WELL-BEING, INCLUSION, DISABILITY, AND QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERNITY: ANALYSES AND PERSPECTIVES

Fabio Orecchio[i]

Reasearcher,
Didactics and Special Pedagogy,
Pegaso University.
Italy

Abstract:

The contribution focuses on a reflection on wellbeing, inclusive policies, and disability in the context of sustainable development, to grasp the possible implications that are now part of a project aimed at promoting policies to improve living conditions. These are made explicit in terms of resources, living standards, health, accessibility, and capabilities, which are among the objectives of promoting the person and human development in general.

Keywords: 2030 Agenda, well-being, quality of life, capabilities, sustainability

1. Introduction

Focusing attention on well-being, inclusive policies, and disability in the context of sustainable development– in order to grasp their possible implications–would seem to be a repetition, since among the many issues, that are nowadays part of sustainable development planning, promoting policies aimed at improving living conditions–expressed through the definition of resources, living standards, health, accessibility, and capabilities–is certainly one of the objectives of individual promotion both generally speaking and for human development in particular. In the declarations, at least of intent, there is an effort of national and supranational public policies to understand what objectives to pursue in order to highlight all those interdependent variables representing a sustainable development, even though, in today's historical period– characterized by complexity and a sort of post-traumatic disorder due to the post-Covid situation and to the war in Ukraine–it is really difficult to identify new solutions and to put them into practice through targeted, interdependent and above all feasible actions.

Furthermore, this aspect has already been addressed by the 2030 Agenda which, through its 17 objectives for sustainable development, has pointed out new ways to overcome anthropological, measurable (beyond GDP), and entrepreneurial

---

[i] Correspondence: email forecchio@alice.it, fabio.orecchio@unipegaso.it

reductionisms that have led the planet to unsustainable levels of inequality and environmental impairment as well as to high levels of unemployment, to the deterioration of social and civil capital, and to a loss of happiness and meaningfulness, to give way to a model focused on the pursuit of multidimensional, equitable and sustainable fare of both the community as a whole and of each of its members (Hosseini, 2023).

In other words, it is a question of upholding a systemic, broader, and proactive point of view–considering the social, economic, environmental, and political worlds as interconnected– and taking up a strong ethical attitude in putting forward the future of a well-being society and of the quality of life of today's and tomorrow's citizens.

It is no coincidence that Sachs (2015) defined sustainable development as a way of looking at the world, one shedding light on the interactions among economic, social, and environmental changes and describing our shared ambitions for a decent life, in which economic development, social inclusion, and environmental sustainability are combined. Therefore, as stated by Bollani (2021), it would be a matter of pursuing the much-vaunted social cohesion, within a country aiming to remove the barriers that limit individuals' opportunities to reach their goals, an aim which is also pursued by the resilience plan. Such interventions are appropriately found in Mission 5 (Component 2, investment 2.1) and Mission 6 of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRPP).

They are fine words indeed, still saying one thing, and doing another. In fact, when dealing with such a topic, starting from the analyses of the life stories of the vulnerable, the fragile, and the disabled walking and living among us, we realize that there is still much to be done. We know little about the consequences of social policies and actions which may be not meaningful to us but that, on the other hand, may trigger serious and sometimes persistent reactions to them, thereby blocking or losing their potential.

If we dwelt longer upon the analysis of life stories, we could find unnoticed past accounts and, therefore, it would be possible to collect a list of grievances made by disabled people, who have personally experienced marginalization, deep loneliness, and ignored help requests (Murdaca, 2022).

Hence the interest in re-visiting social sustainability through strong action by the institutions, in order to give the disabled a voice and to create a reliable 'place' and 'context'. The aim of this is to create a "thinkable" social community, able to overcome the limits of a hitherto individualistic, efficiency-oriented society, which very often forgets about the weakest and, therefore, cares for them only on the surface, but little in fact. This is why, in everyday life, the construction of a community well-being system is often pleaded for, one whose aim is to "to catalyze", that is to say, to generate the conditions for a well-being society which–as emphasized by the National Statistical Institute and the National Council for Economy and Labour too (2012) – is characterized not only by economic well-being but also by social relationships and by the quality of the available social and healthcare services offered (Venturi & Rago, 2012, p. 77; Madans *et al.*, 2017, pp. 161-165).

Accordingly, it would be a matter of activating initiatives constantly focused on disabled people–both children and adults–and their parents, starting from their personal stories, stories that–to raise their visibility– need a community putting into practice as its priority elements guidelines oriented to multidimensional well-being, a goal nowadays considered by the NRPP as well. Therefore, in dealing with sustainable development, it is necessary to focus on the "*individual*" in order to design a *"human-development oriented community"* bearing an ethical and environmental culture that realizes both its economic and political relationships and its educational interventions in a framework of socialization and globalization of disabled people's integration and of an active citizenship guarantee.

2. Disability and social governance: Which development community?

The foreword aims to stress that, in dealing with the complex topic of inclusion, identifying it with the process through which a disabled individual begins their journey to acquire personal and social maturity, it is not possible to avoid wondering– in today's modernity scenario–in which terms it is in fact possible to think of a "social governance" able to create reliable environments and contexts capable of sustaining disabled people's promotion.

Such a promotion, not only has strong ethical implications, as mentioned by papal encyclicals on several occasions, but also strong socio-political ones not acting on behalf of economic growth (i.e. acknowledgment of the disabled's pseudo-need) but, rather, of all citizens' rights to and quality of life, enhancing disabled people's role and considering them as the originators and not the addressees of the intervention.

The reason for that is a real involvement of the disabled within the educational policies oriented to them in order to detect emerging needs and design together, in acknowledgment of their wealth, strength, capacity, and active resources. The aim is to turn the disabled individual into an active subject, a self-determined being able to benefit from those inalienable rights which grant him to be considered a real person rather than a fictitious one. It is well known that a man becomes a social actor when, through his choices, he opts for a free way of being to maximize his happiness and fulfill himself as best as he can. The reference to Martha Nussbaum's capability approach is no coincidence here since it represents personal resources as a whole and the opportunity to use them in practice. Capabilities are therefore human capacities, that is what people are able to do and be, from the standpoint of an intuitive idea of a life that is mirrored to the dignity of a human being (Nussbaum, 2002). Developing the skills of a disabled student means, for example, giving value to his '*beings', 'doings',* and '*becomings'* and to the expansion process of growth opportunities (Sen, 2009).

But rights, alas, come at a cost, and in the financial act, there are many spending cuts in health care, education, and in social areas. Therefore, if on the one hand–as Maino (2017, p. 21) argues–there is a share of the population with a considerable level of income and wealth, on the other, there is an often-dramatic shortage of essential services. The

reference is to those services that are better detailed in the active citizenship pact, which is greatly supported by the policies of the European Union, which, since the year 2003 (the European Year of People with Disabilities), has been seeking to raise citizens' awareness of issues related to non-discrimination and inclusion of people with disabilities.

Therefore, one wonders about the guidelines of a policy focused on meeting the individuals' and their families' demands, not just to manage daily life or to have financial support but to acquire a well-being that deals not just with the quality of life, but also represents a stimulus to recover every particle of potential, capacity, and possibility of improvement, i.e. the overall project of individual life.

Social solidarity, environmental compatibility, and an integrated territorial approach seem effective in meeting the demand for sustainable development as a procedural methodological paradigm, covering integration practices and having as its primary objective the achievement of a better quality of life (Laeken Declaration on the Future of European Union, 2001). Therefore, the above-mentioned development is not only embodied in the creation of services in several territorial areas but also in real stimulation and in the development of projects aimed at ensuring that everyone, including disabled people, is able to live in the environment, the city and the territory (Law 328/2000, Art. 9 - Accessibility).

So what does it mean to talk about sustainable development for disability? Which among the several meanings is better to emphasize? Beyond doubt, in our opinion, it is advisable to head for an educational dimension of sustainability (Malavasi & Vischi, 2023), where, as also stressed by Del Gobbo (2017, p. 273), educational intervention becomes a prerequisite for sustainable community development, which "*requires a holistic approach to problems and encourages the use of reflection and systems thinking*" and not just a cultural paradigm shift. All this is within a general framework that focuses on building social skills, creating new competences, and facilitating participatory and mediation processes. Sustainability, in its various environmental, social, economic, and cultural components, is oriented toward enabling structural change at a global level.

The UN document *Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, through its 17 sustainable Development Goals, calls for a political and educational commitment, i.e. to revive the theme of sustainability. Both the Declaration and the wording of Goal 4, *Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*, highlight the crucial role of education for sustainable development and lifestyles, a role which is widely recognized for identifying, implementing, and monitoring plans, strategies, and actions aimed at promoting cultural changes toward an increasingly equitable, inclusive and sympathetic society. The whole topic is constantly referred to as a kind of environmental education, in which sustainability–previously invoked by 2021 domestic agendas first and then by the 2030 Agenda–promotes a series is so much mentioned in the 21 local agendas first and then in Agenda 2030, it carries out a diversified series of proactive policies which design an environment providing services to people, a new well-being system, the upgrading of

cities, sustainable and accessible tourism, as well as the territory ability to open up to all people, including those with special needs.

3. Toward an education to the global and integrated development of disabled people as a well-being research: a well-being community

Further to what has been mentioned before, it emerges that sustainable development is, to us, one of the paths to follow to set up an "education to global and integrated development' of people with disabilities. Thinking of the environment from a geographical point of view will certainly not help people express their human potential: it is in fact necessary to adopt a human, social, cultural, and interpersonal standpoint.

This is why such a development, which is an important test of interinstitutional work, requires continuous monitoring of the ever-changing needs. Monitoring that, following the slogan "first see, then act" offers guiding ideas that can support the creation of a non-rejectionist society that becomes a "place of acceptance" and of the world. A place where the services arranged for people are not containers but networks with a strong educational value, able to help change the disabled's lifestyle while doing their best to fulfill the other's needs.

It's worthwhile highlighting that such a change goes beyond an inclusive perspective and aims at rationalizing everyday life instead. It is not a matter of living a life in a continual journey to the several treatment centers in order to fulfill primary needs, but rather of the usefulness to set up contexts going beyond health interventions and aiming at the organization of a living environment: they should deal not only with the removal of architectural barriers, but also with the arrangement of recreational, cultural, and sports activities as well as leisure, holidays, tourism, etc.

And so, if sustainable development goes hand in hand with the underlying philosophy of the new approach to disability, its articulation cannot help focusing on the above-sketched ideas. They, in fact, represent the setting within which global development will make sense while considering the development of disabled people toward the achievement of autonomy, participation, and education. An education that is both global and in-progress, requiring not a resource leakage, but, rather, a procedural, planning, and integrated acting and behavior, so that the subject, moving from one educational environment to another, does not find himself with missing pieces of his own story history (Murdaca, 2022).

It would be desirable – and by now understood – for all scholars of educational issues to focus on the thinkability of a 'smart educational environment. One which, being the living place of the subject, as well as of interrelated human groups, will have to take on features qualifying it as a 'source of life', as a place of happiness, as an ideal habitat guiding the growth and development of each one.

An environment set up on seeing-listening-feeling/hearing-doing, which is interwoven and adapted according to the hologram of needs, to individual necessities changing based on the different kinds of disability, of the various levels of improvement

and of multidimensional personological domains. And it is the case to highlight once again that the environment here referred to not only is pregnant with geographical, anthropological, sociological, and further meanings but above with educational ones. It is a place that reminds of Lewy, one which assures of an integrated educational system (fostered by the idea of a lifelong education so much supported by Fabbroni 1998, p.67) and which is nowadays called to venture another difficult, and apparently impossible, feat, that is to make humanity and society see reason, since they seem to be moving along divergent paths.

An environment designing educational paths for the disabled's development, establishing networks of (not only) educational alliances aimed at their co-evolution of the people who, in order to grow, is in need of doing, learning to know, being aware of danger and opportunities, learning a competence to relate to the outside world. In fact, as G. and M. Brunetti (2001) argue "*Man is not just a set of neurons, neural circuits and nervous functions, but also an expression of mental and emotional States, which are at the basis of individual life and can undergo continuous modification even as a result of solicitation from external events influencing and guiding biological and mental life.*"

In this situation, the approach to Action Research shows indeed its strength within the planning of a reliable context if the aim is to really modify it. Such a change occurs inside a disabled person, who, to reach his becoming, will have to learn to move within a space to rearrange himself at both a cognitive and an emotional-affective-relational level.

It is a change that is useful to the disabled, who are immersed in a new experiential-contextual way and are led to modify their own schemes and to think of new operational possibilities to face the many inputs/tasks, imposed by the new situation: from practical-operational to cognitive and emotional-affective-social tasks, from general experiential knowledge to changing situational knowledge, as a practical activity in skills to achieve the related competences.

3. The various meanings of sustainable development

Therefore, to discuss the meaning of sustainable development for disability is to take action to achieve a proper alignment between the environment and the subject. As Stohorow and Akwood (1979) would say, the child develops a sense of reality through a validating tuning, which comes from the environment, the best place and space to build his subjectivity.

In this perspective, the sustainability here referred to becomes a sort of political-educational strategy, which, aiming at improving the quality of life of the disabled person, heads to homogenize the various systems, subsystems, or contexts of life of the individual, not only to simply ensure accessibility, formerly achieved through the removal of architectural barriers but also in view of qualitative planning of the territory.

Such a project is oriented toward a wider social responsibility, structured on a sort of ethical pact, able to promote new opportunities for disabled people, and their families and to increase intervention integration.

Therefore, to design 'a socially responsible territory' means to be able to identify the inhabiting "community" as well as its values, to define the "*degree of individuals' belonging to the community itself, analyzing, at both a local and an extraterritorial level, the processes contributing to its founding, in reference to participation, to a common identity, to the sharing of a sustainable development project.*" Ultimately, in order to be applied to disability, a sustainable approach requires a real and profound change in the practice and in the behaviors of all social actors involved in the integration process.

The aim is to maximize disabled people's well-being in a framework of sustainable interventions, putting the real needs of disabled people at the heart of all social processes. Specifically, the sustainability here referred to is precisely the one relating to human capital development and to the services provided for disabled people, services which, at present, are showing great critical issues in some areas of our country.

From the standpoint of field research, these problematic aspects are linked to the persistence of resource leakage, to a disconnection among the various agencies in charge, to the little attention paid to disabled people's existential becoming, since people with disabilities are not considered their ability to establish meaningful relationships in a unique living space of their own. It is worth pointing out that in such a space they should be welcomed with their own differences, which are other than not being in line with the canons of built normality culturally built on the criteria of functionality, efficiency, etc.

In a dynamic perspective of sustainability, stemming from the research of community psychology and systemic approach, "*what matters is not only individual rights*" as Donati argues, since they "*end up categorizing needs and stigmatizing people as much as the promotion of common goods under conceived stood as relational goods*" (Donati, 1995, p. 463). Such goods will allow a wide range of transitions between the individual and the context and they will highlight the person's changes in the very context.

A person, which in our case is disabled, one who, in order to satisfy his needs, has to carry out various operational actions not of a reparative but rather of a proactive and constructive kind, so that, within a context of actions, he himself can experience new personal ways of interactions, which are nothing but transactions from his system of pre-knowledge to the experience he is facing, an experience filtered by that pre-knowledge which he can disassemble and reconsider. And it is well known that when the subject becomes aware of the world through perceptions, he constructs a complex operational module taking into account personal and shared representational dynamics, self-realization, as well as social relational dynamics, and intellectual-cognitive abilities.

Arguing about what has been stated so far, it would be possible to theorize an ontological model of the mind, able to explain the integration between man and the environment according to a conscientization (according to the latest neuroscience research) of the subject, since it is certain that, from the beginning of extrauterine life, the brain and its biological and psycho-mental functions undergo continuous changes, which

are the result of brain plasticity reflection in trans-action with the outside world. Such transactions are determined first by simple motor actions and then by a consciousness of actions, acts, and meanings (mirror neuron theory). Of that *consciousness*, which primarily is:

- *concrete consciousness,* which is based on perception elements and has instinctive and automatic features which are closely related to the incoming input;
- *emotional consciousness,* which is no longer structured, strictly speaking, through motor acts only but also through, of course, representational elements (i.e., instinct+movements+act+symbol) as much as on the relational meaning of the input, that is, as its reverberation (mirror neuron theory);
- *imaginative consciousness*, which is responsible for a higher function of the relationship of the self with the other, with the world and is oriented as to both space and time;
- *relational consciousness*, which can symbolize the relationship of the self to all the functional possibilities governed by experiences, by logical, analytical, and deductive skills.

Therefore, in Damasius' opinion (2003), on the one hand, consciousness expresses the continuous perception "*of the inner and outer world and, on the other, the relationship between such perceptions and the concept of the self which is found in the subject's memory. Thus, the foundation of the consciousness is not the result of an evanescent Cartesian res cogitans but of a continuous process of self-referencing based on the information continuity, which every organism keeps within both its own body and of its environment*" (Damasio, 2003, p. 235 ff.).

To highlight the fecundity of what is mentioned above, suffice it to refer also to the bio-educational approach proposed by Fraunfelder (Rivoltella & Sibilio, 2012) and to one of the developmental pedagogies put forward by Contini (2006, p.2 ff.) who, in her latest book, underlines how important it is to decipher the complexity of the subjects whom we work with.

The author states that "*complexity is preferable to a plentiful multiplicity of plans which, if ignored, will return a worn-out individual, open to our stereotypes and prejudices, forced into a simplified script erasing him as a living body and neglecting his personal history, be it either the biological, i.e. neuronal, or the cognitive, cultural, affective one of his contexts*".

Thus, the context turns into a place of mediation for the processing of experiences with a view to the becoming of a disabled person and the progressive construction of his own theory of mind. This is a progressive construction carried out by the disabled individual, who needs time, space, and internalization and appropriation processes (as social constructivism theorists would say) to broaden his relational and sense horizons paving the way to a shared space in which consciousness, thought, perception, representation, imagery, and knowledge positively mediate between the internal and external reality, allowing him to recognize and create objects that set in motion the process of subjectivation.

Therefore, the context is considered as a diachronic and synchronic place (synchronized images, as Damasio would say, that, once joined to the film in the brain,

will result in mental images and in persistence and constancy of both the object and the individual's complex to reach the world of knowledge, which, according to Borgna (2005), is nothing but the way through which "*the objective becomes subjective and how a set of neuroscientifically ascertainable facts (i.e., a subject acting in a context) turns into meanings.*"

To put a pedagogical and didactic interpretation on that means focusing on a new way of approaching the disabled person, thinking of him as an active subject at the heart of individual and social behaviors, as somebody who is not only capable of thinking but of acting too, in the entirety and within the limits of its competences and possibilities, not only cognitive in connection with the social, material and symbolic situations of existence.

4. As a community organisation for a welcoming environment

Organising sustainability for social inclusion, in the light of what has been outlined above, becomes a meeting not only of levels of accessibility, adaptability, visitability, but also of openness towards a new culture of hospitality. As Bollani argues, taking up the interventions within Investment 2.1 of Component 2 of Mission 5 and Investments 1 and 2 of Component 1 of Mission 6 of the PNRR, as far as services are concerned, it is a matter of promoting and encouraging a global transformation that allows them to adapt to the inclusive approach of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, broadening their mandate and rethinking the organisational processes that characterise them. It is an evolution that sees these services change from exclusive and reserved places of reception to places of "accompaniment" and support for life, with a broader mandate that leads them to work on the construction of new living contexts, co-designed with users and institutions. It is therefore a new season for different services.

If sustainability, in the light of the reworking of the theories presented above, becomes, in short, for the disabled, a fundamental category for the expansion of their existential possibilities, then we need to design an environment, a context, a territory which, articulated in a network of practices (consciousness + action), allows the exercise of a series of activities capable of modifying and transforming their way of being in the world. An encounter with the world other than itself, which modulates its action: an action with things, with the body, with forms of doing, such as, for example, the constant exercise of the subject who achieves differentiation (in Lewi's perspective), which, as we know, is an effective means useful for the construction of its subjectivity, very often humiliated, if not unknown. It is an action of the handicapped that is a harbinger of his new abilities, which concern the organisation and construction, step by step, of the world and of his personal, social, and cultural identity while inhabiting the territory. The latter offers a variety of experiences necessary for the acquisition of autonomy of disabled people, where they can rediscover the value of interdependence and solidarity, where doing is not just a playful exercise, but a dialogue with others and a meeting of others to grow together, to acquire that sense of belonging which is the point from which to begin to recompact oneself. This is why the cornerstones of a new integrative socio-educational policy must be conceived in terms of modularity of support, collaborative and

cooperative activities (leisure activities, sports, and theatre projects, guided tourism, etc.) that go beyond the obligatory nature of schooling and focus on the multifactorial nature of experiences that foster curiosity and the search for understanding. The winning strategy is the one that sees in the system of coherence and synergies the key to deciphering the many existential problems and translating them, at the level of education/training, into many relational paths of help.

In this direction, it is necessary to follow the path of a humanising design of the life contexts of disabled people, aimed at the enhancement of their personal resources and, above all, of their personal history. It is a training design that we could define as a programmed change, characterised first of all by systematic observations that allow us to establish for each person a profile on the various cognitive, social, and behavioural domains (ICF-ICF-CY-VODHAS II), which makes it possible to identify the level of mental elaboration, the type of learning, the object relations and the level of quality of socialisation, as well as the recovery and/or structuring of the so-called basic (functional autonomy) and integrative skills, such as:

- relational attitudes (interpersonal and social) with the activation of expressiveness and bodily mobility (walking and orientation);
- resocialisation activities (use of public transport, use of local services, use of money, use of watches, use of telephones);
- activities to support daily living (domestic skills, etc.) and communication (verbal and non-verbal - graphic, pictorial, theatrical, musical, etc.).

This design is holistic-integrative, taking historicity as a guideline (i.e. linking the fundamental moments with the interventions of family members, specialists, animators, etc.), in terms of:

- observation of developmental difficulties, diagnosis, periodic assessment of functional recovery);
- the totality, understood as the total involvement of the person, taking into account emotional reactions, affective experiences, cognitive elaborations, and interpersonal relationships;
- subjective participation, i.e. the activation of individual and personal processes in such a way that the formative process is not imposed from outside but is the result of an intimate activation of the subject, restored in its values of desire, will, participation, and self-identification;
- the activation of the family dynamics, involving the analysis of the behaviour of the parents and of all those who make up the family environment and who must participate in the functional recovery and social reintegration;
- social inclusion and integration as a moment of expansion of existential possibilities.

It is obvious that the definition of the objectives, the choices, the activities, and the evaluation has the purpose of outlining a path that best indicates which resources present in the territory can be useful to the disabled person to achieve his life project, which is also present in the art. 14 of Law 328 of 2000. This is the law that underlines the

characteristics of the territorial policy, which, as is well known, goes beyond the health voucher and instead focuses on the network of services, health, province, and reason, converging towards the basic district. This district is defined by many parties as the "scenario" in which various interventions converge, in which personalised protocols are defined, such as those to be continuously monitored according to the assessment and personal conditions and analysed through a series of methods and operational techniques to draw up a functional diagnosis and a personalised educational plan.

Design therefore becomes a continuous activity of research-action, problem-solving strategies, and interactive and interactive methods. It is a space where different skills meet but with the aim of restoring in the disabled person that sense of belonging and visibility, from which the useful knowledge to deal with any special need then begins.

This is a special need that is also a need for help, not in the sense of medical dependency, but of the action of services that put in place contextual mediators who, in a social biomedical vision, create the conditions for facilitating (or removing obstacles to) personal functioning (from ability to performance) and social participation, precisely through an integration of places and social and health interventions.

If this does not happen, the separation of the educational moment from the social and health moment would only be stupid, scientifically invalidating, and technically losing.

It is a circular, participatory, shared, and orientated design. These are all typologies to be considered as intervention strategies in the territory, as they are at the service of the development, the personal and cultural promotion of the disabled person, and his or her existential stages. For these reasons, it is necessary to set up a territorial partnership in which the different actors decide which objectives, for which person, with which actions, as well as the use of a communication system that is not only the exchange of information, but also sharing, participation, dialogue, and responsibility. In the end, the design becomes a kind of pedagogical direction that alternates moments of information-knowledge with moments of identification of needs, resources, contextual mediators, and usable social spaces where the disabled can realize their being in the world, experiment with new ways of living, methodological strategies of socialisation, participation, and involvement.

This commitment is also aimed at "*seeing*" the change in the subject and in the community because it is in the latter that "*bridges*" are built, in which education acquires "*meaning*" in the direction of independence. In light of the above, what can be the conditions for an authentic society of well-being? From a philosophical and anthropological point of view, the proposal put forward by Ferretti and Pizzi may be interesting, highlighting how "*only a multidisciplinary and intradisciplinary approach*" can support social policies adequate to the pursuit of a state of collective well-being (Pizzi, 2010). In fact, biomedical, psychological, and social disciplines must increasingly work together to formalise "*models of optimal behavioural functioning*" to identify what is positive and healthy, focusing their attention on the resources of the individual to improve his or

her active inclusion in society. Emphasising the importance of prevention over treatment and enhancing its potential through training programmes aimed at health, education, psychological, and social professionals are now increasingly common objectives, but not always easy to achieve.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The author declares no conflicts of interest.

About the Author(s)
Fabio Orecchio, Researcher in Didactics and Special Pedagogy, Pegaso University, Italy. He deals with problems related to disability, social inclusion and the conditions related to the recognition of fragility to define to develop prevention models in the educational field, also with reference to the dimension of legal protection.
ORCID https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3219-6031.

Riferimenti bibliografici

Bollani, M. (2021). Il PNRR e la disabilità: partire dal sistema o partire dai territori? *Vita, 25* (*novembre*), p. 1.

Borgna, P. (2005). *Sociologia del corpo*. Bari: Laterza.

Brunetti, G., & Brunetti, M. (2001). La Mente ed i suoi misteri: la patologia della sofferenza. *Difesa sociale*, 30(3).

Del Gobbo, G. (2017). Azioni educative diffuse per comunità sostenibili: riflessioni introduttive. In M. L. Iavarone, P. Malavasi, P. Orefice, & F. Pinto Minerva (Eds.), *Pedagogia dell'ambiente 2017. Tra sviluppo umano e responsabilità sociale* (pp. 267-282). Lecce-Brescia: Pensa MultiMedia.

Donati, P. (1995). *Teoria relazionale*. Milano: Angeli.

Giacco, D., & Ducci, G. (2017). Scenarios for the future of mental health care: a social perspective. *Lancet Psychiatry*, *4*(3), 257-260.

Gibson, S. (2006). Beyond a 'culture of silence': inclusive education and the liberation of 'voice', Disability & Society. *Disability & Society, 21*(4), 315-329.

Giovanazzi, T. (2021). For a culture of sustainability. Pedagogical reflection, educational professionalism 0-6. *Form@re - Open Journal Per La Formazione in Rete, 21*(2), 160-168. https://doi.org/10.36253/form-11330.

Guarino, C. (2023). *Il ruolo dell'arte e della cultura nella promozione del benessere e della qualità della vita: impegno culturale, capitale sociale e salute*. Milano: Ledizioni.

Hosseini, S. A. H. (2010). Activist knowledge: interrogating the ideational landscape of social movements. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 5*(5), 339–357. https://doi.org/10.18848/1833-1882/CGP/v05i05/59299

Hosseini, S. A. H. (2012). Theorizing social ideations: beyond the divide between humanities and social sciences. *The International Journal of the Humanities, 9*(5), 53–68.

Hosseini, S. A. H. (2023). The well-living paradigm: reimagining quality of life in our turbulent world. *Discover Global Society, 1*(19), 1-22.

Madans, M., & Loeb, H. A (2017). Measuring Disability and Inclusion in relation to the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development. *Disability and the Global South, 4*(1), 1164-1179.

Mortari, L. (2020). *Educazione ecologica.* Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Murdaca, A. M. (2022). Quali coordinate educativo-didattiche per l'insegnante di sostegno nell'ottica di una scuola innovativa? Nuove piste di ricerca educativa per potenziare e valorizzare le complessità esistenziale. *Education Sciences and Society.* Retrieved from https://iris.unikore.it/handle/11387/155045

Murdaca, A. M., Oliva, P., & Curatola, A. M. (2014). La dimensione metodologica: capacitazione, self determination theory e formazione degli adolescenti. Uno studio cross-cultural. L. Binanti (a cura di), *La capacitazione in prospettiva pedagogica.* Brescia-Lecce: Pensa MultiMedia s.r.l.

Nusbaum, M. (2002). *Giustizia sociale e dignità umana*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Rago, S., & Venturi, P. (2012). *Le politiche sociali nell'era della vulnerabilità*. AICCON Short Paper Series, 2

Rivoltella, P. C., & Sibilio, M. (2012). *Traiettorie non lineari nella ricerca, nuovi scenari interdisciplinary*. Lecce: Pensa MultiMedia s.r.l.

Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The Age of Sustainable Development*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. 543 *Journal of the American Planning Association, 81*(3), 241–242

Sen, A. (2008). The Discipline of Economics. *Economica*, 75.

Stolorow, R. D., & Atwood, G. E. (1996). La prospettiva intersoggettiva. *Ricerca Psicoanalitica, 7*(1-2), 55-69.

Vischi, A. (a cura di) (2021). *Im-patto sul territorio. Lavoro, giovani, ecologia integrale*. Lecce-Brescia: Pensa Multimedia.

Wali, A., Alvira, D., Tallman, P. S., Ravikumar, A., & Macedo, M. O. (2017). A new approach to conservation: using community empowerment for sustainable well-being. *Ecology and Society 22*(4), 6. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-09598-220406