *Directory of accredited programs*. Retrieved April 29, 2021, from <https://www.cswe.org/Accreditation/Directory-of-Accredited-Programs.aspx>
- Council on Social Work Education. (2021b). *Educational policy and accreditation standards for baccalaureate and master's social work programs (Draft #2-Fall 2021)*. Alexandria, VA: CSWE. Retrieved March 27, 2022, from <https://www.cswe.org/accreditation/info/2022-epas/draft-2-of-2022-epas/>
- Council on Social Work Education. (2022). *2022 EPAS*. CSWE. Retrieved March 27, 2022, from <https://www.cswe.org/accreditation/info/2022-epas/>
- Creswell, J.W., & Poth, C.N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed. Kindle book). Sage.
- Daniel, C. (2011). Lessons learned: Pedagogical tensions and struggles with instruction on multiculturalism in social work education programs. *Social Work Education*, 30(3), 250–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615471003789829>
- Decuir-Gunby, J. T., Marshall, P. L., & McCulloch, A. W. (2010). Developing and using a

- codebook for the analysis of interview data: An example from a professional development research project. *Field Methods*, 23(2), 136-155.
- De Los Santos, S. B., Kupczynski, L., & Mundy, M. (2019). Determining academic success in students with disabilities in higher education. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 8(2), 16-38.
- Dessel, A., Rogge, M. E., & Garlington, S. B. (2006). Using Intergroup Dialogue to Promote Social Justice and Change. *Social Work*, 51(4), 303–315.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design approach* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dukes, S. (1984). Phenomenological methodology in the human sciences. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 23(3), 197–203. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00990785>
- Dunn, D., & Andrews, E. (2015). Person-first and identity-first language: Developing psychologists' cultural competence using disability language. *The American Psychologist*, 70(3), 255–264. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038636>
- Dupré, M. (2012). Disability culture and cultural competency in social work. *Social Work Education*, 31(2), 168–183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2012.644945>
- Dupré, M., & Carty, B. (2016). The challenge of addressing disability within social work education: Reconciling theory and practice. *Professional Development*, 19(2), 16–28.
- Eddles-Hirsch, K. (2015). Phenomenology and educational research. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 3(8) 251-260.
- Flink, P. (2021). Person-first & identity-first language: Supporting students with disabilities on campus. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 45(2), 79–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2019.1640147>

- Fox, R. (2013). *The call to teach: Philosophy, process, and pragmatics of social work education*. CSWE Press.
- Garran, A., Kang, H., & Fraser, E. (2014). Pedagogy and diversity: Enrichment and support for social work instructors engaged in social justice education. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work, 34*(5), 564–574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2014.952868>
- Gilson, S., & DePoy, E. (2000). Multiculturalism and disability: A critical perspective. *Disability & Society, 15*(2), 207–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687590025630>
- Gilson, S. F., & DePoy E. (2002). Theoretical approaches to disability content in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 38*(1), 153–165.
- Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Liddiard, K., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2019). Provocations for critical disability studies. *Disability & Society, 34*(6), 972–997.
- Goulden, A. (2020). Disability competency in social work education: Tools for practice teaching. *The Journal of Practice Teaching and Learning, 17*(2), 61-77.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Sage.
- Hässler, T., Uluğ, Ö. M., Kappmeier, M., & Travaglino, G. A. (2021). Intergroup contact and social change: An integrated contact-collective action model. *Journal of Social Issues, 77*(1) 217-241.
- Heumann, J.E. (1993) Building our own boats: a personal perspective on disability policy. In L. O. Gostin & H.A. Beyer (Eds.) *Implementing the Americans with Disabilities Act: Rights and responsibilities of all Americans*. Paul H. Brookes.
- Holley, L. C., Charles, J. L. K., Kondrat, D. C., & Walter-McCabe, H. A. (2020). Supports and

- gatekeeping: Experiences of schools of social work with students with mental health conditions. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2020.1798312>
- Hosking, D.L. (2008, September 2-4). *Critical Disability Theory* [Conference presentation paper]. Fourth Biennial Disability Studies Conference, Lancaster University, UK.
https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/events/disabilityconference_archive/2008/papers/hosking2008.pdf
- Hudson, N. J. (2020). An in-depth look at a comprehensive diversity training program for faculty. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 14(1), 1-10.
<https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstol.2020.140103>
- Hutcheon, E. J., & Wolbring, G. (2012). Voices of “disabled” post secondary students: Examining higher education “disability” policy using an ableism lens. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 5(1), 39–49.
- Kattari, S. K. (2015). Examining ableism in higher education through social dominance theory and social learning theory. *Innovative Higher Education*, 40(5), 375-386.
- Kiesel, L. R., DeZelar, S., & Lightfoot, E. (2018). Challenges, barriers, and opportunities: Social workers with disabilities and experiences in field education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 54(4), 696–708. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2018.1507365>
- Kim, J., & Sellmaier, C. (2020). Making disability visible in social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 56(3), 496–507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2019.1661899>
- Leo, J., & Goodwin, D. L. (2013). Pedagogical reflections on the use of disability simulations in higher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 32(4), 460–472.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.32.4.460>

- Lewis, K. G. (1996). Faculty development in the United States: A brief history. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 1*(2), 26-33.
- Lightfoot, E., & Gibson, P. (2005). Universal instructional design: a new framework for accommodating students in social work courses. *Journal of Social Work Education, 41*(2), 269–277. <https://doi.org/10.5175/JSWE.2005.200303129>
- Linton, S. (1998) *Claiming disability: Knowledge and identity*. New York University Press.
- Lombardi, A., Murray, C., & Dallas, B. (2013). University faculty attitudes toward disability and inclusive instruction: Comparing two institutions. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 26*(3), 221–232.
- Mackelprang, R. W., & Salsgiver, R. O. (2016). *Disability: a diversity model approach in human service practice* (2nd ed.). Lyceum Books, Inc.
- Mary, N. L. (2007). An approach to learning about social work with people with disabilities. *Journal of Social Work in Disability and Rehabilitation, 6*(1/2), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1300/J198v06n01_01
- Marques, J. F., & McCall, C. (2005). The application of interrater reliability as a solidification instrument in a phenomenological study. *The Qualitative Report, 10*(3), 439-462.
- Mazza, E. (2015). Experiences of social work educators working with students with psychiatric disabilities or emotional problems. *Journal of Social Work Education, 51*(2), 359–378. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2015.1012935>
- Meekosha, H., & Shuttleworth, R. (2009). What’s so “critical” about critical disability studies? *Australian Journal of Human Rights, 15*(1), 47–75.
- Moriña, A., Perera, V. H., & Carballo, R. (2020). Training needs of academics on inclusive

- education and disability. *SAGE Open*, 10(3), 2158244020962758.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020962758>.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. (Kindle Book). Sage.
- Nagda, B. A., Spearmon, M. L., Holley, L. C., Harding, S., Balassone, M. L., Moïse-Swanson, D., & de Mello, S. (1999). Intergroup Dialogues: An Innovative Approach to Teaching about Diversity and Justice in Social Work Programs. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 35(3), 433–449.
- Nario-Redmond, M. R., Gospodinov, D., & Cobb, A. (2017). Crip for a day: The unintended negative consequences of disability simulations. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 62(3), 324–333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rep0000127>
- NVivo. (n.d.). Coding. <https://help-nv.qsrinternational.com/12/win/v12.1.103-d3ea61/Content/coding/coding.htm>
- Ogden L., McAllister, C., and Neely-Barnes, S. (2017). Assessment of integration of disability content into social work education. *Journal of Social Work in Disability & Rehabilitation*, 16(3-4), 361-376.
- Olmsted, A. P. (1998). Words are acts: Critical race theory as a rhetorical construct. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 9(4), 323–331. <https://doi-org.libproxy.albany.edu/10.1080/106461798246934>
- Onwuachi-Willig, A. (2009). Celebrating critical race theory at 20. *Iowa Law Review*, 94(5), 1497-1504.
- Padgett, D.K. (2017). *Qualitative methods in social work research* (3rd ed. Kindle book). Sage.
- Paluck, E. (2006). Diversity training and intergroup contact: A call to action Research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(3), 577–595.

- Paolini, S., White, F. A., Tropp, L. R., Turner, R. N., Page-Gould, E., Barlow, F. K., Gómez, Á., Boin, J., Rugar, M., Graf, S., Neji, S., Spiegler, O., & Swart, H. (2021). The generalization of intergroup contact effects: Emerging research, policy relevance, and future directions. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(1), 105-131.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12419>
- Pardeck, J. (2001). Using the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) as a tool for helping social work faculty develop cultural competence in the area of disability. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 20(1), 113–125. https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v20n01_09
- Pettigrew, T. F. (2021). Advancing intergroup contact theory: Comments on the issue's articles. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77(1), 258-273.
- Phillips, B., Deiches, J., Morrison, B., Chan, F., & Bezyak, J. (2016). Disability diversity training in the workplace: Systematic review and future directions. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 26(3), 264–275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-015-9612-3>
- Reyneke, R. (2016). The benefits of using adventure education to facilitate dialogue in social work diversity training. *The Social Work Practitioner-Researcher*, 28(2), 157–172.
<https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC197059>
- Rocco, T. S. (2005). "From Disability Studies to Critical Race Theory: Working Towards Critical Disability Theory," *Adult Education Research Conference*.
<https://newprairiepress.org/aerc/2005/papers/17>
- Rocco, T. S., & Delgado, A. (2011). Shifting lenses: A critical examination of disability in adult education. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education*, 132, 1-12.
- Roth, D., Pure, T., Rabinowitz, S., & Kaufman-Scarborough, C. (2018). Disability awareness,

- training, and empowerment: A new paradigm for raising disability awareness on a university campus for faculty, staff, and students. *Social Inclusion*, 6(4), 116-124.
<https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v6i4.1636>
- Scheef, A., Caniglia, C., & Barrio, B. L. (2020). Disability as diversity: Perspectives of institutions of higher education in the U.S. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 33(1), 49–61.
- Sniatecki, J. L., Perry, H. B., & Snell, L. H. (2015). Faculty attitudes and knowledge regarding college students with disabilities. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 28(3), 259-275.
- Snyder, T.D., de Brey, C., and Dillow, S.A. (2019). *Digest of Education Statistics 2018 (NCES 2020-009)*. U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics: Washington, DC. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2020/2020009.pdf>
- Tainter, B., Compisi, G. & Richards, C. (1995). Embracing cultural diversity in the rehabilitation system. In S. Walker, K. A. Turner, M. Haile-Michael, A. Vincent & M. D. Miles (Eds.) *Disability and diversity: New leadership for a new era* (pp. 28-32). President's Committee on Employment of People with Disabilities.
- Tower, K. D. (2003). Disability Through the Lens of Culture. *Journal Of Social Work In Disability And Rehabilitation*, 2(2/3), 5–22.
- United States Census Bureau. (2020). 2019: ACS 1-year estimate subject table disability characteristics [TableID: S1810]. <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=S1810&y=2019&tid=ACSST1Y2019.S1810&hidePreview=true>
- Whitford, E. (2020, October 7). New round of budget cuts hitting personnel. *Inside Higher Ed*.

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/10/07/colleges-running-out-budget-areas-trim-besides-personnel>

- Wolfensberger, W. (2013). A brief introduction to Social Role Valorization: A high-order concept for addressing the plight of societally devalued people, and for structuring human services. (4th ed.). Valor Press.
- Wynants, S. A., & Dennis, J. M. (2017). Embracing diversity and accessibility: A mixed methods study of the impact of an online disability awareness program. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 30(1), 33–48.
- Zhou, S. (2020). Intergroup contact theory in a nutshell: A meta-meta- analytic examination of intergroup contact theory and the contact space [ProQuest Information & Learning]. In *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering* (Vol. 82, Issue 6–B).
- Zoom. (2021, June 7). Using audio transcription for cloud recordings. <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/115004794983-Using-audio-transcription-for-cloud-recordings->

Appendix A

Informed Consent Form

You are being asked to participate in a study conducted by Carrie Snyder, doctoral student, Millersville University and Assistant Director of the Disability Resource Center at the University at Albany. Please read the following carefully and ask any questions you have before signing. Signing your name and the date at the bottom of the page indicates that you understand the information provided below and agree to participate.

Title of the Study:

#SayTheWord: Is Disability Included in Diversity Training for Social Work Educators?

Purpose and Procedures:

This study seeks to gather data surrounding the inclusion of disability in diversity training for social work educators at CSWE accredited programs in ____ state. An increasing body of research has demonstrated that diversity training can enhance social work educators' comfort and competency in incorporating diversity into their curricula and working with students from diverse backgrounds, which in turn teaches students to work with clients from diverse backgrounds. The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), in the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS), requires that social work educators incorporate diversity into their courses and practice. CSWE includes disability as diversity. Yet, gaps exist in the literature as far as disability diversity training for social work educators and how this training, if it exists, may prepare them to include disability in their coursework, as well as prepare them to teach students with disabilities.

You will be participating in a 1:1 interview with Carrie Snyder, the researcher. Interviews will be conducted via Zoom and will be arranged as your schedule permits.

Risks and Benefits:

There are no known risks or benefits to you personally associated with participation in this study. Zoom interviews will be recorded and auto transcribed so that researcher can analyze and

summarize them. Your responses will be assigned a pseudonym name and will not be associated with your name, your institution's name or any other identifying factors. Dr. Stacy Lee, from the University of North Alabama, will be a secondary coder in this study and has signed confidentiality statements. Results of this study will be published in my dissertation and may also be utilized conference or other presentations or publications. The findings of this study may serve to inform social work education programs as they examine their current professional development practices and determine future professional development opportunities for social work educators.

Compensation, Refusal, and Withdrawal:

Participants receive no compensation. Your participation in this study is voluntary and you can withdraw at any time with no negative consequences.

Confidentiality:

The confidentiality of recorded and transcribed data will be maintained throughout the study by the researcher. Your responses will be recorded. Your responses will be assigned a pseudonym name and will not be associated with your name, your institution's name or any other identifying factors. All files will be saved on password protected laptops and printed transcripts will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in my locked office, for the duration of the study. In compliance with Federal law, they will be kept for three years, at which time any recordings and documents with identifying information will be destroyed.

Age and Experience: All participants must be over the age of 18 and must have worked in their current CSWE accredited social work program in _____ State as a social work educator for at least one year prior to the study.

Contact:

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns before, during, or after the study, please contact me and I will answer any questions and provide any additional information.

Carrie Snyder
cesnyder@millersville.edu
(518) 442-5501

Dr. Laura Brierton Granruth is the chair for this dissertation. She can be reached at laura.granruth@millersville.edu or (717) 871-5956.

This study has been approved by the Millersville University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board. Dr. René Muñoz, Director of Sponsored Projects and Research Administration, can be contacted with any questions at either (717) 871-4457 or (717) 871-4146, or at rene.munoz@millersville.edu.

Consent:

I understand this information and agree to participate fully under the conditions stated above. I also acknowledge that I am 18 years of age or older.

Participant Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix B

Semi-structured Interview Protocol

Title of Project: #SayTheWord: Is Disability Included in Diversity Training for Social Work Educators?

Date/Time:

Interviewer Name:

Interviewee Pseudonym:

Introductions: Researcher introduces herself, reviews session procedures, including one hour length, recording via Zoom and question format.

Review Consent Form: Researcher discusses informed consent form with participant, which includes:

- This study seeks to gather data surrounding the inclusion of disability in diversity training for social work educators at CSWE accredited programs in New York state. An increasing body of research has demonstrated that diversity training can enhance social work educators' comfort and competency in incorporating diversity into their curricula and working with students from diverse backgrounds, which in turn teaches students to work with clients from diverse backgrounds. The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), in the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS), requires that social work educators incorporate diversity into their courses and practice. CSWE includes disability as diversity. Yet, gaps exist in the literature as far as disability diversity training for social work educators and how this training, if it exists, may prepare them to include disability in their coursework, as well as prepare them to teach students with disabilities.

- Results of this study will be published in my dissertation and may also be utilized conference or other presentations or publications. The findings of this study may serve to inform social work education programs as they examine their current professional development practices and determine future professional development opportunities for social work educators.
- Zoom interviews will be recorded and auto transcribed so that researcher can analyze and summarize them.
- The confidentiality of recorded and transcribed data will be maintained throughout the study by the researcher. Your responses will be recorded. Your responses will be assigned a pseudonym name and will not be associated with your name, your institution's name or any other identifying factors. All files will be saved on password protected laptops and printed transcripts will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in my locked office, for the duration of the study. In compliance with Federal law, they will be kept for three years, at which time any recordings and documents with identifying information will be destroyed.
- Your participation in this study is voluntary and you can withdraw at any time with no negative consequences.

Introductory Question:

- 1) Please tell me about your role as a social work educator, for example, how long have you been at your current institution, what courses do you teach, etc.

Key Interview Questions:

- 1) Can you please describe diversity trainings offered by your institution in which you've participated? (Probes: Were these trainings mandatory or voluntary? How long in duration? In-person or online modules?)
- 2) Could you please discuss how disability was integrated into the training(s) you just described?
- 3) Can you describe any other disability trainings offered by your institution or social work department? (Probes: Were these trainings mandatory or voluntary? How long in duration? In-person or online modules? How did the individual(s) who facilitated the training identify as far as disabled/able-bodied?)
- 4) Please discuss the disability models/perspectives that were included in the trainings in which you participated?
- 5) If your perception of disability shifted after taking the training(s), can you please discuss what those changes may have been?
- 6) Can you please describe what changes, if any, you may have incorporated into your curriculum/courses to be inclusive of disability after taking this/these training(s)? (Probe: Did you take the training intending to make changes?)
- 7) Can you please describe what changes, if any, you may have incorporated into your teaching style to be inclusive of students with disabilities after taking this/these training(s)? (Probe: Did you take the training intending to make changes?)
- 8) Can you please describe any additional training that you feel you would need to better prepare you to incorporate disability into your curriculum/courses? To better prepare you to teach students with disabilities?

Institution/program Questions:

Please respond to the following questions regarding the program/institution at which you teach as a social work educator. If you teach in more than one program, please answer for the institution at which you teach the majority of your classes.

- 1) Please indicate whether you are considered an adjunct or permanent faculty member:
- 2) Please indicate how many classes you teach:
- 3) Please indicate what level(s) (i.e. Bachelor's, Master's, Doctorate) your social work program houses and at what level(s) you teach:
- 4) Please indicate the size of your institution (approximate number of students):
- 5) Please indicate whether your institution is public or private:

Please respond to the following questions, as you are comfortable, according to how you personally identify.

- 1) Please indicate your race/ethnicity:
- 2) Please indicate your gender:
- 3) Please indicate if you identify as an individual with a disability:

Concluding Interview Question:

- 1) Do you have anything else you would like to add or share regarding this topic?

Appendix C

A Priori Codes and Subcodes

- ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act)
- CDT Theory
 - Shared experiences of individuals with disabilities
 - Disability as an external social construct
 - Ableism
 - Self-determination
 - Marginalization
- Coursework in disability
 - Individual course
 - Disability history
 - Disability activism
- Disability as Multiculturalism Theory
 - Shared cultural experience
 - Disability language
 - Disability community
 - Disability identity
- Disability culture
- Diversity training for social work educators
 - Institution sponsored
 - School of Social Work sponsored
 - Individually sought

- Mandatory
- Voluntary
- Field educators
 - Field placement
 - Accommodations
 - Disability exposure
 - Disability discussions
- Classroom instructors
 - Accommodations
 - Pedagogical techniques
 - Peer support
 - Experiential training
 - Inclusive instructional strategies
 - Course discussion strategies
- Models of disability
 - Medical model
 - Deficit perspective
 - Social model
 - Strengths perspective
- Incorporation into coursework
 - Syllabus statements
 - Inclusive course materials
 - Accessible course materials

- Universal design for learning
- Intergroup Contact Theory
 - Contact with outgroup member (disability community)
 - Targeted knowledge of other group (disability community)
 - Disabled facilitator for training
 - Nondisabled facilitator for training
- Outcomes of training
 - Attitude toward disability
 - Comfort with providing accommodations
 - Knowledge of accommodations
 - Implicit curriculum inclusion of disability
 - Explicit curriculum inclusion of disability
- Type of diversity training
 - Interactive intervention
 - Lecture-style intervention
 - In-person
 - Online
 - One session
 - Multiple Sessions

Appendix D

Full List of Codes and Subcodes

- ADA
- Add'l traing to help incorporate disability into courses
 - Ableism
 - Accommodations
 - Apps
 - Captioning
 - Resources
 - Tech
 - Theory
 - Use of language
 - Working with Deaf & HOH
- Add'l training to better prepare to teach students w disabilities
 - Community learning forum
 - Digital accessibility
 - Online course accessibility
 - Simulation
 - Student perspectives
 - Ableism
 - Theory
 - Universal design
- CDT Theory

- Ableism
- Disability as an external social construct
- Marginalization
- Self-determination
- Shared experiences of individuals with disabilities
- Competence due to prior knowledge
- Courses taught
 - Addictions
 - Advanced practice
 - Assessment
 - Child and family policy
 - Child Welfare
 - Disability policy
 - Disability Practice
 - Diversity
 - Evaluation
 - Family social work practice
 - Field
 - Field liaison
 - Forensic social work
 - HBSE
 - Human diversity social justice
 - Intro

- Intro practice
- MH practice
- Policy
- Populations at risk
- Practice evaluation
- Practice with individuals, families and groups
- Psychopathology
- Research methods
- Theory
- Trauma
- Coursework in Disability
 - Disability activism
 - Disability history
 - Incorporated into courses
 - Individual course
 - Lack of courses
 - Struggle for disability inclusion
- Demographics
 - Black, African American
 - Disabled
 - Female
 - Hispanic
 - Male

- Not disabled
- White, Caucasian
- Disability as Multiculturalism Theory
 - Disability community
 - Disability identity
 - Disability language
 - Shared cultural experience
- Disability Culture
 - Activism
- Diversity training for social work educators
 - Classroom instructors
 - Accommodations
 - Course discussion strategies
 - Experiential training
 - Inclusive instructional strategies
 - Pedagogical techniques
 - Peer support
 - Field educators
 - Accommodations
 - Disability discussions
 - Disability exposure
 - Field placement
 - Have not attended

- Individually sought
 - Outside professional development
 - Disability underrepresented
 - Still lacking disability
- Institution sponsored
 - Accessibility Training
 - Adjunct orientation
 - Disability discussed frequently
 - Adjuncts not required to participate
 - Basic disability info
 - Connected to outside trainings
 - DEI training
 - Digital accessibility
 - Disability included as a separate diversity training
 - DSS offering information
 - Expressed it could be better
 - General
 - Incorrect information about disability
 - Lack of intersectionality including disability
 - Lack of training for adjuncts
 - Lacking disability
 - Mandatory
 - More training opportunities for full-time faculty

- Optional disability diversity training
 - Presented
 - Pushback when asking about disability inclusion in trainings
 - UDL training
 - Voluntary
- Lack of disability diversity training at institutional level
- Mandatory
- School of Social Work Sponsored
 - Acting as training facilitator
 - Ableist language
 - Disability cultural competence
 - How to undo your ableism
 - Identity first vs Person first language
 - Adjunct unsure of offerings
 - Brown bags
 - Digital accessibility
 - Disability trainings offered by SSW
 - Disabled trainer
 - DSS departmental training
 - Formal
 - Informal
 - Lack of disability diversity training at department level
 - Language

- Struggle to get disability included
 - Voluntary
- General awareness of disability
- Institutional Information
 - BSW program
 - Large (15,000+) students
 - Medium (5,000-15,000 students)
 - MSW Program
 - Private
 - Public
 - Small (less than 5000 students)
- Intergroup Contact Theory
 - Contact with outgroup member (disability community)
 - Disabled facilitator for training
 - Nondisabled facilitator for training
 - Targeted knowledge of other group (disability community)
- Models of disability
 - Medical Model
 - Deficit perspective
 - None mentioned in training or recalled
 - Social Justice Model
 - Social model
 - Strengths perspective

- Never discussed in cultural diversity courses
- Openness to learning from disability community
- Outcomes of training
 - Attitude toward disability
 - Awareness of physical accommodations
 - Change in perception of disability
 - Awareness of digital accessibility
 - Awareness of messages and naratives learned about disability
 - Need to continue to question
 - Sense of knowledge gained
 - Changes in course and or curriculum
 - Content
 - Disability Advocates and Community
 - Disability identity
 - Incorporation into coursework
 - Accessible course materials
 - Ensuring captioning
 - Ensuring visual access
 - Variety in presentation
 - Inclusive course materials
 - Syllabus statement
 - Universal design for learning
 - Varied assessments

- Varied assignments
- Changes in teaching style
 - Awareness of varied needs
 - Captioning
 - Language use
- Comfort with providing accommodations
- Explicit curriculum inclusion of disability
- Implicit curriculum inclusion of disability
- Knowledge of accommodations
- More likely to use DSS as resource
- No change
 - Due to lack of add'l info
 - Knew more about disability than trainers
- Personal growth and development
- SW Educator Role
 - 1 course per semester
 - 1 course per year
 - 3 courses per semester
 - 4 courses per semester
 - Adjunct
 - BSW
 - Director of Field
 - Interim Dean

- MSW
 - MSW Field Coordinator
 - Permanent
 - Professor
- Time at institution
 - 11-15 years
 - 1-5 years
 - 16-20 years
 - 6-10 years
- Type of diversity training
 - Bias reporting
 - Gender orientation
 - In-person
 - Interactive intervention
 - Lecture-style intervention
 - Multiple sessions
 - One session
 - Online
 - Race
 - Restorative Justice
 - Safe spaces
 - Universal design