



Sport in Society

Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics

ISSN: 1743-0437 (Print) 1743-0445 (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/fcss20>

Inclusion in sport: disability and participation

Florian Kiuppis

To cite this article: Florian Kiuppis (2018) Inclusion in sport: disability and participation, Sport in Society, 21:1, 4-21, DOI: [10.1080/17430437.2016.1225882](https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2016.1225882)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430437.2016.1225882>



Published online: 30 Aug 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 91398



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 31 View citing articles [↗](#)



Inclusion in sport: disability and participation

Florian Kiuppis

Faculty of Education and Social Studies, Lillehammer University College, Lillehammer, Norway

ABSTRACT

For the last couple of decades UNESCO has aimed to achieve to a far extent the implementation of the guiding principle of inclusion at all levels in education systems worldwide. The idea that countries 'should ensure an inclusive education system at all levels' is also a central objective of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. This Introduction to the Special Issue explores what participation as an aspect of inclusion means in general, and realistically can mean in sport and quality physical education in particular. Sport is introduced as a context in which, unlike in education, the individual choice of a sporting activity on a spectrum ranging from separate activities for persons with disabilities to modified activities designed for all makes it necessary to attribute each approach equal importance and validity instead of discrediting segregated structures and glorifying supposedly inclusive ones.

For the last couple of decades, while following up the World Conference on Special Needs Education that was held in Salamanca in 1994, UNESCO and its collaborators have aimed to achieve to a far extent the implementation of the guiding principle of *inclusion* at all levels of education systems worldwide (Kiuppis and Hausstätter 2014). In context of the most recent International Conference on Education, held in Geneva in 2008 and hosted by the International Bureau of Education (IBE), UNESCO stated:

[I]t has now been several decades since the international community provided itself with significant legal instruments which, by stressing the right of ALL children to benefit from an education without discrimination, express – implicitly or explicitly – the concept of 'Inclusive Education.' (UNESCO 2008, 3)

Inclusion is primarily discussed in education, as is apparent from just a quick search of the term on the Internet. However, with the increasing number of UN member states ratifying the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) (UN 2006),¹ politicians and academics have vividly discussed inclusion in the context of other areas of life, such as the community at large (Milner and Kelly 2009), as 'social inclusion' in the context of work and employment (Hall and Wilton 2011), and with regard to the aspects addressed by Article 30.5 of the CRPD, namely cultural life and leisure (Singleton and Darcy 2013), recreation (Gray, Zimmerman, and Rimmer 2012) and sport (e.g. Thomas and Smith 2008; Kiuppis and Kurzke-Maasmeier 2012).

What does ‘Inclusion in Sport’ mean?

This volume is organized around the topic *inclusion* in sport and has a particular focus on the *participation of people with disabilities* in sport once their access has been secured.² This Introduction deals in particular with the point that research is clearly indicating, namely that sport is an area of life in which people with disabilities arguably have less favourable experiences than their non-disabled peers and competitors (Stevenson 2009). Typical barriers for people with disabilities to participate in sport include lack of awareness on the part of people without disabilities as to how to involve them in teams adequately; lack of opportunities and programmes for training and competition; too few accessible facilities due to physical barriers; and limited information on and access to resources (DePauw and Gavron 2005). Central importance is attributed to the processes and mechanisms of *inclusion* that operate within sporting environments and to the question of either what happens or could happen to persons with disabilities who enter the playing field (cf. Spaaij, Magee, and Jeanes 2014).

Let us begin with the basic premise – originally formulated by German-American sociologist Reinhard Bendix (and post-mortem published by his son John Bendix) – that the use of a term (in this case ‘inclusion’) in different social contexts is itself a worthwhile subject of comparative analysis (Bendix 1998, 310). Accordingly, as a rhetorical starting point for this Introduction I chose the question: Does *inclusion* in sport mean the same as *inclusion* in education? In other words, when the word ‘inclusion’ is used in the context of sport, do we actually associate the same theories, concepts and methods as in Inclusive Education (IE)? For the purpose of finding a preliminary answer, the work from the later phase of Austrian British philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889–1951) appears useful, since it states that ‘in general, the meaning of a word is its use in language’ (Wittgenstein [1936–1946] 2001, 22). While Wittgenstein specified this statement by arguing that ‘a meaning of a word is one kind of its use in language’, he left open the difference between ‘a general use’ and, for example, ‘two kinds of use’ of a word. However, according to Wittgenstein’s understanding, one could find out about meanings of ‘inclusion’ in sport and education by considering the use of the word in language as the ‘the hinge of investigation’ (cf. Biletzki and Matar 2011).

As a person who has been academically trained in comparative education and whose scholarly work encompasses for the most part studies on institutions and knowledge, analysing shifts in meanings, I am sure that what we know about one context does not automatically apply to another context. For an initial understanding of the use of the word ‘inclusion’ in different contexts (here, I will not go so far as to conduct a comparative analysis), I am wondering about functional equivalents between debates relating to *inclusion* in education and in sport. For both contexts, the following holds true: *inclusion* is ‘about the participation of *all* children and young people and the removal of *all* forms of exclusionary practice’ (Len Barton, as quoted in Armstrong 2003, 3).

When thinking about differences between sport and education, the first argument supporting the answer ‘no’ to the question about the same meaning of *inclusion* in sport and education is that sport is a context, which, with the exception of compulsory Physical Education (PE), is more or less voluntary. So, unlike in education, the provision of opportunities and structures for doing sport seems to be generally much more oriented towards the *choice* of those who decide to do sport. Accordingly, as Spaaij, Magee, and Jeanes (2014) illustrate it, when dealing with inclusion in sport it is important to keep in mind that non-participation

does not equal social exclusion, as this occurs when people want to participate but cannot. Indeed, not everyone, regardless of whether they have disabilities, wants to take part in sport.

In front of this backdrop it is better to understand why this volume titled ‘Inclusion in Sport: Disability and Participation’ contains not only articles about options of sporting activities for people with disabilities together with non-disabled peers and competitors (e.g. the papers from Valet; Meziani), but also contributions that emphasize Disability Sport in segregated settings (e.g. the papers from Saxton; Mojtahedi and Katsui). Also, the Preface of this volume makes perfect sense now, informing the reader about that through Article 30.5 the CRPD provides a framework for addressing a rights-based approach to the inclusion and *integration* of disabled people in sport and covers the spectrum of opportunities for people with disabilities, ranging from ‘inclusion within mainstream settings’ to ‘*inclusion within disability-specific opportunities*’ (emphases added). Accordingly, in connection with the Olympic Movement Wolff and Hums outline that the CRPD does not call for the creation of one Games for all, but for all athletes with disabilities within the Olympic Movement to be respected and valued as athletes first, since all athletes are equally Olympians.

This Introduction deals with various scenarios of people with disabilities involved in sport and quality physical education (QPE). Due to my background in education and knowledge of the variety of meanings attributed to *inclusion*, I chose to focus particularly on the aspect of *participation* as part of processes of *inclusion of people with disabilities in sport* and QPE. I follow the basic assumption borrowed from studies of fairness, justice, equity and equality of opportunity in education, that inclusive approaches can be characterized by ‘ensuring a basic minimum standard [...] for all’ (Ainscow 2012, 290), in our case a minimum standard of *sport for all*. Hence, my focus is on the question of the interrelations between *inclusion* in sport and QPE, *disability* and *participation*, which is the reason why I want to go beyond questions of *who* has or should have access to sport, or *who* achieves in joint physical activities, and instead move towards consideration of various ‘terms of inclusion’ (Ramirez 2006, 434).

The issue of different wording: ‘disabled people’/‘people with disabilities’

In the Disability Studies and IE literature there is tension over the basic terms of ‘disabled people’ versus ‘people with disabilities’ (e.g. Le Clair 2011). The issue of the different wording is controversial (Kiuppis 2013). ‘People First’ language, named after an organization in the US, emerged in the 1980s as a way to counteract objectifying language (such as ‘the disabled’) and foregrounds the notion that this population is *people* first and that the personhood is of foremost importance. Such thinking is in line with the ‘person-first’ terminology used by international organizations such as the UN (e.g. UN 2006) and their respective suborganizations (e.g. WHO 2001; UNICEF 2016), which allows individuals to be the primary focus of attention and relegates the disability issue to a position of secondary importance. This is a way of framing that arguably dates back to the UN Decade of Disabled Persons (1983–1992), of which one outcome was the publication of the Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities (UN 1993). However, Disability Studies in the UK have traditionally relied on the British ‘Social Model’, according to which disability is not an attributable feature of individuals but is imposed by society’s oppression of people who are physically impaired (Finkelstein 1996). Understood in this way, the limitations of

people who are considered ‘disabled’ result either primarily or – in a more radical understanding of the social model – *only* from their societal context (see Kiuppis and Soorenian, [forthcoming](#)). Accordingly, participation restrictions should be understood as mainly caused by barriers (not only physical ones, but also, for example, attitudinal ones) imposed by the social environment. Somewhat contrarily, members of the Disability Studies community in the US, such as those of the Society for Disability Studies, prefer to talk about ‘people with disabilities’ from a human rights based perspective, seeing the use of the term disability as a way to remove the stigma linked to disease, illness and impairment by both implying that some of those conditions cannot be explained by biological science and that disability is determined by social, political, cultural and economic factors.

From the above, readers may understand why I chose to vary my use of wording, depending on the context when referring to the group in focus in this Introduction. I decided to point out this variation, rather than to prioritize consistency.³

Structure of the Introduction

In the following, I introduce the key definitions on which this volume is based. Thereafter, I illustrate the *inclusion* debates in education as the main reference context for relatively more recent *inclusion* debates in sport. In this context I contrast the discourses of *inclusion* in education and in sport and discuss what equivalence the debate about the conceptual development from special education, via education in integrated settings, to IE has in the world of sport.

In the main part of the Introduction, I deal with major ‘shifts in the positioning and meaning of international disability sport’ (Le Clair 2011, 1075) in three stages. First, I identify the position I take on a *Sports Development Continuum* as conceptualized by Spaaij, Magee, and Jeanes (2014). Second, I introduce the *Integration Continuum for Sport Participation* developed in the US (Winnick 1987), which, according to the author, builds upon those developed for provision of special education services (Reynolds 1962; Deno 1970) and PE services (Winnick 1987, 160).⁴ Third, I provide an overview of the processes of the various revisions of the *Integration Continuum* carried out in the UK in connection with the development of the *Inclusion Spectrum*, a model that has been reworked into a practical tool (Black and Stevenson 2011)⁵ and that, like the *Index for Inclusion* that is well known in the IE literature (Booth, Ainscow, and Kingston 2002), can be used to support practitioners to think when planning and delivering activities in sport (Stevenson 2009). The main part culminates in a summary of the five modalities of the Inclusion Spectrum and the introduction of a model known as ‘STEP’ or ‘TREE’. At the end of the Introduction, I provide a conclusion.

Basic definitions

The three key defining factors of the UNESCO Chair in Inclusive Physical Education, Sport, Fitness and Recreation at the Institute of Technology (IT) in Tralee (Ireland) are ‘sport’, ‘disability’ and ‘QPE’ and ‘physical literacy’ as a central aspect of QPE (UNESCO Chair at IT Tralee 2015, 8). I rely here on slightly different definitions than other works on *inclusion* in sport, particularly those on which me and my team members based our UNESCO Chair’s work.

Sport

The UNESCO Chair at IT, Tralee understands sport as ‘all forms of physical activity that contribute to physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction, such as play, recreation, organized or competitive sport, and indigenous sports and games’ (UN Inter-Agency Task Force 2003).

Disability

Disability is commonly associated with functional limitations. Le Clair (2011, 1078) states: ‘Disability is often equated with inferiority and deficiency rather than a neutral difference that may require some adaptation.’ However, the meaning of ‘disability’ we rely on is borrowed from the World Health Organization (WHO), according to which ‘disability’

is an umbrella term, covering impairments, activity limitations and participation restrictions. An impairment is a problem in body function or structure; an activity limitation is a difficulty encountered by an individual in executing a task or action; while a participation restriction is a problem experienced by an individual in involvement in life situations. (WHO 2016)

This definition is in line with the bio-psychosocial model of disability, which is connected with WHO’s classification of the components of health, namely the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) (WHO 2001), which is a conceptual ‘pentagon’ containing the following components that are used to conceptualize disability, starting with a health condition: (1) activity, (2) body structures and functions, (3) participation, (4) environmental factors and (5) personal factors (see Kiuppis 2013). The ICF is an integrated model that describes a continuum of more to less ‘functioning’ and ‘disability’ and uses arrows between the different components to indicate how they are connected. In context of the ICF, a change in one component means a shift in the whole fabric of components, which makes the model applicable for the assessment and interpretation of sport dynamics. To give an example: (1) a person experiences an impairment in their body structures and functions (e.g. blindness); (2) that impairment causes a limitation in their activity (e.g. their ability to see a ball in a game); (3) that limitation in turn leads to a restriction in the person’s participation (e.g. their exclusion from a team); (4) the latter restriction potentially has consequences in terms of environmental factors (e.g. mobilization of extra support); and (5) all of the components together have an impact on personal factors, such as the person’s coping styles and level of involvement in sport (for the use of this example in education, see, e.g. Hollenweger and Moretti 2012).

Quality physical education

Our understanding of QPE relates to guidelines for policy-makers published by UNESCO (2015), which are in line with the International Charter for Physical Education, Physical Activity and Sport that was recently revised and in its new form adopted by the UNESCO member states.⁶ Section 3.1 (on ‘Ensuring an Inclusive Approach’) of the QPE guidelines for policy makers highlights the UNESCO Chair’s work on the project European Inclusive Physical Education Training (EIPET), which was officially acknowledged by UNESCO as a case study for instituting inclusion (UNESCO 2015, 37). EIPET, launched in 2009, was adopted internationally by many higher education teacher-training institutions and by many

allied professionals for in-service training or lifelong learning (UNESCO Chair at IT Tralee 2016). UNESCO (2015) describes QPE as not only the entry point for lifelong physical activity, but also as improving health awareness, enhancing civic engagement and contributing to social inclusion. UNESCO's QPE policy identifies the UN's Post-2015 Development Agenda as outlining how sustainable development begins with healthy, safe, active, well-educated children. However, UNESCO highlights 'inclusion', 'equality' and 'physical literacy' as central tenants of QPE (see UNESCO Chair at IT Tralee 2015, 8).

Physical literacy

UNESCO (2015) promotes the concept of physical literacy, which was originally defined by Physical and Health Education Canada, as a part of their programme for physical and health educators, Passport for Life, as the ability to move,

with competence and confidence in a wide variety of physical activities in multiple environments that benefit the healthy development of the whole person. Competent movers tend to be more successful academically and socially. They understand how to be active for life and are able to transfer competence from one area to another. Physically literate individuals have the skills and confidence to move any way they want. They can show their skills and confidence in lots of different physical activities and environments; and use their skills and confidence to be active and healthy.⁷

Physical and Health Education Canada (2016) describes physical literacy as follows:

Individuals who are physically literate move with competence and confidence in a wide variety of physical activities in multiple environments that benefit the healthy development of the whole person.

- Physically literate individuals consistently develop the motivation and ability to understand, communicate, apply and analyse different forms of movement.
- They are able to demonstrate a variety of movements confidently, competently, creatively and strategically across a wide range of health-related physical activities.
- These skills enable individuals to make healthy, active choices that are both beneficial to and respectful of their whole self, others and their environment.⁸

While conducting a literature search I found that physical literacy is mostly dealt with in PE journals, such as the *European Journal of Physical Education*, *Physical and Health Education Journal*, *British Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, *Journal of Physical Education*, *Recreation and Dance* and *Physical Education Matters*. Colin Lankshear's (1997, 1998) account of the meanings of 'literacy' in reform conceptions may be a useful analytical tool for (further) research, since Lankshear focuses on meanings at the level of policy proposals in education. Framed with his approach, one could argue that physical literacy spans a spectrum of different meanings, of which 'some remain close to its earlier connotative and denotative associations, while others stretch to encompass sophisticated levels of analysis, abstraction, symbol manipulation, and theoretical knowledge and application' (Lankshear 1998, 356). Following this line of reasoning, we would have to ask how the meanings of physical literacy could be seen to encode values that define physical literacy as an ideal to be realized in both sporting and educational practice, establish the bases of its perceived worth and set parameters for what counts as physical literacy and engagement in it as social idea (Lankshear 1998). According to Lankshear, documents reflect different

‘types’ of the concept under study, different ‘physical literacies’, of which some are oriented closer to earlier ‘associations’ than others. The different types of physical literacy appear to have a common denominator, as ‘they share more or less in common a number of features that are important and contentious from a normative perspective’ (Lankshear 1998, 357).

Inclusion debates in education as the main reference context for inclusion debates in sport

The main reference context of debates on inclusion in various areas of life still remains education, which arguably is the reason why ‘sport’, ‘disability’ and ‘participation’ are often discussed in connection with Inclusive PE (Goodwin 2009; Coates and Vickerman 2010). What IE in general and Inclusive PE in particular means, what is the main target population and how teacher education and school reform could and should be organized accordingly, have all been subject to academic discussions (Connor et al. 2008; Elliott 2008; Flintoff, Fitzgerald, and Scraton 2008), particularly since the most recent International Conference on Education, held in Geneva in 2008 (Kiuppis 2015a, 6). At that conference, UNESCO stated:

[I]t has now been several decades since the international community provided itself with significant legal instruments which, by stressing the right of ALL children to benefit from an education without discrimination, express – implicitly or explicitly – the concept of ‘Inclusive Education’. (UNESCO 2008, 3)

While some authors understood IE as primarily concerned with people with disabilities, in the sense of education in integrated settings (Sharma, Forlin, and Loreman 2008), others interpreted and still interpret it as an objective to widen the focus of special needs education in terms of the target group by reaching out to the heterogeneity of learners in ‘schools for all’ and taking diversity as a starting point for educational theory and practice (Kiuppis 2014a).

It is common sense that the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action (UNESCO 1994) adopted at the World Conference on Special Needs Education in 1994, connected the emerging principle of *inclusion* with the idea of overcoming the divide between regular and segregated provision of education for people with special needs. From a comparative inclusive (physical) education point of view,

the question we have to answer is to what extent and how the principle of inclusion can be translated to the activities of sport, because obviously education and sport cannot be easily compared, they are not functionally equivalent. So, in other words, what inclusion in education means is something else than what inclusion in sports means. (Kiuppis 2015b)

The relevance of clarity when defining IE becomes clear in UNESCO’s Guidelines for Inclusion, a manual designed to ‘assist countries in making National Plans for Education more inclusive’ (UNESCO 2005, 3), in order to ensure full access to education for all in the true sense of the word, covering the whole range of different target groups and all age groups, and not only guaranteeing access to education, but also tackling active participation and achievement (Whitehead 1995). UNESCO considers its Guidelines for Inclusion to be ‘a first step in seeking to foster dialogue on the quality of educational provision and the allocation of resources, providing a policy tool for revising and formulating Education for All plans, and also raising awareness about a broadened concept of inclusive education’ (UNESCO 2008, 31), which – following a recommendation at the East Asia Workshop on IE, held in Hangzhou (China) in 2007 – has been called ‘New Inclusive Education’ (Kiuppis 2015a, 11).

As outlined above, this volume has its focus on *disability* because I assembled the articles in my role as the Head of the UNESCO Chair with the official title ‘Transforming the Lives of People with Disabilities, Their Families and Communities, Through Physical Education, Sport, Recreation and Fitness’. We understand inclusion in PE and sport as encompassing the levels of ‘access, participation and achievement’ (Slee 2006). Instead of focusing just on the question of placement, which is how to make sure that people with disabilities have the chance or become enabled to do sport, the more process-oriented understanding of *inclusion* draws from ideals of empowerment of persons with disabilities and their communities and aims at activating civic society and the various communities therein to become inclusive.⁹

Arguably, the main difference between inclusion debates fuelled by the CRPD in both education and sport is that in sport disability-specific activities are accepted as part of what in the sport and PE literature is commonly called the ‘inclusion spectrum’, but not in education, in which inclusion debates commonly deal with positive aspects of education in segregated settings and especially with negative aspects of education in such settings. As I show in the following, sport is a context in which special, integrative and inclusive structures are co-existing non-hierarchically.

However, since sport is associated not only with *social inclusion*, but also with physical well-being and the enhancement of self-esteem, it is crucial to understand it as a right and to consider *access* and *participation* in sport – unlike in education – as a question about *individual choice* of a sporting activity across a continuum of segregated, integrated and inclusive approaches, rather than about placement in a context chosen by professionals. Thus, as Wolff and Hums indicate in the Preface, participation of people with disabilities in disability-specific sporting activities is – again, unlike in education – to be considered part of an *inclusion spectrum* (see next section). In a sporting context, the goal is to assist people with disabilities in making their ‘independent’ choice to participate in sport in the way that they want to and with whom they want to participate (see Misener 2014, 3–4). Hence, inclusion debates in sport are not about how to substitute special structures with integrative ones, and those in turn with inclusive ones, but are characterized by giving each approach equal importance and validity.

Major conceptual shifts in the positioning and meaning of international disability sport

Spaaij, Magee, and Jeanes (2014) edited a volume in which they deal with social exclusion as a phenomenon that can occur or be challenged at any level of sporting competition. In this connection, they introduce different levels as parts of what they refer to as a *sports development continuum*, which ranges from the foundation/participation levels through to the performance/excellence levels. In this connection they refer to this continuum as ‘a logical progression from learning the basic skills at foundation level to performing as an elite performer at the excellence level’ (Spaaij, Magee, and Jeanes [2014, 3], see also Enoch [2010, 46]; as quoted). The *sports development continuum* suggests that elite competitive sport is as much part of ‘sport for all’ (ie the promotion of access to sport) as the provision of community opportunities for participation (Houlihan and White 2002). As such, the continuum seeks to reconcile some of the historical tension between those promoting elite sport and those promoting grass roots participation by suggesting that these dual goals are inextricably interdependent (Bloyce and Smith 2010). The *sports development continuum*

is described as instructive for conceptualizing the relationship between sport and social exclusion (Spaaij, Magee, and Jeanes 2014).

Spaaij, Magee, and Jeanes (2014, 7) state: '[E]xclusionary processes can be found at any level of sporting competition, and the different levels are often interdependent in terms of the experiences, causes and consequences of social exclusion', to which I would add social inclusion. For this reason, I decided to assemble articles that focus both on the foundation and participation end of the continuum (e.g. the papers by Valet; Wickman, Nordlund and Holm) and on the performance and excellence end (e.g. the papers by Howe and Silva; Saxton).

Integration continuum for sport participation

The *integration continuum for sport participation* is a conceptual framework on the provision of sport opportunities for 'individuals with handicapping conditions' (Winnick 1987).¹⁰ This framework was published as a 'Viewpoint' article in the *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly* and reflects alternative 'settings' of sport for people with disabilities, ranging from regular sport with no modifications to segregated sport (Winnick 1987, 157–158). The settings are distinguished on the basis of the 'degree of integration' and 'sport type' (Winnick 1987, 160). The continuum ranges from the least restrictive setting possible (1. Regular Sport), which is described as 'most normal/integrated', to the most restrictive segregated one (5. Adapted Sport Segregated). The other settings located between those two poles are: '2. Regular Sport with Accommodation', which is described as necessarily 'reasonable and [should] allow individuals with handicapping conditions equal opportunities to gain the same benefits or results from participation in a particular activity' (Winnick 1987, 159); '3. Regular and Adapted Sport'; and '4. Adapted Sport Integrated'.

For each of the five settings, Winnick offered various 'scenarios' and examples, such as the following respective ones:

- (1) 'A mentally retarded¹¹ athlete [participating in] his school's track team because of his performance in the high jump' (157).
- (2) 'A blind bowler competing in regular sport competition with only the accommodation of a guide rail' (159).
- (3) '[A] handicapped athlete participating from a wheelchair (adapted sport) may compete against all runners in a marathon including able-bodied and handicapped athletes. Able-bodied athletes run the marathon (regular sport)' (159).
- (4) '[B]oth able-bodied and handicapped athletes participate in an adapted version of the sport in an integrated setting. [...] One example of level 4 is when both able-bodied and handicapped athletes use wheelchairs in their competition against wheelchair-confined opponents in wheelchair tennis' (159).
- (5) '[H]andicapped athletes participate in adapted sport in a totally segregated setting. A mentally retarded athlete participating in the Special Olympics program is an example. Also, two teams of blind youngsters competing in goal ball exemplifies level 5' (160).

Despite the wording, although the model might seem accurate and up to date for researchers and practitioners outside the field of sport, it arguably appears outdated for those familiar with *inclusion* debates in sport. As outlined above, the CRPD covers the spectrum

of opportunities for people with disabilities: inclusion within mainstream settings, as well as inclusion within disability-specific opportunities, depending on the independent individual choice of persons with disabilities themselves. While Winnick acknowledged that '[a]lthough level 5 is most restrictive, it should not be inferred that experiences at these levels are not beneficial and should be minimized' (Winnick 1987, 160), his model clearly privileges participation of persons with disabilities in regular sport, eventually with accommodations, rather than in segregated settings. Winnick suggested greater involvement of persons with disabilities on levels on which arguably they are underrepresented: levels 3 and 4. When critically reading his text in connection with the continuum of the five settings, it becomes clear that his personal main goal was to serve as many people with disabilities as possible (level of access) in settings ideally located on one extreme of the continuum (1. Regular Sport) rather than on the other extreme (5. Adapted Sport Segregated). This tendency is also expressed in the following quotation:

It is hoped this sport continuum will broaden perspectives in regard to integration in sport. It should help include into sport more persons with handicapping conditions and encourage involvement at levels that are least restrictive and most appropriate. (Winnick 1987)

In sum, Winnick's structure is a hierarchical one suggesting that inclusive activity is the programme pinnacle, and the other approaches he described are adaptations or modifications leading to this goal. However, from an IE perspective, it might seem appropriate to declare hierarchically level 1 the most ideal and level 5 the least ideal. However, for the context of sport it appears to be outdated that the preferences of the individuals described in the scenarios and examples are not given any consideration. Sport appears here as a context, in which what is regarded as relevant is not the *individual's independent choice* of a setting on the continuum from special to inclusive, but rather the *replacement* of special offers by integrative ones.

Subsequent revisions of the integration continuum for sport participation

In this section, I provide an overview of the process of various revisions of the integration continuum that have been carried out in the UK, and which were connected with the development of the Inclusion Spectrum (see Valet 2013). In context of the conceptual framework for the provision of sport opportunities for people with disabilities developed by Winnick (1987), scholars and practitioners considered it necessary 'to arrange the format of the continuum to give each approach equal validity and importance within the overall programme' (Black and Williamson 2011, 203).

A first version of an *Inclusion Spectrum* was introduced in 1996 by Ken Black (at that time Inclusive Sport Officer at the Youth Sport Trust, UK), who changed Winnick's model of a hierarchical order and instead introduced different strategies for participation that could be adopted without one strategy being considered superior to another. In contrast to the *Integration Continuum*, this first revision demonstrated how varying degrees, rather than levels, of participation can be thought of in the sporting environment. In this view, inclusion was more about accepting responsibility for the provision of sporting opportunities for people with disabilities and taking the necessary steps to ensure that everyone is given equal chance and choice to participate (Misener 2014). According to Pam Stevenson (2009), Black refined Winnick's model in a chapter of a handbook titled *Including Young Disabled People* (Youth Sport Trust 1996), '[arranging] the format of the continuum in a

manner that gave each strategy equal importance' (Youth Sport Trust 1996, 123). Aiming for an inclusive approach was only considered legitimate if professionals oriented their thinking, decision-making and action on the preferences of individuals with disabilities and their respective independent choices. 'Regular sport activities' were no longer considered the ultimate aim and segregated ones were not, in Winnick's terms per se, considered 'more restrictive'. According to Black and Williamson (2011, 203), '[t]his amended Winnick's hierarchical structure that suggested that inclusive activity was the programme pinnacle, and the other approaches he described were adaptations or modifications leading to this goal'. They provided an informative description of efforts made mostly by practitioners with great impact on the emergence of practical programme designs that addressed inclusion in sport.

One difficulty facing those who started to work on revisions of Winnick's model was the underlying dilemma of *inclusive* approaches: 'How does one include without excluding or further marginalising in the process?' (Kiuppis 2015a, 13). To some extent, and with reference to John Rawls' 'egalitarian difference principle', a perspective that takes into consideration both the differences between persons as well as their equal rights might have been helpful here (Rawls 2003 [1921]). Accordingly, specific measures that are necessary to accelerate or achieve equality among athletes (regardless of the extent of their participation) do not necessarily need to be considered discriminative, marginalizing or excluding (cf. UN 2006, Article 5). Rather, exclusive concentration on different development potentialities, abilities, characteristics and expectations should be understood as a prerequisite of inclusive approaches in any heterogeneous group of people doing sport together.

However, slightly deviating from Winnick's five levels, developers of early forms of the *Inclusion Spectrum* subdivided physical activity into five types: separate activity (e.g. Paralympic sports); parallel activity (e.g. sport for all with separated subcontexts); reverse integration activity (e.g. wheelchair basketball); open activity (e.g. Capoeira);¹² and modified activity (e.g. Baskin).¹³ Black's version of an *Inclusion Spectrum* published in 1996 was developed further by him in cooperation with David Tillotson (at that time an advisory teacher of PE in Birmingham). Stevenson used that model then in her practical work with students and teachers, and subsequently the model became a tool for practitioners.

Summary of the five modalities of the inclusion spectrum

The inclusion spectrum proposed five distinct modalities of practice, which according to Stevenson (2009) overlap in principle and methodology. Black and Williamson (2011) presented a graph showing an oval containing the following categories:

- (1) Separate Activity: Special activities, specially thought for and proposed for people with disability and practised in different times and spaces, such as skate soccer in Ghana.
- (2) Parallel Activity: Disabled athletes may need to train separately with disabled peers to prepare for a competition, such as a wheelchair basketball group included in a local basketball club (see Black and Williamson 2011, 210).
- (3) Disability Sport Activity: Reverse integration whereby non-disabled children and adults are included in disability sport together with disabled peers, such as using the Paralympic sports goalball, boccia or sitting volleyball as a basis for an inclusive game.

- (4) Open (inclusive) Activity: ‘Everyone does the same activity with minimal or no adaptations to the environment or equipment; open activities are by their nature inclusive so that the activity suits every participant. For example, warm-up or cool down, and cooperative or unstructured movement games (like collecting games, play canopy games, or actions songs and activities)’ (Black and Williamson 2011, 207).
- (5) Modified Activity Activities designed for all, with specific adaptations to space, tasks, equipment and people’s teaching (e.g. Baskin, Unified Sports program).

Black and Stevenson’s version of the Inclusion Spectrum published in 2006 was broadly considered ‘definite’ (see Black and Williamson 2011, 206). Black and Stevenson then cooperated to develop an inclusion workshop for the English Federation of Disability Sport (Stevenson 2009; Black 2011; Black and Williamson 2011, 203). In 2007, a further refinement was made by placing the ‘reverse integration activity’ strand, which was also considered ‘disability sport activity’ at the centre of the spectrum of settings. The reason for that move was to express that ‘reverse integration’ activities can be used as the basis for open, modified, parallel or separate activities (Black and Williamson 2011, 207). This arguably opened up the *Inclusion Spectrum* towards approaches that do not associate *inclusion* only with disability, but also connect this guiding principle with an all-embracing approach allowing for ways of sport activity in heterogeneous teams without the group being imagined as divided into people with or without disabilities. To date, reverse integration has been understood as:

a descriptor for those approaches to sport which turn around the philosophy of integrating the needs of people with disabilities into mainstream society by adapting the functioning of athletes without disabilities to those with disabilities, e.g. when playing wheelchair basketball. (Ogden 2016)

The STEP/TREE model

The STEP or TREE model resulted from the conceptual shifts in the positioning and meaning of international disability sport. It provides a useful way for practitioners to structure changes to sporting activities, and it should be used as a complement to the Inclusion Spectrum.

STEP is an acronym derived from the word ‘Space’, ‘Task’, ‘Equipment’ and ‘People’. STEP was developed in Youth Sport Trust resource material as a simple means of assisting teachers, coaches and community sport deliverers in differentiation (ie changing activities in order to provide suitable entry points across the ability range). As a structure, STEP can be used to ensure that participants with different abilities can be included in physical activities. Changes in the way an activity is delivered can be made in one or more of the STEP areas (Black and Williamson 2011, 212). For each word represented by the letters of the acronym, the authors offer the following examples:

Space – Increase or decrease the size of the playing area; vary the distances to be covered in practices to suit different abilities or mobility levels; use zoning, for example where players are matched by ability and therefore have more opportunity to participate. (213)

Task – Ensure that everyone has equal opportunity to participate, for example in a ball game, all the players have the chance to carry/dribble, pass, shoot, etc.; break down complex skills into smaller component parts if this helps players to more easily develop skills; ensure there

is adequate opportunity for players to practice skills or components individually or with a partner before including in a small-sided team game.

Equipment – In ball games, increase or decrease the size of the ball to suit the ability or age range of the players, or depending on the kind of skill being practiced; provide options that enable people to send or receive a ball in different ways, for example using a chute or gutter to send, a catching mitt to receive; the use of bell or rattle balls can assist the inclusion of some players.

People – Match players of similar ability in small-sided or close marking activities; balance team numbers according to the overall ability of the group, that is, it may be preferable to play with teams of unequal numbers to facilitate inclusion of some players and maximize participation of others.

TREE is an acronym derived from the text or words ‘Teaching or coaching style’, ‘Rules and regulations’, ‘Equipment’ and ‘Environment’. This slight variation from STEP was developed by the *Disability Sport unit* of the Australian Sports Commission. The advantage of introducing the ‘T’ is that attention is given to the actions of the teacher or coach (Black and Williamson 2011, 213).

Conclusion

This Introduction to the volume on *inclusion* in sport started with the claim that the questions of what *inclusion* in sport means and which steps need to be taken in order to ensure *inclusion* in sport at all levels has to be answered differently in the context of sport than in education, which is the context primarily known for debates on ‘inclusion’. Borrowing from Wittgenstein, who stated that ‘in general, the meaning of a word is its use in language’ ([1936–1946] 2001, 22), I have dealt with the meaning of *inclusion* in sport, and have contrasted the use of the word ‘inclusion’ in sport with its use in the reference context, education.

The Introduction clarifies that, unlike the context of education, in which the CRPD demands that countries ‘should ensure an inclusive education system at all levels’, through Article 30.5 the CRPD has provided a framework for addressing a rights-based approach to the inclusion and *integration* of people with disability in sport and covers the spectrum of opportunities for people with disabilities: inclusion within mainstream settings as well as *inclusion within disability-specific opportunities*. Thus, a preliminary answer to the question of how the participation of people with disabilities in sport can be guaranteed is simple: in accordance with their individual preferences, wishes and choices.

The idea behind the aim to shed light on ‘the issues related to disability in sport and physical activity in different cultural settings intersected by gender, race and ethnicity, class and age’ (Le Clair 2011, 1072) is that inclusion in sport is to be considered more than guaranteeing access. Moreover, the guiding principle of inclusion requires approaches to improve participation, beyond the question of ‘who’, in the process-oriented sense and in accordance with the fundamental right to participate in physical education and sport, as proclaimed in UNESCO’s International Charter of Physical Education and Sport. In other words, the ‘how’ is of central importance here, as Article 30.5 of the CRPD covers the spectrum of opportunities for people with disabilities: inclusion within mainstream settings as well as inclusion within disability-specific opportunities (see Wolff and Hums in this volume).

In sport, the view embedded in the CRPD’s text, ‘to enable persons with disabilities to participate on an equal basis with others’ (UN 2006, Art. 30.5) does not per se favour

approaches that take diversity and/or heterogeneity as a starting point but allows for segregated contexts in which persons with disabilities can be physically active together with their peers and competitors who have a similar level of functioning. In the beginning of the Introduction I have argued the case for why, unlike in education, where inclusion debates typically discredit segregated structures and glorify supposedly inclusive ones, in sport the individual should be able to choose an activity on a spectrum ranging from separate activities for persons with disabilities to modified activities designed for all.

This volume is the result of my intention to contribute to a ‘terms of inclusion’ debate in sport with a focus on participation, rather than merely to an ‘access for all’ debate (Gold and Gold 2007), and throughout it has reflected the ‘discursive simultaneity’ (Kiuppis 2014b) of different ideas on the question of how the relation between ‘sport’ and ‘disability’ could be thought of and ideally put into practice when thinking about ‘participation’ in the context that most readers of this journal are more familiar with, namely inclusion in education.

Notes

1. Since its adoption in 2006, the CRPD has been ratified by 166 countries.
2. *Inclusion* does not necessarily relate to people with disabilities (Kiuppis 2014a, forthcoming). However, I focus here on people with disabilities in sport because in my role as the Head of the UNESCO Chair at the Institute of Technology (IT), Tralee (in Ireland), since February 2015, I have been continuously engaged in questions relating to sport, inclusive Physical Education, recreation and fitness with a focus on people with disabilities.
3. I thank Marsha Saxton (World Institute on Disability, Berkeley, CA) who encouraged me to make these decisions. For further clarification regarding the definition of disability see below.
4. Since these frameworks that fuelled the development of the *Integration Continuum* did not precisely or directly apply to sport settings but rather to special education, I do not describe them in detail here. For further details see Fait and Dunn (1984) and Sherrill (1986).
5. See Fitzgerald (2012).
6. For information on the revision see <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002,338/233885e.pdf>.
7. See http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/physical-education-and-sport/sv14/news/physical_education_for_healthier_happier_longer_and_more_productive_living/#.Vt3fLRgVhE4.
8. See <http://www.phcanada.ca/programs/physical-literacy/what-physical-literacy>.
9. One of the main goals of the UNESCO Chair at IT, Tralee is to ‘[p]romote empowerment and active participation of people with disabilities in physical activity contexts’ (UNESCO Chair at IT Tralee 2015, 6).
10. The wording has to be understood in its historical context. While today in the Anglo-American context it is common to use the descriptor ‘people with disabilities’ or ‘disabled people’ when, for example, talking about Paralympic athletes, and to use ‘people with intellectual disabilities’ when referring to Special Olympics athletes, between the 1960s and 1980s the former were typically referred to as ‘with handicaps’ or ‘the handicapped’, and the latter as ‘mentally retarded’. In context of education, the group of ‘exceptional children’ was imagined as subdivided into ‘the handicapped’ and ‘the gifted’ (cf. Ross 1964; Kirk 1962). For historical shifts in the use of terminology in context of the Deaflympics see Clark and Mesch in this volume.
11. See the previous footnote.
12. See Meziani in this volume.
13. See Valet in this volume.

Acknowledgements

I edited this volume in the role I played since February 2015 as Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in Inclusive Physical Education, Sport, Fitness and Recreation at the Institute of Technology, in Ireland. For their support I would like to thank in particular the members of my team in the Chairgroup: Catherine Carty (UNESCO Chair Manager), Therese Conway (Postdoctoral Researcher), Shauna Kearney (Social Media), Ann O'Connor (International Development and Research), Katharina Schlüter (Sport and Development), Aisling Sugrue (Resource Development); the Vice President of the Institute: Brid McElligott; the 'Strand Leaders' of the UNESCO Chair: Tomas Aylward (Outdoors), Ursula Barrett (Adapted Physical Activity), Edel Randles (Civic Engagement), Eileen Sayers (Aquatics), and Karen Weekes (Physical Education); all our numerous partners, including our partner on campus: the CARA Centre; my valuable Chairholder colleagues, particularly Pat Dolan (NUI Galway, Ireland), Mark Brennan (PennState University, USA) and Bernhard Streitwieser (George Washington University, USA), who followed my invitation to a panel titled 'Bridges between international organizations, academic communities, and practice: UNESCO Chairs at the forefront of ensuring inclusive approaches in education' in context of the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, in March 2016 in Vancouver (Canada), and Alan Smith (University of Ulster, Northern Ireland). Moreover, I am very grateful to the contributors of this volume; the peer reviewers; and not least to the Editor Boria Majumdar; the production editor Carolyn Haynes; and Shathipriya Ganesan from the FCSS production team.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

- Ainscow, M. 2012. "Moving Knowledge around: Strategies for Fostering Equity within Educational Systems." *Journal of Educational Change* 13 (3): 289–310. doi:10.1007/s10833-012-9182-5.
- Armstrong, F. 2003. "Researching the Practices and Processes of Policy Making." Chap. 1 in *Spaced out: Policy, Difference and the Challenge of Inclusive Education*, edited by F. Armstrong, 1–8. New York: Kluwer Academic.
- Bendix, J. 1998. "Comparison in the Work of Reinhard Bendix." *Sociological Theory* 16 (3): 302–312. doi:10.1111/0735-2751.00060.
- Biletzki, A., and A. Matar. 2011. "Ludwig Wittgenstein." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Summer Edition. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/wittgenstein/>.
- Black, K. 2011. "Coaching Disabled Children." In *Coaching Children in Sport*, edited by Ian Stafford, 197–212. London: Routledge.
- Black, K., and P. Stevenson. 2011. *The Inclusion Spectrum*. <http://www.sportdevelopment.info/index.php/browse-all-documents/748-the-inclusion-spectrum>.
- Black, K., and D. Williamson. 2011. "Designing Inclusive Physical Activities and Games." In *Design for Sport*, edited by A. Cereijo-Roibas, E. Stamatakis and K. Black, 195–224. Farnham: Gower.
- Bloyce, D., and A. Smith. 2010. "Elite sports development: promoting international success." *Sport policy and development: An introduction* 132–156.
- Booth, T., M. Ainscow, and D. Kingston. 2002. *Index for Inclusion: Developing Play, Learning and Participation in Early Years and Childcare*. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education. <http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/Index%20EY%20English.pdf>.
- Coates, J., and P. Vickerman. 2010. "Empowering Children with Special Educational Needs to Speak up: Experiences of Inclusive Physical Education." *Disability and Rehabilitation* 32 (18): 1517–1526. doi:10.3109/09638288.2010.497037.
- Connor, D. J., S. L. Gabel, D. J. Gallagher, and M. Morton. 2008. "Disability Studies and Inclusive Education: Implications for Theory, Research, and Practice." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 12 (5–6): 441–457. doi:10.1080/13603110802377482.

- Deno, E. 1970. "Forum: Special Education as Developmental Capital." *Exceptional Children* 37 (3): 229–237.
- DePauw, K. P., and S. J. Gavron. 2005. *Disability and Sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Elliott, S. 2008. "The Effect of Teachers' Attitude toward Inclusion on the Practice and Success Levels of Children with and without Disabilities in Physical Education." *International Journal of Special Education* 23 (3): 48–55.
- Enoch, N. 2010. "Towards a Contemporary National Structure for Youth Sport in England." In *Examining Sports Development*, edited by M. Collins, 45–71. London: Routledge.
- Fait, H. F., and J. M. Dunn. 1984. *Special Physical Education: Adapted, Individualized, and Developmental*. Virginia, VA: Saunders College.
- Finkelstein, V. 1996. "The Disability Movement Has Run out of Steam." *Disability Now*, 11.
- Fitzgerald, H. 2012. "'Drawing' on Disabled Students' Experiences of Physical Education and Stakeholder Responses." *Sport, Education and Society* 17 (4): 443–462.
- Flintoff, A., H. Fitzgerald, and S. Scraton. 2008. "The Challenges of Intersectionality: Researching Difference in Physical Education." *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 18 (2): 73–85.
- Gold, J. R., and M. M. Gold. 2007. "Access for All: The Rise of the Paralympic Games." *The Journal of the Royal Society for the Promotion of Health* 127 (3): 133–141.
- Goodwin, D. 2009. "The Voices of Students with Disabilities: Are They Informing Inclusive Physical Education Practice." In *Disability and Youth Sport*, edited by H. Fitzgerald, 53–75. London: Routledge.
- Gray, J. A., J. L. Zimmerman, and J. H. Rimmer. 2012. "Built Environment Instruments for Walkability, Bikeability, and Recreation: Disability and Universal Design Relevant?" *Disability and Health Journal* 5 (2): 87–101.
- Hall, E., and R. Wilton. 2011. "Alternative Spaces of 'Work' and Inclusion for Disabled People." *Disability & Society* 26 (7): 867–880.
- Hollenweger, J., and M. Moretti. 2012. "Using the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health Children and Youth Version in Education Systems: A New Approach to Eligibility." *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation* 91 (13): 97–102.
- Houlihan, B., and A. White. 2002. *The Politics of Sports Development*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kirk, S. A. 1962. *The Intellectually Gifted Child*. In: *Educating Exceptional Children*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Kiuppis, F. 2013. "'Pedagogikkens Pentagon' Revis(It)Ed – Considerations on Emancipation from a Disability Studies and Inclusive Education Perspective." In *Pedagogikk under Livets Tre* [Education under Life's Tree], edited by J. Steinnes and S. Dobson, 147–160. Trondheim: Akademika.
- Kiuppis, F. 2014a. "Why (Not) Associate the Principle of Inclusion with Disability? Tracing Connections from the Start of the 'Salamanca Process.'" *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 18 (7): 746–761.
- Kiuppis, F. 2014b. "Risiko Oder Gefahr, Bedarfe Oder Bedürfnisse? Zur Diskursiven Gleichzeitigkeit Von Sich Widersprechenden Grundideen Bei Der Entwicklung Bildungspolitischer Projekte Im Kontext Internationaler Organisationen." [At Risk or in Danger, in Need or with Requirements? On the discursive simultaneity of contradictory ideas in the course of the development of educational projects in context of International Organizations.] *Schweizerische Zeitschrift Für Bildungswissenschaften* 36 (2): 243–264.
- Kiuppis, F. 2015a. "Friendly but Demanding? On Different Meanings of Inclusive Education as an Imagined Concept in National Reform Planning." *Opuscula Sociologica* 1: 5–21.
- Kiuppis, F. 2015b. Inaugural Address as UNESCO Chairholder, Presented at the Launch of the UNESCO Chair IT Tralee 'Transforming the Lives of People with Disabilities, Their Families and Communities, through Physical Education, Sport, Recreation and Fitness', Tralee, February 23. <http://tinyurl.com/jjnxxgu>.
- Kiuppis, F. *Forthcoming*. "From Special Education, via Integration, to Inclusion: Continuity and Change in UNESCO's Agenda Setting." *Zeitschrift Für Internationale Bildungsforschung Und Entwicklungspädagogik – ZEP* 2016 (3).
- Kiuppis, F., and R. S. Hausstätter, eds. 2014. *Inclusive Education 20 Years after Salamanca*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Kiuppis, F., and S. Kurzke-Maasmeier, eds. 2012. *Sport Im Spiegel Der UN- Behindertenrechtskonvention [Sports Reflected in the UN-Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities – Interdisciplinary Approaches and Political Positions]*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Kiuppis, F., and A. Soorenian. **Forthcoming**. “Bridging Continents, Cultures, and Crip Theories: Teaching Comparative and International Disability Studies in Sociology and Education.” *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*.
- Lankshear, C. 1997. *Changing Literacies*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Lankshear, C. 1998. “Meanings of Literacy in Contemporary Educational Reform Proposals.” *Educational Theory* 48 (3): 351–372.
- Le Clair, J. M. 2011. “Global Organizational Change in Sport and the Shifting Meaning of Disability.” *Sport in Society* 14 (9): 1072–1093.
- Milner, P., and B. Kelly. 2009. “Community Participation and Inclusion: People with Disabilities Defining Their Place.” *Disability & Society* 24 (1): 47–62.
- Misener, L. 2014. “Managing Disability Sport: From Athletes with Disabilities to Inclusive Organisational Perspectives.” *Sport Management Review* 17: 1–7.
- Ogden, L. E. 2016. *Reverse Integration – Doing Disability Sport Differently*. Inclusion Club, Episode 63. <http://theinclusionclub.com/reverse-integration/>.
- Physical and Health Education Canada. 2016. “What is Physical Literacy?” <http://www.phecanada.ca/programs/physical-literacy/what-physical-literacy>.
- Ramirez, F. O. 2006. “Beyond Attainment and Achievement Studies – Revitalizing a Comparative Sociology of Education.” *Comparative Education* 42 (3): 431–449.
- Rawls, J. 2003 [1921]. *The Principles of Justice*. In: *A Theory of Justice*. edited by J. Rawls, 47–101. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Reynolds, M. C. 1962. “A Framework for Considering Some Issues in Special Education.” *Exceptional Children* 28 (7): 367–370.
- Ross, A. O. 1964. *The exceptional child in the family*. Oxford: Grune & Stratton.
- Sharma, U., C. Forlin, and T. Loreman. 2008. “Impact of Training on Pre-service Teachers’ Attitudes and Concerns about Inclusive Education and Sentiments about Persons with Disabilities.” *Disability & Society* 23 (7): 773–785.
- Sherrill, C. 1986. *Adapted Physical Education and Recreation: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Singleton, J., and S. Darcy. 2013. “‘Cultural Life’, Disability, Inclusion and Citizenship: Moving beyond Leisure in Isolation.” *Annals of Leisure Research* 16 (3): 183–192.
- Slee, R. 2006. “Teacher Education, Government and Inclusive Schooling: The Politics of the Faustian Waltz.” In *Inclusion, Participation and Democracy: What is the Purpose?*, edited by J. Allen, 207–223. New York: Kluwer Academic.
- Spaaij, R., J. Magee, and R. Jeanes. 2014. *Sport and Social Exclusion in Global Society*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Stevenson, P. 2009. “The Pedagogy of Inclusive Youth Sport: Working towards Real Solutions.” In *Disability and Youth Sport*, edited by H. Fitzgerald, 119–131. London: Routledge.
- Thomas, N., and A. Smith. 2008. *Disability, Sport and Society: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- UN (United Nations). 1993. *Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities*. New York: United Nations.
- UN (United Nations). 2006. *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. New York: United Nations.
- UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace. 2003. *Why Sport?*. Paris: UNESCO. <http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/home/sport>.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). 1994. *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action*. Paris: UNESCO. http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA_E.PDF.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2005. *UNESCO Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring Access to Education for All*. Paris: UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001402/140224e.pdf>.

- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2008. *Inclusive Education: The Way of the Future. General Presentation of the 48th Session of the ICE*. Paris: UNESCO. http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Policy_Dialogue/48th_ICE/General_Presentation-48CIE-English.pdf.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2015. *Quality Physical Education: Guidelines for Policy Makers*. Paris: UNESCO. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002311/231101E.pdf>.
- UNESCO Chair at IT Tralee. 2015. *A Blueprint for Action*. Tralee: UNESCO Chair. <http://unescoitttralee.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/A-Blueprint-for-Action.pdf>.
- UNESCO Chair at IT Tralee. 2016. *European Inclusive Physical Education Training*. Tralee: UNESCO Chair. <http://unescoitttralee.com/european-inclusive-physical-education-training/>.
- UNICEF (The United Nations Children's Fund). 2016. *The State of the World's Children* [Report on Children with Disabilities]. New York: UNICEF. <http://www.unicef.org/sowc2016/>.
- Valet, A. 2013. "Sport, Inclusion, Innovation. Le Cas Italien Du Baskin (2001-2013)." [Sport, Inclusion, Innovation. The Italian Case of Baskin (2001–2013).] Doctoral diss., Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1. December 9. <http://www.theses.fr/2013LYO10318>.
- Whitehead, J. 1995. "Multiple Achievement Orientations and Participation in Youth Sport: A Cultural and Developmental Perspective." *International Journal of Sport Psychology* 26 (4): 431–452.
- WHO (World Health Organization). 2001. *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health*. Geneva: WHO.
- WHO (World Health Organization). 2016. *Health Topics: Disability*. Geneva: WHO. <http://www.who.int/topics/disabilities/en/>.
- Winnick, J. P. 1987. "An Integration Continuum for Sport Participation." *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly* 4 (3): 157–161.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1936–1946) 2001. "Philosophische Untersuchungen. [Philosophical Investigations]" In *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, edited by J. Schulte, 7–34. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Youth Sport Trust. 1996. *Including young disabled people: a handbook to support TOP Play and BT TOP Sport*. Loughborough: Youth Sport Trust.