COMMITMENT TOWARDS INCLUSION REPERTOIRE:
A TOOL FOR FLOURISHING COMMUNITIES

Marina Santi

Department of Philosophy, Sociology, Pedagogy and Applied Psychology - University of Padova
marina.santi@unipd.it

Elisabetta Ghedin

Department of Philosophy, Sociology, Pedagogy and Applied Psychology - University of Padova
elisabetta.ghedin@unipd.it

Abstract

In this paper inclusion is considered as a *value* orienting organizational actions and individual, social and political agency, and a *process* against discrimination, inequality, and exclusion. The axiological dimension of inclusion refers to different frameworks in which its value is correlated with human development, health, well-being, and considered as valuable condition for individual happiness. The process of inclusion emerges as product of different inter-actions and intervention planned and implemented at cultural, political and practical levels. The *Commitment toward Inclusion Repertoire* (CTI-Repertoire) is presented as a multifunctional tool to guide and improve individual and social commitment toward inclusion, focusing on their axiological and procedural aspects. The focus on *commitment* has the advantage to highlight the fundamental role of a shared and individual responsibility, involvement and accountability to affirm inclusion as social value and goal. Starting from a model of inclusion based on the ICF (OMS, 2001) bio-psycho-social framework of human functioning, and on the Sen's Capability Approach to human development, the main purpose of this study was to move from a *descriptive* level of analysis (proper of the Indexes), to a *prescriptive* level of agency (proper of a Repertoire), in order to offer a proactive tool. Finally, we highlight the main potential of the *Commitment toward Inclusion Repertoire* and focus on analyzing its implications in educational contexts; we also highlight the role of inclusive education as a fundamental vector for converting children's capabilities into "flourishing" functionings.

Keywords: Inclusive education; Repertoire; Capabilities; Diversity.

Resumo

Neste artigo a inclusão é considerada enquanto *valor* orientador das ações organizacionais e das iniciativas individuais, sociais e políticas, e enquanto *processo* contra a discriminação, a desigualdade e a exclusão. A dimensão axiológica da inclusão refere-se a diferentes quadros conceptuais, nos quais o seu valor é correlacionado com o desenvolvimento humano, a saúde, o bem-estar, e condição essencial da felicidade individual.

O processo de inclusão emerge como produto de diversas inter-ações e intervenções planeadas e implementadas aos níveis cultural, político e prático. O *Compromisso para a Inclusão* é apresentado como uma ferramenta multifuncional para orientar e melhorar o envolvimento individual e social na inclusão, focado nos seus aspetos axiológicos e procedimentais. A ideia de *compromisso* tem a vantagem de sublinhar o papel fundamental de uma responsabilidade partilhada e individual e do sentido de prestação de contas na afirmação da inclusão como valor e objetivo sociais. Partindo de um modelo de inclusão baseado num quadro de referência bio-psico-social do funcionamento humano (OMS, 2001) e na abordagem de Sen (2000) sustentada nas competências e no desenvolvimento humano, o principal objectivo deste estudo foi movermo-nos de um nível de análise *descritivo*, para um nível de acção *prescritivo*, por forma a desenvolver uma ferramenta pro-activa. Por fim, sublinhamos o potencial do *Reportório para o Compromisso visando a Inclusão*, e analisamos as suas implicações em contextos educacionais; acentuamos também o papel da educação inclusiva como vector fundamental de transformação das capacidades das crianças em funcionamentos "florescentes".

Palavras-chave: Educação Inclusiva; Reportório; Capacidades; Diversidade.

Introduction

The 48th International Conference on education, *Inclusive Education: The way of the future* (UNESCO, 2008) states as a fundamental principle the need to promote inclusive education at all levels. It follows that one of the most significant challenges for educational actions, is the definition of the founding principles of inclusive education. This endeavor does not seem to have received the attention it deserves. The tool

presented in this paper seeks to meet this challenge. The CTI-Repertoire is conceived as a prescriptive guide and evaluation instrument to implement individual and social commitment toward inclusion and to enable inclusive good practices. In the first part, the concept of inclusion is analyzed and its meaning is clarified, in order to identify the inclusion model adopted as a framework. According to interdisciplinary literature, we assume inclusion process as a fundamental aspect of human health and development, a dimension of well-being, and a valuable condition for individual happiness (Delle Fave, 2007). In our view inclusion is, first and foremost, a value orienting organizational actions and individual, social and political *agency*, and a process against discrimination, inequality, and exclusion. Although the Repertoire deals with the inclusion process as a locus that welcomes all human differences, our research focuses on disability as one of the main differences characterizing humanity and interfering with human development. We adopt the bio-psycho-social model of health at the core of the International Classification of Functioning (ICF, 2001). Ability and dis-ability are defined as emerging products from interactions between health conditions and contextual factors. In the WHO document framework, dis-ability, like ability, correspond to functional variability and difference as a "mainstream" experience, rather than one that affects a minority of humanity.

Starting from these premises which substantiate the model of inclusion adopted in this study, the *Commitment toward Inclusion Repertoire* (CTI-Repertoire) is presented as a new tool in which the main dimensions in the *Index for Inclusion* drawn up by Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE, Booth and Ainscow, 2000, 2006) are set out within the main implications of the Capability Approach (CA) and the core concepts involved in the International Classification of Functioning (ICF). Finally, we highlight the main potential of the *Commitment toward Inclusion Repertoire* and focus on analyzing its implications in educational contexts; we also highlight the role of inclusive education as a fundamental vector for converting children's capabilities into "flourishing" functionings. The potential strength of the paper lies in the operationalization of a multidimensional and complex idea of human functioning declined in terms of the Capability Approach, to better grasp and understand discourses regarding education-related diversity and inclusion.

The Quest for Flourishing Inclusion

The first step of the research considers some definitions of inclusion within

scientific literature and specifies different aspects of the process. Each definition contributes to highlight alternative models of inclusion, with their main conceptual components and relationships. One interesting definition comes from mathematics and assimilates inclusion to a "belonging relationship between sets in which the relations between the elements of a set are part of the other one". The reciprocity of a belonging relationship is a fundamental aspect of inclusion. This aspect emerged also in the transposition from mathematics into the social field, in which inclusion is considered a complex sense of (well)-being, which implies: feeling respected, valued for who you are; and feeling a level of supportive energy and *commitment* from others so that you can do your best work (adapted from Miller & Katz, 2002). Here being "inside of something", part of a wider community, is considered in terms of a psychological state that meets primary and secondary social and existential needs, connoting inclusion as a place of well-being (Ghedin, 2009). Considered against this backdrop, the definition by Miller & Katz (2002) takes on a pro-active meaning, that helps define actions that combat exclusion through the promotion of certain feelings, moods, privileges, opportunities, and rights gathered under the umbrella term "inclusion".

In a pedagogical framework, inclusion could be viewed as a value-based philosophy aiming to maximize the participation of all in society and an education that minimizes exclusionary and discriminatory practices. The definition and practice of inclusive education, however, may vary significantly, not only *between,* but also *within,* cultures and educational systems (Dyson, 1999). We agree with Dyson when he points out the need to speak about multiple versions of inclusion, thus it makes sense to talk about "inclusions" in the plural.

Furthermore, International Community documents (United Nations, World Health Organization, European Union) contain the aforementioned multiple versions of inclusion, whereby the inclusion process is proposed as a positive value and widely promoted as a fundamental goal desirable for the development of contemporary human society. In fact "inclusion" is never directly defined; most of the time it is enriched with adjectives that contextualize the process, so we could talk about social inclusion, or economic inclusion, or inclusive politics, or all of these things together. In some documents inclusion is mentioned alongside other concepts, such as empowerment, participation, or peace-building. The multiple meanings of "inclusion" are not explicit and unambiguous, but emerge within operational guidelines that offer practical directions to possible supporting actions. What emerges from an in-depth reading of the documents is the need to encourage States to *commit* themselves to inclusion to

establish the conditions which allow the preservation of the moral value of human differences to promote equal development opportunities toward diverse valuable ends, that all individuals and communities should choose freely.

In Sen's Capability Approach, freedom and development are closely linked to Aristotelian "practical reason" as a tool for the development of value judgments, and the reasonableness behind choices and decisions. Sen assimilates exclusion to the deprivation of capabilities that leads to a life of poverty, i.e. a life devoid of opportunity for flourishing and thus subject to exclusion. Speaking about "active and passive exclusion", Sen highlights the voluntary element that characterizes the social implications of this relationship and its consequences for development (Sen, 2000). In addition, Sen also states that exclusion also means "unfavorable inclusion", which would not produce future development, in terms of freedom, equity and justice. Therefore "favorable inclusion" can be understood as guaranteeing freedom, equality and justice, not in an "absolute" way, but regarding voluntary participation in real opportunities for day-to-day decisions mixed with individual characteristics and aspirations thus producing development. The inclusion process will emerge alongside the "capabilities" of individuals and communities facing constraints and its success could be recognized in the implementation of individual and collective flourishing (Biggeri & Bellanca, 2011; Ghedin, 2009). It is clear that providing a model of inclusion connected to freedom and development envisages an open community, where inclusion is not simply "stay inside", and exclusion simply "stay outside". Inclusion implies a wish to participate which is re-considered and shared in every moment, involving a volitional, collaborative, open and non-segregation dimension, in the sense of assimilating or imprisonment as pointed out by Habermas (1998).

According to this complex view of inclusion, our study aims to develop a tool able to identify conceptually, suggest practically, capture realistically, communities' educational commitments and corresponding actions toward the realization of inclusive societies. This implies the need to rethink the education as a mean to achieve human development and as a *conversion factor* to transform children's capabilities into citizenship functionings (Biggeri & Santi, 2012). As a consequence, it becomes crucial to readdress the policy goals of educational systems in terms of wellbeing and well-becoming from an individual and societal points of view (ib.). To this aim we started from a recognition of the Italian context, in which the need and importance of expanding the participation of all children and youth, firstly through mainstream school attendance, are recognized in the educational system and regulated by law.

Nevertheless, the process towards genuine inclusion, passing through the processes of insertion and integration, has been very long and difficult. Ianes (2008) detects a complex situation in our country: the school feelings of *commitment* (note: emphasis added) and positive motivation, best practice implementation, coexist with feelings of fatigue and difficulties, dysfunction and ineffectiveness (Ianes, in Booth & Ainscow, 2008, p. 66). It should be said that, in Italy, the processes of integration/inclusion in schools represent the most important factor in preventing social exclusion for pupils with barriers to learning and participation (which has prevented the emergence of additional handicap for all); those processes were also a formidable factor of change and educational and social innovation. Caldin (2009) points out that recent studies and research - Italian, European and international – focused on school world are now numerous and have highlighted the many factors that may facilitate or threaten inclusion, such as "[...] regulatory frameworks, financial arrangements, *evaluation systems* (note italics), school facilities, class sizes, the use of individualized teaching, the availability of support teachers and other educational staff, training of teachers, family involvement and collaboration with other services. " (Dovigo, 2008, p. 25). The author highlights that the inclusive challenge, constrain to a change of the whole educational system (Caldin, 2009, p. 86). This restructuring is also in line with the constitutional principles of the classification system of functioning (ICF, WHO, 2001, 2007), the development of the person as such, the holistic and comprehensive, integrative bio-psycho-social model, consideration of factors surrounding the person, the importance of context and relational perspective, the quality of the processes and systems of education and participation in daily life within an inclusive society (Caldin, 2009, p. 86).

Starting from the above considerations and local recognition, our study focuses on the promotion of "flourishing inclusion" as a process geared towards creating inclusive contexts that foster human development as a desirable aim emerging from the interplay between human participation, aspiration and agency.

The Quest for Diversity and Equality in Inclusion

The core commitment of inclusive education represents a challenge to the notion of "normality" as it values a broad range of diversity beyond disability. The CA is coherent with this statement, and sees education as playing a key role in the empowerment of those disadvantaged by their "diversity". From this perspective the CA

offers a firm philosophical basis for social justice and entitlements for all (Polat, 2010). Terzi (2005a, 2005b) introduced the CA as an innovative perspective in special education, contrasting the "normalization" process that lies at the basis of the traditional rehabilitation approach. She believes it provides fundamentally new insights into the conceptualization of impairment and disability. Of particular interest is how the CA goes beyond the "dilemma of difference" by conceptualizing difference as a specific variable of human diversity (Reindal, 2009, p. 155). Indeed the dilemma of difference consists "in the seemingly unavoidable choice between, on the one hand, identifying children's differences in order to provide for them differentially, with the risk of labeling and dividing, and, on the other hand, accentuating 'sameness' and offering common provision, with the risk of not making available what is relevant to, and needed by, individual children (Dyson, 2001; Lunt, 2002; Norwich, 1993, 1994). Subsumed in the dilemma are two interrelated aspects: a theoretical dimension, concerned with issues of conceptualization and definition, and a political one, which refers to questions of provision in order to meet the equal entitlements of all children to education." (Terzi, 2005a, p. 444). Terzi (2004) suggests that the CA can move us beyond the "dilemma of difference to a more just response to educational needs/wishes", considered as an "inclusive response" to children's different aspirations and potentialities rather than to certified "special educational needs". The CA is crucially different because it considers disability as a specific variable of human diversity and evaluates its impact on individuals within institutional and social arrangements." (Terzi 2005a, p. 203). The finding is that the CA allows an understanding of difference as a function of comparisons between people rather than distinctions based on fixed categories (Florian et al. 2006, p. 43; Reindal, 2009, p. 157). This understanding is crucial because it addresses the issue of empowerment and the enhancement of human agency (Reindal, 2009, p. 158), and contributes to a redefinition of the meaning and the scope of inclusion as the main challenge of education and social policy. Indeed the core concept behind the CA is to consider people as subjects, as agents of their own lives; in relation to education, the aim is to support and develop those capabilities that enhance the development of agency (Reindal, 2010) in educational contexts and head toward the achievement of inclusive societies.

The CA to "differences" and "normality" was very useful and challenging in our work towards reshaping the quest and the need for inclusion in education. In particular it has interesting implications for disability as one of the more excluded expressions of human diversity. Regarding this, Sen (1985) wrote: "We must take note that a disabled

person may not be able to do many things an able-bodied individual can, with the same bundle of commodities" (p. 7). The set of capabilities that a disabled person benefits from, i.e. the various possible functionings that she/he can choose to achieve can be restricted or expanded by the constraints that the environment adds to the person's impairment. That is in line also with the bio-psycho-social model of health in the ICF (2002), proposed by WHO and adopted in our study. In this model the differences in distribution of acquired abilities and dis-abilities emerge from contextual situations in which biological heritage, health, personal and environmental factors, activity and participation interrelate during functioning. This approach considers the differences in human functioning as individual and social resources to be taken into account to promote personal and communal well-being: an increase in the amount, kind, and level of activity and participation is considered a relevant factor which affects human functioning and development positively, while disability emerges in terms of restrictions and limitations to activity and participation. In this perspective, ability and disability become "umbrella concepts" that cover a wide range of different situations in which human functioning is facilitated or compromised during life-time. Introducing an "activity and participation" component to the ICF to understand human functioning, could be considered consistent with and complementary to the CA. Indeed Sen's notions of well-being and quality of life refer to a concept of human "functionings" as multi-faceted expressions of personal and communal *agency,* as manifested in the free choice of one's values in terms of *being* and *doing* (Sen, 1998). Sen's reflection on the conditions and situations - existential, social and institutional - that may turn individual differences into disadvantages and inequalities, or, conversely, may enhance development, represents a "powerful counter rhetoric of equality" that summarizes the axiom that "all human beings are born equal", but with the conviction that individuals come into the world totally different from each other and therefore each egalitarian project should move from the achievement of a "strong dose of pre-existing inequality to counter" (Sen, 1998). Sen's perspective is interesting for our discussion on inclusion, because it suggests looking at development by shifting the focus from what an individual or a community is able to produce to what he/she/it can and has the opportunity to choose to produce as something of value to them. Promoting development thus means increasing individual's opportunities for choices and initiatives in a contextualized manner, rather than in an undifferentiated way that provides the missing resources to meet mere "needs" (Frediani, 2008). In this sense, the inclusion process could be interpreted in terms of genuine opportunities for choice and initiative in context.

From a CA perspective the quest became: how could the limitations to, or the improvement of capabilities, be addressed and measured? The CA can provide the appropriate information for designing specific policies that aim to re-establish equality of possibilities and choices for those who suffer from capability deprivation. The strength of the CA as regards inclusion, pointed out by Tania Buchardt (2004), is that it is able to highlight inequalities without sacrificing evaluations of standard of living according to resources. This richer description is possible because the CA focuses on the ends instead of the means of well-being, i.e., on capabilities instead of resources (Reindal, 2009, p. 159). The commitment to these ends and capabilities are the focus of the Repertoire we propose, as a pro-active tool to support and monitor good inclusive practices in education.

CTI-Repertoire Philosophy

The question whether one is disabled or disadvantaged, therefore, depends on the *commitment* of the community (parents/families, caregivers/social services, teachers/schools, etc.) (Reindal, 2009, p. 157) in terms of "external capability" (Biggeri et al. 2010). With this in mind and focusing on education, our study aimed to create a tool that would allow educational organizations, in particular schools, to re-think their educational mission and daily practices in terms of the inclusive processes they *commit to* and *choose to* implement in order to promote a school system that meets inclusive values.

The tool would help to avoid a demagogical approach to inclusion and to identify an organization *agency* toward inclusion, in terms of possible sets of actions tailored for each different person, group, and/or community in order to promote truly favorable and flourishing inclusion, in which individual and social agency is internally and externally supported. The notion of inclusion we use here does not set boundaries around particular kinds of disability or learning difficulty, but instead focuses on the ability of the school itself to accommodate (see "reasonable accommodation", art. 2 CRPD) diverse children and youth needs and aspirations (Booth et al., 2000, Kalambouka et al 2005, Demeris et al.2007). The tool is designed as a pragmatic response to UNESCO's guidelines for inclusion, which are seen ideologically as "a dynamic approach of responding positively to pupil diversity and of seeing individual differences not as problems, but as opportunities for enriching learning" (UNESCO, 2005). Considered from a CA perspective, our *Repertoire* not only helps to "find a better way" to achieve

what Sen would define as "favorable and active inclusion", but also to assume the responsibility for recognizing, supporting, and enlarging the personal and social set of capabilities needed to live a valuable life. From a political point of view, the *Repertoire* would help educational organizations like schools to implement the growing tendency towards integrating inclusive education into national education policies (Van Kempen et al. 2006) as it takes into account the different ways in which inclusion would be organized and promoted. Moreover, the *Repertoire* would help contrast, compare, and evaluate the different opportunities/solutions for promoting inclusion in particular in a European context and with respect to school settings. The *Repertoire* would also help to identify effective actions which could facilitate the shift from "intrusion" to "inclusion" in educational contexts, particularly in schools, going beyond simply placing children in mainstream classrooms, and promoting instead the appropriateness of the inside presence/of this process (Yell & Drasgow, 1999). In other words, the tool would help administrators and teachers/educators/caregivers to consider the "what" and the "how" before the "where" of inclusion.

The aim of the *Commitment toward Inclusion Repertoire* (CTI-Repertoire) is to help to design projects and evaluate the quality and the level of inclusion processes implemented by an educational community in which inclusion is considered as a fundamental component of well-being. The core claim of the Capability Approach is that assessments of a person's well-being or quality of life, and judgments about equality or justice, or a community's or a country's level of development, should not focus primarily on resources, or on mental states, but on the effective opportunities that people have to lead the lives they have reason to value. Therefore the *Repertoire* proposes various sets of *commitments* that correspond to the concrete inclusion opportunities created and offered by educational organizations to develop the individual and social capabilities that will increase well-being.

As Heshmati et al. stated (2007), "Well-being is a realization of the children's rights and the fulfillment of the objectives to provide them with abilities, potential and skills through effective protection and provision of assistance by families and their institutional environment" (p. 192). Thus, well-being is the positive outcome that emerges from a flourishing situation for the children growing, while the negative one, deprivation, is a result of neglecting children's rights to learn, grow-up and develop. The main factor in this relationship is the person's overall orientation and capacity to make the best use of the "set of commodities" available to live a flourishing life.

CTI-Repertoire Structure

The CTI-Repertoire was based on revision, adaptation, and enlargement of the two existing "Index(es) for Inclusion" proposed by Booth et al. (2002, 2006) as a resource to support the inclusive development of schools and care communities. The authors assume that the inclusion process involves in-depth analysis of the views and experiences of key stakeholders on barriers and obstacles to educational access, participation and achievement, as well as an investigation into the ways in which such barriers can be reduced or eliminated for all (Polat, 2010, p. 50). According to this aim, the main objective of the first phase of the study was to transform the inclusion indicators into concrete opportunities to be actively and favorably included in the educational community; they focus on the organization's *commitments*[1], according to a polarization of the Repertoire on *ends* and *responsibility*. The purpose was to move from a *descriptive* level of context analysis to a *prescriptive* level of intervention and agency promotion in order to offer a pro-active tool for inclusion, oriented to promote change rather than just a monitoring procedure. The Repertoire aims to offer inputs, suggestions, and guidelines to create a tailored "Inclusive Community Agenda", connecting the commitment to inclusion to the value of subjective and social agency (Biggeri et al. 2010): operationalizing "things to do", acting as a "device" that keeps memory of the priorities assumed and renewing the specific commitments to facilitate the development of inclusion favorable and flourishing settings. The CTI-Repertoire can be used, in particular, by organizations to:

- identify the cultural, political, instructional *actions* for inclusive education that organizations/schools are committed to, in terms of *agency*, which could be externalized, observed, implemented, and evaluated;

- self-evaluate the level and quality of the organizations'/schools' commitment toward inclusion;

- rate the inclusion accountability (quantitative and qualitative) of the organization/school;

- create a repository of good practices for community and school staff to support investments in this area;

---

[1] The value of "commitment" in the development of individual and collective identity has been examined in several works by Sen (Sen, 2002, 2005 a, b, 2006) and developed in a number of critical essays (Petitt, 2005; Hausman, 2005; Schmid , 2005, Giovanola, 2006).

- define a main set of capabilities tailored for each organization and individual that translate into educational opportunities for all members, thus promoting human well-being and development.

According to Booth et al. (2000, 2006), inclusion and exclusion are explored along the three interconnected dimensions of the organization's/school's educational improvement: creating inclusive cultures, producing inclusive policies, and developing inclusive practices. Booth et al. (2000, 2006) believe that these three dimensions are important ways to structure organizational development, mainly in schools, and all are necessary to the development of inclusion within educational contexts. The three-dimensional framework proposed is based on the cultural dimension of inclusion with its related indicators and detailed questions. The authors think that the development of shared inclusive values and collaborative relationships may lead to changes in the other two dimensions. Each dimension is divided into two sections that focus further attention on what is needed to increase learning and participation in an inclusive educational organization, such as a school. The first dimension, "Creating inclusive cultures", refers to the creation of a secure, accepting, collaborating, and stimulating community in which everyone is valued to ensure the highest achievements of all. The principles and values of inclusive cultures guide decisions, policies and practices so that organization development becomes a continuous process. It comprises two sections: "Building an inclusive community" and "Establishing inclusive values". The second dimension, "Producing inclusive policies", encourages the participation of all (i.e. students and school staff) in the promotion of inclusive education at all levels and the minimization of exclusionary pressures. It comprises two sections: "Developing the setting for all" and "Organizing support for diversity". The third dimension, "Developing inclusive practices", enhances educational practices that reflect the organization's/school's inclusive values and policies. It comprises two sections: "Orchestrating learning" and "Mobilizing resources". For each dimension indicators and questions are identified, that would check the quality of the inclusion achieved by the organizations/schools and identify any weak areas.

Starting from the above CSIE Indexes structure, the CTI-Repertoire operationalizes the organization's *commitment* to inclusion by developing the individual and social engagement around the three main cultural, political and practical dimensions of inclusion that guide the agency of the schools/communities. Each dimension is considered through the lens of different components in which the assumed commitment toward inclusion is interpreted by the organization. The assumed

commitments are operationalized in terms of the specific *functionings* through which the organization/school carries out the inclusion process. Each assumed commitment corresponds to a set of capabilities, which is translated in the Repertoire as a series of opportunities designed to help identify the specific actions/functionings chosen and implemented by the organization to construct favorable and flourishing inclusion. The sets of capabilities/opportunities correspond in the Repertoire to related lists of possible questions that guide the revision process and enable the organization's main actions toward inclusion to be identified. Clearly, the list of questions is not a set of pre-defined closed choices, as each organization should identify and choose the actions needed to achieve the aims in its own educational context, in accordance with values of the school and the single learner's aspirations. The CTI-Repertoire links the commitments toward inclusion with the concept of functionings; it rates communities/schools according to their grade of responsible involvement in terms of their chosen practices, plans and missions to promote (achieve) inclusive education in daily activities. The CTI-Repertoire commitments are well connected with functionings and cover "statements of aspirations" that a school uses as its pledges toward an inclusive education. The questions, opportunities and capabilities proposed clarify the meaning of each commitment in ways that invite schools to explore them in detail. They prompt and challenge reflective thinking about a particular commitment and draw out existing knowledge about the school's identity and agency. They provide additional ideas for the development of inclusive-community activities and serve as criteria for progress assessment.

The CSIE Index(es) were revised by paying particular attention to the language of the new CTI-Repertoire. Words, conceived as linguistic-acts and meaning-nets, are transformed into intentional instruments that realize and change things in the world. The CTI-Repertoire uses terms such as "activity", "participation", "contextual factors", "facilitators" and "obstacles", or "justice", "rights", "freedom" which are justified both by the need for a general framework consistent with the foundation of the ICF and the CA and by the instrumental role played by words in educational culture, policy, and practice.

The structure of the CTI-Repertoire is summarized in the following tables:

Table 1 – CTI-Repertoire

Dimensions of Inclusion	
A	Creating inclusive cultures
B	Producing inclusive policies
C	Evolving inclusive practices

Table 2 – Components of dimension A Creating inclusive cultures

Components of dimension A Creating inclusive cultures	
A1	Building an inclusive community
A2	Establishing inclusive values

Table 3 – Assumed commitments concerning component A1 culture-community, and corresponding specific functionings

Component A1 culture-community, and corresponding specific functionings	
A1.1. Welcome: Make everyone feel welcome	A1.1a Appreciate individual diversity
	A1.1b Promote reciprocal knowing
A1.2.Involvement: Create a partnership involving everyone toward the success of the project	A1.2a Promote partnership at Organization level (e.g. at school: all students, all staff, all families/carers)
	A1.2b Enlarge partnership at Local level

Table 4 – Organization "Agency" (Example): Assumed Commitment A1.1

Assumed Commitment A1.1 culture-community-welcome and the related functioning's a./b. provides a set of opportunities/capabilities that answer the following questions (in terms of welcoming doing and being and presence of conversion factors)

A1.1a Appreciate individual diversity	A1.1b Promote reciprocal knowing
A1.1aQ1 What actions are dedicated to the first contact with the community?	A1.1bQ1 What actions are settled to prepare the members of the community to welcome the new entries/arrivals?
A1.1aQ2 What actions are implemented to witness that personal impairment, race, gender, sexual orientation, cultural habits, citizenship, political or juridical status are considered a benefit for the community?	A1.1bQ2 What attempts are made by the community to inform new members about its history and customs?
A1.1aQ3 What rituals are offered for welcoming new entries/arrivals to the community and marking their leaving?	A1.1bQ3 What kind of events/signs/displays are realized to celebrate local cultures and communities?
A1.1aQ4 What actions are done to facilitate communication/translation/interpretation among different first languages (including sign language)?	A1.1bQ4 What actions are done to guarantee that information about the organization are made accessible to all, irrespective of home language and impairments?
A1.1aQ5 What actions are implemented in the community to facilitate the members' understanding that different degrees of conformity to school rules and habits may be expected from different members?	A1.1bQ5 How the organization show its interest in knowing the different rules and habits of the new entry's/arrival's culture?
A1.1aQ6 What actions are done to facilitate participation of new members to organization meetings?	A1.1bQ6 How social meetings take into account the different degrees of the new entry/arrival's with community members' world?
A1.1aQn ……………………	A1.1bQn …………………………

Table 5 – Assumed Commitments concerning component A2 culture-values, and corresponding specific functionings

Component A2 culture-values, and corresponding specific functionings:

A2.1.Expectation – Promote excellence	A2.1a. Positive views of everyone
	A2.1b Responsibility for everyone
A2.2.Participation – Remove obstacles in activities	A2.2a. Stereotyping/discrimination
	A2.2b. Aggression/violence
	A2.2c. Marginalization/exclusion
A2.3.Flourishing – Promote well-being and a good life for everyone at the Organization (e.g. at school: students, staff, families/carers)	A2.3a Choice opportunities
	A2.3b External capabilities
	A2.3c Expectations

Table 6 – Organization "Agency" (Example): Assumed Commitment A2.3

Assumed Commitment A2.3 culture-values-flourishing and related functionings provides a set of opportunities/capabilities that answer the following questions (in terms of flourishing doing and being)

A2.3a Choice opportunities	A2.3b External capabilities	A2.3c Expectations
A2.3aQ1 Is each member invited to express his/her preference about some aspects of the organization daily?	A2.3bQ1 Does the organization offer unexpected support for specific member's choice?	A2.3cQ1 Is the organization prepared to welcome unexpected creative behaviours?
A2.3aQ2 Are the planned activities open to alternatives?	A2.3bQ2 Is the need for direct or indirect scaffolding considered to be positive?	A2.3cQ2 Are members invited to develop forms of behaviour not immediately requested in the curriculum aims?
A2.3aQ3 Is the freedom to choose and deliberate nurtured with specific educational activities?	A2.3bQ3 Is the dimension of body health taken into account when planning activities?	A2.3cQ3 Is un-adaptive response to situations explored in its possible meanings?
A2.3aQ4 Is the impact of personal choices on the quality of one's own and other's lives monitored and evaluated?	A2.3bQ4 Are the external supports to achievements recognized and celebrated?	A2.3cQ4 Are skills not immediately recognizable in employment of the members positively considered?
A2.3aQ5 Do personal emotions play a positive role in decision-making?	A2.3bQ5 Are the different components of a good individual/group achievement recognized and displayed?	A2.3cQ5 Is the improvisational dimension of life taken into account when designing activities?
A2.3aQn …………………	A2.3bQn …………..	A2.3cQn ………….

Table 7 – Components of dimension B Producing inclusive policies

Components of dimension B Producing inclusive policies	
B1	Developing an organization for all
B2	Organizing support for diversity

Table 8 – Assumed commitments concerning component B1 Policies-organization, and corresponding specific functionings

Component B1 Policies-organization, and corresponding specific functionings	
B1.1. - Ensure staff appointments and promotions are open and fair	B1.1a Possibility to answer the organization calls for appointments/promotions
	B1.1b Possibility to propose upgrades to organization
B1.2. Acceptance - Help newcomers to settle into the organization (e.g. at school: staff, students, parents, carers)	
B1.3. Attractiveness - Ensure the organization and places are attractive and engaging:	B1.3a Building is attractive
	B1.3b Organization is engaging

Table 9 – Assumed commitments concerning component B2. Policies-support, and corresponding specific functionings

Component B2. Policies-support, and corresponding specific functionings

B2.1. Promotion - Organize promotion of diversity	
B2.2. Training – Educational programs for students, staff, parents/ careers to respond to individual diversity:	B2.2a Students
	B2.2b Staff
	B2.2c Parents/Carers
B2.3. Differentiation - Carry out individualized and tailored activities for special needs/aspirations in shared contexts/situations	B2.3a Individualization
	B2.3b Personalization
B2.4. Accessibility - Remove obstacles and ensure that the organization and places are accessible to all.	
B2.5. Norms - Use legislation to support inclusion	B2.5a Promote knowledge of current laws by supporting bespoke projects
	B2.5b Establish organization rules favourable to project development
B2.6. Gear - Gear the organization's plan toward personal development and developing knowledge and competences	
B2.7. Investment - Future Project Design and Implementation	

Table 10 – Components of the dimension C. Practices

Components of dimension C. Producing inclusive policies	
C1	Orchestrating specific activities at school, curriculum, learning and teaching levels
C2	Mobilizing contextual factors (human, financial and technological resources to improve inclusive projects)

Table11 – Assumed Commitment concerning component C1. Practices-activities, and corresponding special functionings

C1. Practices-activities, and corresponding specific functionings	
C1.1. Potentiality - Work on more advanced levels to promote development	
C1.2. Needs/Aspirations - Consider the needs/aspirations of all when planning activities	
C1.3. Encouragement - Encourage the participation of all in activities	
C1.4. Empathy - Develop comprehension/understanding of differences	
C1.5. Collaboration - Promote collaboration/cooperation and reciprocal apprenticeship among community members	
C1.6. Achievements - Ensure evaluation and assessment contribute to the achievement of all participants	C1.6a Authentic evaluation
	C1.6b Dynamic assessment
C1.7.Climate - Ensure a positive working environment	
C1.8. Engagement - Involve all in special and extra-curricular activities	

Table 12 – Organization "Agency" (Example): Assumed Commitment C1.6a

Assumed Commitment C1.6a Practices-activities-achievements-authentic evaluation, and 6b dynamic assessment related functioning's provide a set of opportunities/capabilities that answer the following questions (in terms of achieved doing and being):

C1.6a Authentic evaluation	C1.6b Dynamic assessment
C1.6aQ1 Are assessment procedures useful for upgrading students/staff learning and development?	C1.6bQ1 Is teaching mediation in learning activities evaluated as a constitutive component of the final achievements?
C1.6aQ2 Are meaningful, shared performances settled to evaluate learning achievements?	C1.6bQ2 Are different kinds and degrees of mediation designed to scaffold the members' zones of proximal development?
C1.6aQ3 Does evaluation has a pro-active function for each one?	C1.6bQ3 Do teachers adopt fading during learning mediation to promote autonomy?
C1.6aQ4 Is motivation to learn sustained during assessment?	C1.6bQ4 Are metacognitive dimensions of learning achievement explicitly pointed out during evaluation?
C1.6aQ5 Is self-evaluation promoted at different levels?	C1.6bQ5 Are students invited to deal with different kinds and levels of learning tasks?
C1.6aQ6 Are students encouraged to apply their learning achievement in everyday settings?	C1.6bQ6 Are students encouraged to transfer skills, dispositions, and competences?
C1.6aQn ………….	C1.6bQn ……….

Table 13 – Assumed Commitments concerning component C2. Contextual factors, and corresponding special functionings

C2.1 Facilitators - Provide facilitators for activities and participation in institutional life	C2.1a Tutorial scaffolding
	C2.1b Technological supports
C2.3. Differentiation - Recognize, empower, and employ individual diversities to differentiate setting and aims of activities and participation	
C2.4. Optimization - Use the expertise and competences of all staff and other available local communities to improve effective and meaningful achievements	
C2.5. Distribution - Equal access to resources and proposals	
C2.5. Distribution - Equal access to resources and proposals	C2.6a Within the organization
	C2.6b Outside the organization

The explorative phase of applying the CTI-Repertoire shows the power of this new "mixed tool", which combines top-down principles on inclusion with bottom-up good practices implemented in educational organizations, in particular in schools. One of the main implications is the opportunity the tool offers to reflect on the conceptual meanings of inclusion while creating a useful repertoire of inclusive actions that recognize and implement the different meanings of inclusion and correlated agency toward it. In the organization/school kit, the CTI-Repertoire includes a rating scale from high to low priority levels for each commitment (according to the amount of human, financial, and time resources ascribed) and a qualitative part in which an "e-grid section" can be uploaded onto a website. The schools upload the "flourishing inclusion" actions they introduce or achieve to provide examples of their inclusive agency and assumed commitments. The upload area is created to monitor and match the level of commitment declared and achieved, but most of all to create a "repository of good practices" that will offer a concrete repertoire of actions which enable other organizations/schools to implement the inclusion process and make comparisons. Each user, using the grids of the Directory, is called to choose their commitments by detailing the relevant activities in terms of responses/opportunities to the next sets of questions/demands/opportunities/capabilities for each commitment that represent the feedback for the institutions' work toward inclusion. To close, even temporarily, the

path of self-monitoring and evaluation of efforts toward inclusion, the system needs to "load" in the CTI-Repository, materials (documented through video, images, texts ...) by witnessing the communities inclusive *agency* of belonging towards that commitment. Through these multiple paths, the CTI-Repertoire offers a multidimensional approach to the evaluation of commitments toward inclusion, in which quantitative feedbacks regarding the level of persistency, intensity, and investment are complemented with qualitative feedbacks elaborated by registered peer-communities review of the actions upload in the Repository. The evaluation procedure is regulated by shared criteria and dimensions of analysis available in the system. The criteria are coherent with the assumed Capability Approach and has to do with internal/external capabilities, conversion factors, and choice opportunities which are offered by the community agency. The dimensions of analysis are declined into six facets and related rubrics of standards (Wiggins and McTighe, 1998) useful to assess assumed commitments toward inclusion: explanation (accurate, coherent, justified, systematic, predictive), interpretation (meaningful, insightful, significant, illustrative, illuminating), application (effective, efficient, fluent, adaptive, graceful), perspective (credible, revealing, insightful, plausible, unusual), empathy (sensitive, open, receptive, perceptive, tactful), self-knowledge (self-aware, metacognitive, self-adjusting).

Conclusion

The Capability Approach assumed as theoretical framework of the inclusion tool presented in this paper allows inclusion to be viewed as an ethical concept. Capabilities point to certain human powers that extend possibilities and enable valued accomplishments, given the right conditions (Hinchliffe, 2007). This approach puts the learners at the center of their educational enterprise and transforms educational system into favorable vector to realize the learners' life projects and aspirations. This view does not imply a wholly agent-related education, because the issue of the 'reason to value' is consistent with the consideration of human flourishing and the exercise of freedom (Reindal, 2010, p. 11).

The implications for these findings are considerable because:

1. the study provides a new tool directly derived from advanced frameworks currently recognized and valorized in the scientific community, offers pragmatic support to the organizations' everyday activity, and goes beyond the limit of "abstractness" so often pointed out in literature;

2. the CTI-Repertoire helps evaluate, manage, and monitor both actions/*doings* and features/*beings* for inclusion, which are expressed/externalized and become *recognizable*, *shareable*, and *available* among different institutions and by all community members, who will be made *aware* of and *responsible* for the inclusion process promoted.

As Reindal (2010) pointed out: "An evaluation of school results or a school situation that fails to take account of the various opportunities of a given situation in relation to an achieved functioning would be very partial and would not address the fundamental issue of social injustice within education or in any other field." (p. 7).

The implications of the use of the new *Commitment toward Inclusion Repertoire* is considerable because it offers the opportunity to transform a top-down approach to inclusion, considered in an idealistic perspective, into a bottom-up procedure, focusing on a concrete repertoire of actions that create and implement effective inclusive communities. Moreover this study operationalizes sets of capabilities into the school system, which are required to promote the process of "situated-inclusion" for all.

We identified three future directions for this research. The first will be to create as part of CTI-Repertoire an on-line school/organization accountability form useful to publish evidences about the level and nature of the commitment toward inclusion achieved in the educational system. The next will be to develop a quality system of analysis of the "good practices repository" content, in order to transform it from a simple database into a self/reciprocal-*trainingpedia* for teachers/parents/caregivers. The final one could be an involvement of inclusion stakeholders into a comparative analysis of the data/practices collected in the first exploratory phase of the Repertoire's use, adopting a "community-based" methodology and action-research procedure.

This is in line with the Horizon 2020 thematic workshop "Towards more inclusive, innovative and secure societies challenge" to make clear the importance of expanding the empowerment of the actors involved in the process through a quick access to various sources of information, also with the view to changing the role of citizens as mere consumers of services into active participants in the delivery and use of those services. The communication between the interlocutors would thus have the objective of allowing the transmission of social signals and increasing the diversity of sources of information available to the general public. In addition, this could be the right way to achieve a balance between "top-down" (inclusive cultures) and "bottom-up" (inclusive practices) approaches that are reflected in the political mediation.

References

Alkire, S. (2005). Subjective quantitative studies of human agency. *Social Indicators Research, 74*(1), 217–60.

Barton, L., & Armstrong, F., (2007). *Policy, Experience and Change: Reflections on Inclusive Education*. Springer: Dordrecht.

Belalcazar, C. (2008). Trends in inclusive education at regional and interregional levels: issues and challenges. *Prospects*, *38*, 113–135.

Biggeri, M., & Bellanca, N. (Eds.) (2010). *Dalla Relazione di Cura alla Relazione di Prossimità*. Napoli: Liguori.

Biggeri, M., & Santi, M. (2012). The Missing Dimensions of Children's Well-being and Well-becoming in Education Systems: Capabilities and Philosophy for Children. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, *13*(3), 373-395.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for inclusion: developing Play, Learning and Participation in schools*. Bristol, UK: CSIE.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M., (2008). *L'Index per l'inclusione*. Trento: Erickson.

Booth, T., Ainscow, M., Black-Hawkins, K., Vaughn, M., & Shaw, L., (2006). *Index for Inclusion: Developing Play, Learning and Participation in Early Years and Childcare*. Bristol, UK: CSIE.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development. Experiments by Nature and Design*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. (1998). *The Ecology of Developmental Processes, Handbook of Child Psychology, 1, Theoretical Models of Human Development* (fifth edition). New York: Wiley.

Burchardt, T. (2004). Capabilities and disability: the capabilities framework and the social model of disability. *Disability and Society, 19*(7), 735-751.

Caldin, R. (2009). La prospettiva nella/della scuola. Percorsi di ricerca e nuove questioni, in *Studium Educationis*, n. 3/2009, pp.85-99, numero monografico La scuola all'inizio del terzo millennio, curato da Luciano Galliani e Luisa Santelli Beccegato.

Delle Fave, A. (2007). *La condivisione del benessere*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.

Demeris, H., Childs, R. A., & Jordan, A., (2007). The influence of students with special needs included in grade 3 classrooms on the large-scale achievement scores of students without special needs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *30*(3), 609–627.

Dyson, A. (1999). Inclusion and inclusions: theories and discourses in inclusive education. In H. Daniels, and P. Garner (Eds.), *World Yearbook or Education* (pp.

36–53). London: Kogan Page.

Florian, L. (2005). "Inclusion", "special needs" and the search for new understandings. *Support for learning*, *20*(2), 96-98.

Florian, L., Hollenweger, J., Simeonsson, R.J., Wedell, K., Riddell, S., Terzi, L., & Holland, A. (2006). Cross-cultural perspectives on the classification of children with disabilities: Part I. Issues in the classification of children with disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education, 40*(1), 36–45.

Ghedin, E. (2009). *Ben-essere disabili. Un approccio positivo all'inclusione*. Napoli: Liguori.

Giovanola, B. (2006). Identità, differenza, libertà: autorealizzazione personale e riconoscimento sociale delle migranti nell'era della globalizzazione. In M.I. Macioti, V. Gioia, P. Persano (a cura di) *Migrazioni al femminile. Identità culturale e prospettiva di genere*, EUM, Macerata, 49-82.

Heshmati, A., Tausch, A., Bajalan, & Chemen, S.J. (2008). Measurement and analysis of child well-being in middle and high income countries. *The European Journal of Comparative Economics*, 5(2), 227-286.

Hinchliffe, G. (2007). Truth and the capability of learning. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 41*(2), 221–32.

Jordan, A., & Stanovich, P. (2003). Teachers' personal epistemological beliefs about students with disabilities as indicators of effective teaching practices". *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs,* 3. [On-line] Available. http://www.nasen.org.uk.

Kroesbergen, M. (2007). Effects of the inclusion of children with Special Educational Needs. In *Dutch mainstream education*, paper presented at 12th EARLI Conference, Budapest, Aug. 28 – 1st Sept.

Kalambouka, A., Farrell, P., Dyson, A., & Kaplan, I. (2005). *The Impact of Population Inclusivity in Schools on Student Outcomes*. London: Centre for Evidence-informed Policy and Practice in Education, University of London. Retrieved June 28, 2007, from http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk.

Lindström, B., & Eriksson, M. (2005). Salutogenesis. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 59*, 440-42.

Miller, F. A., & Katz, J. H. (2002). *The Inclusion Breakthrough: Unleashing the Real Power of Diversity*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Mitra, S. (2006). The Capability Approach and Disability. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 16*(4), 236-247.

Mittler, P. (2000). *Working Towards Inclusive Education: Social Contexts*. London: David Fulton.

Nussbaum, M.C., & Sen, A. (1993). *The quality of life.* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Organizzazione Mondiale della Sanità (2002). *ICF Classificazione Internazionale del Funzionamento, della Disabilità e della Salute*. Trento: Erickson.

Pettit P. (2005). Construing Sen on Commitment. *Economics and Philosophy*, *21*(1), 15-32.

Reindal, S.M. (2008). A social relational model of disability: A theoretical framework for special needs education?. *European Journal of Special Needs Education 23*(2), 135–46.

Reindal, S.M. (2009). Disability, capability, and special education: Towards a capability-based theory. *European Journal of Special Needs Education 24* (2),155–68.

Reindal, S. M. (2010). What is the purpose? Reflections on inclusion and special education from a capability perspective. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *25*(1), 1-12.

Saito, M. (2003). Amartya Sen's Capability Approach to education: A critical exploration. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *37*(1), 17-33.

Santi M. (2010). *Improvisation: Between Technique And Spontaneity*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Publisher.

Santi M. (2010). Filosofia inclusiva?, paper presentato al V Colóquio Internacional de Filosofia da Educação: "*Devir-criança da filosofia: infância da educação*", UERJ – Campus Maracanã, Rio de Janeiro, 7-10 Settembre 2010.

Santi M., & Ghedin, E. (2011). Index of Commitment Towards Flourishing Inclusion*,* paper presented at *Children's Capabilities Conference*, Cambridge, School of Education, April 11-13.

Sen, A. K. (1987). The Standard of Living, Tanner Lectures. In Hawthorn G. (Eds.), *The Standard of Living*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sen, A. K. (1999a). *Commodities and Capabilities.* New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. K. (1999b). *Development as Freedom.* New York: Knopf.

Sen, A. K. (2000). *Social Exclusion: Concept, Application and Scrutiny*, Social Development Paper, No. 1 Asian Development Bank.

Sen, A. K. (2002). The right to One's Identity, *Frontline*, *19*(1), (5-18, gennaio).

Sen, A. K. (2005a). What is like to be a human being?. Intervento al Third Global

Forum on Human Development, *Cultural Identity, Democracy and Global Equity*, Parigi, 17-19 gennaio, 2005.

Sen, A. K. (2005b). Why exactly is Commitment important for rationality. *Economics and Philosophy*, *21*(1), 5-14.

Sen, A. K. (2006). *The Ups and Downs of Identity*, relazione presentata nell'ambito degli ASSA Meetings, Boston, 6-8 gennaio, 2006.

Terzi, L. (2004). The Social Model of Disability: A Philosophical Critique, *Journal of Applied Philosophy, 21*(2), 141-157.

Terzi, L. (2005a). Beyond the dilemma of difference: The Capability Approach to disability and special educational needs. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *39*(3), 443-459.

Terzi, L. (2005b). A capability perspective on impairment, disability and special needs: Towards social justice in education. *Theory and Research in Education*, *3*, 197–223.

Thomas, C. (2004). How is disability understood? An examination of sociological approaches. *Disability and Society, 19*(6), 569–83.

Tomlinson, C. (1999). *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of all Learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, C. (2004). *Fulfilling the Promise of the Differentiated Classroom.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Trani, J.F., & Dubois, J.L. (2008). Capability and disability: an approach for a better understanding of the disability issue. Paper presented at *UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: a Call for Action on Poverty, Lack of Access and Discrimination*, Addis Abeba, Ethiopia, 19-22 May 2008.

United Nations (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*.

Unterhalter, E. (2003). Crossing disciplinary boundaries: The potential of Sen's capability approach for sociologists of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 24*(5), pp. 665–669.

Unterhalter, E. (2009). Social justice, development theory and the question of education. In R. Cowen, R. and A. Kazamias (Eds.), *International Handbook of Comparative Education*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Unterhalter, E., & Brighouse, H. (2007). Distribution of what for social justice in education? The case of Education for All by 2015?. In M.Walker, and E. Unterhalter, (Eds.), *Amartya Sen's Capability Approach and Social Justice (pp.*

67–86). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Walker, M. (2006). Towards a capability-based theory of social justice for education policymaking. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(2), 163–185.

World Health Organization (2007). *International Classification of Functioning – Children and Youth*. Geneva: WHO.