

Sport for All: Italian Model¹

Angela MAGNANINI, Pau Espinosa TRULL

Università di Roma Foro Italico, ITALY

Email: pauespinosatrull@gmail.com

Abstract

The many fragmentation of the scientific research and the lack of dialogue between the disciplines that compose the Sport Sciences in Italy have weakened the scientific-epistemological sport aim. In this context, is necessary to clarify the meaning of the term “sport for all” because during the last thirty years it has been used with more emphasis suggesting different situations and conceptions.

Does the sport for all really exist or it is just a regulative goal, an utopian ideal? Through this study it is pretended to introduce the actual research state in Italy, clarifying how the sport, educationally founded and made structurally accessible from its basis, could be a cultural vehicle for the inclusion, peace and equality in accordance with the own particularity by being opened and addressed to all.

The research presents the “sport for all” model developed by the research group from the Special Education Laboratory of Rome University “ForoItalico”, which attempts to establish a dialogue between the requests of the Special Education area and the Physical Activity and Sport field since more than fifty years ago, highlighting the theoretical and practical implications.

Keywords: Integrated sport, inclusion, sport model, special education, disability

¹ This article was presented in the 4th ISCS Conference in Ohrid, Macedonia, on 22-26 May, 2015.

Introduction

1. Preliminary considerations: from the Sport Sciences weakness to the Sport for all

Sport has always been object of multidisciplinary researches. Many knowledge (from medicine to sociology, from psychology to history or from pedagogy to neuroscience), in fact, has been focused from each own point of view through its methodological instruments about different arguments linked explicitly or implicitly to the Sport. It often creates a fragmentation of the sport knowledge and a conceptual confusion moving sport away and driving it from the population leading it towards specific techniques. Sport Science has found the same problematic in Italy: dealing with the field studies divisions that is the lack of collaboration between the disciplines because of the “*empiric*” aim of researches (sport first of all is practice). This is the beginning of a subjective and technical approach rather than a scientific one (*doxa* vs. science). The epistemological problem, that always make this sector weak (Refrigeri, 1989) and exploitable (from the tendencies, politics or economy), do not find *dux propria principia* the reason to become a knowledge field scientifically founded and self-governed, that could find its choice in the foundation of the recent Faculty and the Physical and Sportive Science University degree (Legislative Decree n. 178, 8 may 1998). These routes are born as an attempt, passing over the old model of Physical Education Institutes (in force since 1958), to provide a clear identity and dignity to the Physical Education studies establishing them into a University ambit in order to promote an interchange between the scientific research and didactics (Magnanini, 2008, p.126). According to the general Decree the indicated areas, in a research, didactics and training levels, on Physical Education science should be: didactics-education, preventive and adapted physical education, performance and sport and at least management. In fact the confusion has grew because the University reform of 1999, that the Ministerial Decree from the 3 November (n. 509) has changed the whole University courses, provided two Stages of different length; the first one with three years of basic training followed by two years of specialization, creating a restructuration moment removing the didactic-education area and going over a technical and medical knowledge.

The new scientific target at the base of the Sport Science, do not let yet to identify an epistemological particularity, so that, today the sports science, rather than an independent science discipline, or a multidisciplinary science (characterized by multiple different interventions that take part without particular integrations between themselves) or an interdisciplinary science (it means outlined from the interaction of two or more scientific areas facing up the same topic), is going in the direction of a transversal Science (cross-disciplinary) getting able to overcome the traditional discipline limitations intended to join the pedagogy, biology, psychology, sociology, medical, legal and economical science (Ricci, 1991). This approach is from one part rich of potential and from the other part produce many different linguistic concepts on which the scientific community often argued and not finding agreements at least Sport Science (the object to clarify and research) is submitted to the medical Sciences and other technical Sciences (Refrigeri, 1998), moving away from an Universal Sport idea that need the construction of a University culture through which debate in order to share paradigms. Science, in fact, should not depends on the context needs but should move on the common good research direction, through a subjective inquiry with a retraceable approach that could be defensible by the research aims (Popper, 1997).

The multiplicity sport definitions: Olympic sport, social sport, sport for people with disabilities, integrated sport, adapted sport, rehabilitative sport, just to enumerate some

examples, is not only the transversal disciplines approach signal but also the light of the conceptual confusion that the Sport field have. Before the beginning of the research, we asked ourselves some questions: has de sport different meanings depending on who, the context or the culture where it is practiced? Could we work for the creation of a sport for all, available and opened? Or this is an utopic ideal? As Parlebassaid “the sport has emerged only in some societies. It appears in a specific period and only in some countries. Has born in the XX century in the industrial English society: sport is an activity dated and located, it is not a universal activity. Sport is the institutionalized motor form of the white men, adult and civilized” (Parlebas, 1997, p.142 own translation). This is why to make it “universal” is necessary a particular research approach, which knows how to provide useful characteristics, accessibility and active participation, founded on educative and non-professional theories. It means to study, decompose and analyse the sport structure from a new point of view, the Special Education, which beyond the Pedagogy Science that deal with education skills, is able to create educational and integration paths when meet people with disabilities in a theory, methodology an practice level (de Anna, 2014). Special Education at the end of the nineties has asked itself, ever more quickly, by the problem exposed on the initial reflexion and the design of Integrated sports, because has seen in the sport a privileged tool to promote Integration of people with disabilities in the society. Some studies leded by Lucia de Ana that had given an important success are collected in the *Processi formativi e percorsi di inclusione nelle scienze motorie. Ricerca, Teoria e prassi* (Milano, FrancoAngeli, 2009). It is an important book in the field that collect the contribution of a special-education group that daily face up with the Sport Sciences because work teaching and doing research in the University.

The special education knowledge represents a favourable ambit to create a Sport for All model (Magnanini, 2010) because submit the sport to the practice of people with disabilities in an integrate context, it means, where there are people with and without disabilities exchanging in a reciprocity dimension. The exigency is to surpass the limitations and barriers that the medical sciences and technologies forced, retaining to the sport a health-therapeutic role or a professional sport that is close to the sport that choose and select people, dividing them between sports for people with disabilities and others for “normal” people. Is it possible to find out a new Sportive way, the third one, without denaturalize the sport essence and make it become a pastime activity?

The sport for all model which is going to be presented has been articulated and developed since the year 2000 thanks to the constant research work composed of didactic and investigation done within the Special Education of Integrated Sport discipline (the unique discipline in Italy with this name) in Technics and Sport Science degree in the Foro Italico University, Rome. This context represents a specific place where to validate the hypothesis through a concrete and constructive experimentation with sample composed by students that are Sports players. Our model pedagogically founded and guided, follow the objective to allow the born of the “third way” of the sport (special-educational) mentioned before (Magnanini, 2011) in order to meet society needs such as opportunities of sharing, common languages, integration moments where everyone can find himself and through which diversity becomes a constitutive characteristic and not something to hide. To develop this model is necessary to rethink the sport basis, catching the reflexions that emerged on the seventies in Italy leading the Educational System into a common school for all. This is the essential step, to transfer the cultural model of the pedagogical accessibility: from the education field to the Sport one.

2. Researching a conceptual explanation

This exchange of conceptual and operational tools between both fields responds to the flexible nature of physical activities and sports. These, indeed, have a transversal content of intersection that depending on the point of view of the study could be a significant area to create opened and flexible proposals aimed to the person and its welfare, on personal improvement and social benefit terms. It must be clear that Special Education will study and analyse this content through its epistemological paradigm. Physical Education, from which sport and physical activities take part, is indeed a research topic of Special Education that tries to outline an “integration frame” in order to follow the educational aims, the growth and development of personal autonomy and the organization and structuration of movement content as a motor action with educative intentions (Magnanini, 2008b).

The sportive and motor activities should be, according to Moliterni, taken over in their educational values and behaviours and led to “not discriminating but respecting the diversity in ways that allow all ... the widest possible participation with respect to the specific problems and educational needs of each one” (Moliterni, 2013, p. 235 own translation).

This consideration suggests that to create the theoretical and practical outlines of the sports for all, we need to recover the educational model that which should give to the sport, even before its institutionalization, a formative intentionality. The sport education according to Barbieri, is preceded by the modern sport origin (Barbieri, 2004, p. 46). Thomas Arnold leads us to this approach. His thoughts on the sports games practices in England at the end of the seventeenth century, found in them an Educational origin. This practice did not provide a segregated gymnastics, to be held in commands and deployments, but a movement aimed at team sport. The English sport education had educational purposes, to consent young people through the rules learning the communal living.

The English model understood sport “as a game, race and learning and respecting the rules ... always played in a social context in which participation is constantly active and responsible, because sport is group activity” (Cambi, 2003, p. 60).

Then was Pierre de Coubertin who wanted to express in this training model a universal and institutional relief that he postulated “tous les sports pour tous” could find international legitimacy and an application model. The Olympic Games in Athens in 1896 had this objective: the competition in a worldwide context that should produce effects of goodwill and respect.

The institutionalization ends, however, drive sport in a “rigid” official regulations, in its segregated contexts, losing the openness and flexibility with which it was born also to get away from a model of motor activity standardized and caged (and Swedish and Germany gymnastics) that imprisoned the body in default schemes.

The game which exists with the sport wanted to leave space for creativity to the “if I could” that is the most beautiful metaphor of education and sports. Sport, in fact, expresses an “artificial” model and a cultural product, with rules, space and time, roles, that when finished allows the person to get back to the reality with greater self-cognition, because in that context it is challenged, when in relation with others, knowing its real potential.

Sport should find this frame of sense not to be dissociated from the humanity and its community because of speaking different languages, due to the expression of its original

provenance its finding moments of sharing where the common language is enriched with all the characteristics of the human being.

The game historically invented sport (Del Nista, Parker, Dowels, 2007) through the codification of specific rules, accepted by those who practice it and acquiring institutional elements (time, space, mode, objects, participants). But just because the game is its medium it must not lose the purpose of entertainment, leisure or the pleasure of competing with others in a motor activity, which recall the meaning of the game itself and the etymological origin of sport term. In fact, it comes from the Latin word *deportare*, it is getting out the door for fun and also from the Provençal word *deportar* which means to practise physical exercises as entertainment. The word sport appears in the Sixteenth Century in the English language, and then spread widely in different International contexts. For all the above we think that, before reading the Sport phenomenon through the Special Education lens, we should retake three definitions of sport in order to work on development the sport model for all that we will present in these pages.

The first definition is from Physical Education intellectuals in the Glossary of Physical Education, published in Rome in 1999, where we read: "the term used to indicate those gymnastics and game activities, of exercise, practiced for fun or for professional aims that has a purpose competitive comparison purpose and requires a more or less intense physical effort (Gori, Tanga, 1999, p. 113). The second definition is given by a scholar of Education Science in the *Le parole dell'educazione* vocabulary (Genovesi, 1998) in which sport is defined as "set of individual, group or team physical exercises that requires initiative capacity and a sort of efforts of motor and muscular skills led for recreational or professional reasons and animated by a competition and competitive spirit."

The third is from Parlebas in his classic *Giochi e sports* (trad.it, 1997) where suggests to start from a wild and opened definition, indicating the sport as "a coded motor situation, called game or sport from social classes. Sport games are defined by the system of rules which determine the internal logic." (Parlebas, 1997, p. 110).

This definition open to the field to further analysis and to the possibility consideration on: institutional sport games or sport legitimized by the society and traditional sport games, ruled by the institutions. The first are officially recognized by Committees and Foundations and depends on the specific regulations that are respected and deeply connected to the socio-economic processes. The second one, however, is linked to tradition with a changing body of rules that allows changes decided from time to time. They do not depend on official authorities and are ignored by the socio-economic processes.

These definitions allow the determination of transversal characteristics to the concept of sport:

1. Game.
2. Fun.
3. Comparison-competition.
4. Rules-coding.
5. Competitive spirit.
6. Professionalization.

These characteristics make it an interesting cultural product, with a double meaning. Sport practiced by professionals and Sport practiced amateur, which recovers the primordial purpose of fun and entertainment. Both variations have as a basic element competition and confrontation with others and with each self, element that in education becomes vital to enable young people to grow.

Non professional sport, where the exercises are taken to the extreme but it remains in an amateur sphere, is the sport for all. It is the sport where everyone can find the opportunity to have fun, grow, be together, respecting the sport rules, recuperating the codification, the statutes and that sense of ritual closely linked to sport as a "moment of separation from real life, where you play for nothing." The game has no other purpose than itself. This makes the sport not dependent on external finalities because within its space it only applies its logic (Mantegazza, 1999, p. 18). It is eminently educative.

3. The sport game and the Special Education: design for all

In Italy the movement towards the Sport for All was born in the Institutional commitment of CONI (Italian Olympic Committee), and also did the sport promotion organizations such as UISP (Italian Union of Sport for All) and CSI (Italian Sports Center) at the same time in local associations movement that on the decade of the sixties through practical proposals and popular publications claimed the right for everyone to practice sport, in an educative and formative sense. This movement fits well in an international context that in the sixties promulgated a series of measures, of papers and charters that tend to clarify how Sport should be understood as everyone's heritage, through which no one should be excluded. Is it clear that the principle adopted by the *European Charter of Sport* (Rhodes, 1992) in which sport is defined as "all forms of physical activity which, through casual or organised participation, aim at expressing or improving physical fitness and mental well-being, forming social relationships or obtaining results in competition at all levels" (Article 2). It should be for all with "no discrimination on the grounds of sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status, shall be permitted in the access to Sport facilities or Sport activities". The commitment is to take measures to ensure that all citizens have the possibility of practicing sport, even additional measures in order to allow "young gifted people, as well as disadvantaged or disabled individuals or groups to be able to exercise such opportunities effectively" (Article 4).

Even the Lisbon Conference in 1995 (Conference of European Ministers responsible for Sport) moved in the same direction, demanding equal opportunities and not a professional dimension, finding the best balance between training and competing to combine values, fun, staying together and building together. The Conference contains some key elements of the International policies designed to create the Sport for all movement that do not desegregate and rewards only capable people. These elements are: valuing the skills of all, consideration of the person, the sport objective led on welfare and not on competition aims, accessibility to the Sport structures and the School in the centre of the Sport culture spreading. The Nice Declaration (2000) confirmed the same ideas insisting on the necessity to guarantee the right to the sport for people with disabilities and that it may overcome the barriers of therapy or professionalism (institutionalized sport for people with disabilities such as Paralympics) getting in common Sport such as the Sport for all. In recent years, many other documents

within the European Year of Education through Sport (2004) have been in favour of the diffusion of a Sport for all, which has to bring together the different forms of Sport to ensure the health, education, recreation, relationship with the context, solidarity and socialization. It means to decouple Sport for all from the purposes of the high Sport level selections in order to consider it as a set of practices differentiated and qualified for different age groups, where no one could be excluded for physical, mental or economic conditions. These notions are exposed in the *White Paper of Sport* (European Commission, 2007) which encourage the use of Sport for social inclusion and equal opportunities, always taking into account the specific needs of each one. We also find other important papers to mention: the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities approved by the United Nations (UN) in the General Assembly on 13 December 2006 in New York, which entered into force on 8 May 2008, with the ratification of the Italian Government on March 3, 2009 (Law n. 18). In fact on the 30 article entitled the "Participation in cultural life, recreation, leisure and sport" urges the States to take appropriate measures in order to allow people with disabilities to participate in recreational and leisure Sport, enabling them to develop and implement their own "creative, artistic and intellectual potential, not only for their own benefit but also for the enrichment of society". In the five paragraphs that conform the article number 5 we can see that it is necessary to "ensure that people with disabilities have the opportunity to organize, develop and participate in sports and specific recreational activities for people with disabilities and, to this end, encourage the provision on an equal basis with others of appropriate instruction, training and resources" (paragraph b); "to ensure that persons with disabilities have access to places that sporting, recreational and tourism" (paragraph c); "to ensure that children with disabilities can participate on an equal basis with other children to play activities, recreational, leisure and sporting activities, including those activities in the school system" (paragraph d); "to ensure that persons with disabilities have access to services from those involved in the organization of recreational, tourism, leisure and sporting activities" (paragraph e).

The most important part in this article is, however, the paragraph "a" that aims to "encourage and promote the participation, the most extent possible, of persons with disabilities in mainstream sport activities at all levels", introducing as an essential element the principle of equality, opportunities, resources, tools and accessibility. From here the general sense of the Convention and the Sport for all right, focused on the diversity of all individuals and on the equality opportunities, is the construction of a world where the disability becomes an authentic expression of human diversity and where social, political and administrative protection could be considered the expression of a right that belongs to all.

Inside this hermeneutic background framework, it is pretended to develop a new cultural scenarios where emerge even more strongly the right to practice Sport, but practicing it not in separated places, different times and especially not in "exclusives" moments. It is not a segregated Sport but a Sport that everyone can choose deliberately to practice, after having experienced, felt and found it suitable to everyone's needs and characteristics. This change should be traced in the expression *ordinary sport activities* where *as ordinary is intended*: usual, customary, played together, participated, common. The new frontier of Sport for all are common experiences, environments, games and activities where common does not mean simplification or reduction of Sports offer and neither means to force everyone to practise the same activity at the same time. In our point of view *common* means participation, building inclusive spaces where the diversity is respected, welcomed, valued and not separated, catalogued or discriminated. From here, the deeper sense of the UN

Convention that observes the growth of the whole person characteristics, self and social fulfilment, with the growth of the whole community where persons with disabilities must be able to give their own significant contribution. This is why Sport should be ordinary, according to the principle of mainstreaming that indicates the implementation of an Inclusive education in an International ambit; it means bringing what is marginal into the mainstreaming (Bodini, Capellini, Magnanini, 2010, p 15). The idea is to abandon the segregation logic and walk into a mainstreaming one, which means ordinary ways of life. This is a conceptual and cultural change able to destroy current fundamentals in order to construct an Inclusive world, where everyone can afford to be itself with the same opportunities and possibilities.

4. Sport for all: Italian model

The recognition of the Sport for all right is established at least in a theoretical ambit. The International Olympic Committee is moving in this direction and towards the principles of non-discrimination. The social values of sport were highlighted during the Fifteenth World Conference on Sport for all, held in Lima in April 2013. But in practice, does the sport for all really exist in terms of opportunity? Or, is it only possible to choose between Sports that segregate with the categories?

Disability, in our opinion, challenges Sport fundamentals enquiring about its founding categories, interrupting the widespread perception that linked sport with health conditions and not with the diseases by which has always been confused disability.

People with disabilities historically pursued some special Sport paths (Magnanini, 2010):

1. The use of Sport as therapy or as a way for mental and physical recovery and rehabilitation. Should be consider the work of doctors Ludwig Guttman in Europe (at the Stoke Mandeville Hospital in the forties) and Antonio Maglio in Italy (at the Center Villa Marina di Ostia) through which born the Paralympics.
2. Adapted Sports (Drabeni, Eid, 2008) and institutionalized for people with disabilities (the list of official sports of the International Paralympic Committee show that Adapted Sports were born from existent ones in order to make them practicable for persons with different types of disabilities, measured according to the medical diagnosis that establish the categories and the competition list (Bertini, 2005).
3. Sport activities organized for particular types of disabilities, for example the Torball that was born as a Sport for blind people.

Our Sport for all idea (or integrated) opens another possibility originated by the assumption that Sport for all must be practiced simultaneously by people with and without disabilities.

If a disabled person with an amputation wants to play volleyball can practice sitting volleyball, but what happens if that person does not want to play sitting volleyball but to play with people without disabilities? What kind of sport should be practiced?

The answer is given by Special Education and the model of Education for all and integration, which has been developed in Italy in the seventies decade, when the Italian school chose to open common classes to people with disabilities. Special Education has experimented the paradigms of accessibility in teaching materials and strategies rethinking the subjects content in order to lead students to recognize themselves.

Italian laws has moved in this direction through the laws n. 118 of 1971 and n. 517 of 1977, until developing a framework law for *the assistance, social integration and rights of disabled people*, n. 104 of 1992, reiterating the necessity of integration in order to guide and promote opportunities for an independent life of disabled people in all areas during their life time. It showed the society to overcome all forms of marginalization in social exclusion (arts. 6-7), school Integration (arts. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16), teachers training (art. 17), work rights (arts. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22) and the elimination of barriers to practice sports, to travel and practise recreational activities (arts. 23, 24).

The importance given to the School is central because it is called to offer to each student the opportunity to develop the own capacities, allowing them to become an active and participant member in social community, through tools such as the *Dynamic Profile and Functional Individualized Plan of Education* (specific models in the Italian school) that offers concrete moments opening them a *Life Project* path. The same law n. 104 has between its objectives to highlight and promote inclusive cultures, including the elimination of obstacles for the Sport practice because it must be encouraged “without limitations”. All these aspects are confirmed in the *guidelines for the education of students with disabilities* developed by the Education Ministry in 2009.

Integration is, on such theoretical and legislative lines, intended as multidirectional “educational” process with a complex and flexible relationships system. Taking part of this system it is also the social, political and cultural interactions able to involve actively all people, without any kind of distinction, in all periods of life and able to create an open and non-discriminatory society where citizenship becomes protagonist of the process.

The acceptance and integration of people with disabilities in the school has represented a radical change in the school and society. At the same time the school has begun to rethink the traditional teaching-learning process, opening new paths of didactic research: metacognitive didactic, peer tutoring, cooperative learning, task analysis, teaching supports, which not only are aimed to facilitate and assist the learning of persons with disabilities (Cottini, 2004), but also to let people with disabilities to experience learning together, looking for constant contact points between Special and common didactics.

In this direction, Special Education do not call us to stare the “world” of people with disabilities or the “world” of “able-bodied” people, but to look both of them as the unique existent “world”, taking the real sense of the integration term where the system only works with the contribution of all, with an active and participatory contribution (Gelati, 2004).

In this context it is relevant the concept of accessibility, which concerns not only the elimination of architectural barriers and physical obstacles, but also becomes the main element of a *design for all* model that can interrogate the elements that we cannot use because they were not thought for us (Mura, 2011). This model needs to rethink and restructure an inclusive formation that only education can get.

Leading Sport in common pathways on the respect for the differences means restructuring Sport from the beginning and think of it as it is possible, opened and practiced by everyone, with adaptations and modifications based on the real capacities of people involved, regardless of their disability status and focusing the attention on the “proximal development”, theorized by Vigotsky. We must start from people and not from an existent activity adapting it to a specific disability. This operation requires a careful analysis of the needs of people involved

and the creation of new regulations that should not lead to any medical classifications, but also the capabilities and skills of people, detectable through motor tests on the field.

To create this model we should use the constituent concepts of Special Education: the person, accessibility, integration, active participation, equal opportunities, together with the teaching models that we referred to before, integrating them with Sport constituent concepts, which we mentioned above, to develop an innovative proposal.

In this direction, creating a model of sport for all does not want to claim a right but call to represent theoretical, technical and operational point of reference to create a solid source of activities, widespread, recognizable and usable to create future proposals (specific Sport activities) accessible to everyone, and from which everyone can choose to participate.

The practical experimentation in our University courses of Special Education of Integrated Sport chair allows us to develop, divided into two successive phases closely correlated, this model constituted by a set of propaedeutic and preparatory activities, which become a significant element. This model could be used in any context, with people of different ages and health levels.

The foundational Educational concepts are:

1. Knowledge and embrace (to play and be together people must know each other, building relationships to understand who is facing you. This step is necessary to propose the following activities, which are specially designed for that group of people, with those specific features).

The first element to be transferred from the Pedagogy to Sport field is the establishment of significant relationships. Knowing, understanding, reading and listening to the needs of the fellow is an essential role of a conscious behaviour aimed to build an effective relationship, which should be turned into a support and then into accompanying relationship towards the possible autonomy. The real educational relationship is an intentional and strategic transfer of tools that are suitable to change people and urge them to "perform" by themselves; on the contrary, a relationship that does not generate autonomy cannot be called educational. It does not mean unhelping equals, but through strategies, even meta-cognitive, to incite them to take possession of the elements that are significant in order to be able to act intentionally and unleash the own creative potential.

2. Confidence (confidence is needed, with activities that are capable to create confidence).

The development of confidence is closely linked to the construction of relationships. It is an essential element to create the conditions of people to get involved with others.

Activities focused on the development of self-confidence and integrated into a specific planning, lead people – both with and without disabilities – to determined and resolute in providing objectives, rules and deadlines.

3. Cooperation (we need to cooperate, activities that consolidate the relations and the spirit of cooperation and positive interdependence). In this direction, the work by Johnson and Johnson on the cooperative management of a class is actually resumed. Elisabeth Cohen invites everyone to think with her work on the fact that people learn many more ideas and concepts by talking, meeting and discussing rather than with a traditional teacher-led lecture (Cohen, 1999, p. 26).

Once someone has been assigned a goal, the student must get used to promoting cohesion through mutual knowledge, development of group identity, promotion of mutual support and enhancement of differences. These elements work if you have reached the other stages.

The function of Round-robin becomes crucial when it comes to ensuring that a role is assigned and shared in rotation. Everyone should be guaranteed with full participation and the creation of a context of mutual interdependence (Cacciamani, 2008).

This moment is important because on it lays the foundation of co-planning (Mercadante, 2007), which will underlie the creation of an inclusive motor and sports activity, along with the maturation of a sense of individual and group responsibility.

The next step involves putting together all the elements previously used in order to play together. Students invent an activity designed for all, according to the characteristics of the people involved.

4. Playing together (motor and Sports activities suited for the group, designed on the basis of equal opportunities and equality and active participation).

5. Reflection. At the end of the activities, it is useful to highlight how do you feel and what can be improved with everyone's contribution.

Each of these phases is accompanied, in the beginning, with teacher example (modelling) who invites the students to think about the elements and to make practical proposals, able to build through those keywords a lesson that is accessible, inclusive, suitable for everyone and participatory.

The point number 4 is the concept of sport for all, available just in case of taking into account all other elements. The sport will be established on the following features:

1. The centrality of the person.
2. Specific roles related to the capability.
3. Regulations with possible exceptions and with some flexibility.
4. Spaces encoded.
5. Competitive spirit.
6. Competition.
7. Fun
8. Adjustments if necessary in the tools and materials, but not in the goals.
9. Active practice.

Sport for all (a result of the relationship between Sport and pedagogic studies) is identified with a set of gymnastic activities, games, exercises of movement held together by people with and without disabilities (with different deficit). These activities are done by men and women, marked by competitive spirit and not, where everyone sees enhanced their potential, based on equal opportunities and active participation, through flexible regulations that respect the nature of people.

The activity trainings were held together in the same space and at the same time, with the help of fellows if necessary, with moments of individual training for each respective role if practising team Sport, or improving their skills in individual Sport.

The aim is to stimulate through Sport activities the cooperation, building a mentality in which everyone take each own values and weaknesses as unique and individual, creating the bases for this way of thought, in all areas of life.



Figure 1. Phases to build Integrated Sport activities.

5. A specific example: Baskin

A brilliant example of a sport for all where we can find all the elements is Baskin (Integrated Basketball) (Bodini, Capellini, Magnanini, 2010), created in Italy in 2003 and which is played on regular basketball courts. This sport is practised by persons with disabilities (of different classes), people without disabilities, men and women who compete to win, under the eyes of a prepared referee through a flexible regulation that allows concessions, if are declared at the beginning of the match. This element wants to meet the multifaceted human situations in which, despite its deficit, wants to play together with all people.

The winner is, obviously, the team that makes more points in four basketball hoops of the game court placed in the traditional areas and in the midfield areas. The only requirement to play is to have the basketball shot ability even with just one arm. The continuous work of regulation and classification conducted during some years shows the opening of sport for all way, the attention focused in the person and the answer to those pedagogical principles mentioned earlier.

Baskin restructures the Sport and is based on the principles of pedagogical trust, acceptance, cooperation, reflection, which form the open activities in each practice. It is a new sport that invents rules, systems of roles attributions knowing how to use adaptations and arrangements

on an inclusive level, according to the criteria of accessibility, full participation and competitive spirit.

The regulation consists on 10 rules and it is entirely available on the www.baskin.it website. Specifically, the game is composed by 6 players per team that compete during 4 periods of 6 minutes each, with a minibasket ball which can be replaced according to the disability with a ball of different sizes.

Each player assume a role that goes from 1 to 5 points according to the characteristics listed below, with the purpose of allowing the most equitable and fair competition possible providing everyone with the opportunity to participate as leaders. The total points team amount could not exceed the value of 23 (principle of equal opportunities and balance in the game). Roles are assigned based on the possession of large abilities: the use of hands, walking, running or the balance. This is a fundamental aspect because we start from a positive consideration of the person and skills and does not marginalize or exclude people from low level that would not find place in official sport games

Conclusion

Baskin, which Magnanini has contributed significantly in the theoretical and methodological implementation, as an illustration of sport for all representative for the model that we presented is just one example of the possibilities of codification on a Sport for everyone according to the educational criteria and in agreement with the Sport Science requirements to be defined as such. Is not, then, as a healthcare or therapeutic Sport, but a sport to the full effects, which can be chosen and practiced by all. We believe that this is the deepest meaning of sport without losing the competitive spirit, the will to win, that is able to create an integration model already structured as an integrated moment.

Integration, then, it is not just an external aim but also an educational internal principle. This eligible Sport speaks a universal language together with that respects everyone, not only in their apparent diversity but also because it constrict to reflect about each self and the live path together with others. The use of the presented model can lead into the birth of other sports, which will become a sign of a culture and a society that can change, thanks to sport.

Note: Both authors developed the text jointly, specifically: paragraphs 1 ,3 , 4 are written by Angela Magnanini;2, 5 by Pau Espinosa Trull. Translated by Angel Espinosa.

REFERENCES

- Bertini, L. (2005). *Attività sportive adattate*, Perugia: Calzetti Mariucci.
- Bodini, A., Cappellini F., Magnanini A. (2010). *Baskin... uno sport per tutti*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Cacciamani, S. (2008). *Imparare cooperando. Dal cooperative learning alla comunità di ricerca*. Roma: Carocci.
- Cambi, F. (2003). *Una pedagogia sportiva per la società di massa*, in R. Frasca, P. de Coubertin, P.(2003). *Memorie olimpiche*. Milano, Mondadori.

- Cohen, E. G. (1999). *Organizzare i gruppi cooperativi. Ruoli, funzioni, attività*. Trento: Erickson.
- Cottini, L. (2004). *Didattica speciale e integrazione scolastica*. Roma: Carocci.
- De Anna, L. (2009). *Processi formativi e percorsi di inclusione nelle scienze motorie. Ricerca, Teoria e prassi* Milano, FrancoAngeli.
- De Anna, L. (2014). *Pedagogia speciale. Integrazione e inclusione*. Roma: Carocci.
- Del Nista, P.L., Parker J., Tasselli A. (2007). *Perfetto Equilibrio. Pensiero e azione per un corpo intelligente*, Firenze: D'anna.
- Drabeni M., Eid, L. (2008). *L'attività fisica adattata per i disabili. Prospettive della realtà italiana ed europea*. Milano: Libreria dello sport.
- Gelati, M. (2004). *Pedagogia speciale e Integrazione*. Roma: Carocci.
- Genovesi, G. (1998). *Le parole dell'educazione. Guida lessicale al discorso educativo*. Ferrara: Corso.
- Gori, M., Tanga, M. (1999). *Glossario di educazione fisica*, Roma: Società Stampa sportiva.
- Legge-Quadro (1992). *Per l'assistenza, l'integrazione sociale e i diritti delle persone handicappate*, pubblicata in Gazzetta Ufficiale, febbraio n. 39.
- Magnanini, A. (2008). *Educazione fisica e Università: dall'Isef alle Facoltà di scienze motorie*, in G. Genovesi, *Educazione e Politica in Italia (1945-2008)*. Università e ricerca educativa. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Magnanini, A. (2008b). *Educazione e movimento*. Pisa: del Cerro.
- Magnanini, A. (2001). *Una terza via per lo sport. Lo sport integrato*, in "Ricerche Pedagogiche", n. 180/2011.
- Magnanini, A. (2010). *Sport integrato: sfida dell'educazione o scelta ideologica?* In P. Russo, P. (2010). *Educazione e Politica in Italia (1945-2008)*. Università e organizzazione della scuola. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Mantegazza, R. (1999). *Con la maglia numero Sette. Le potenzialità educative dello sport nell'adolescenza*. Milano: Unicopli.
- Ministero della Solidarietà Sociale (2008). *La convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone con disabilità*. Roma: Centro Stampa Forti.
- Moliterni, P. (2013). *Didattica e scienze motorie. Tra mediatori e integrazione*. Roma: Armando.
- Mura, A. (a cura di) (2011). *Pedagogia speciale oltre la scuola*. Milano. FrancoAngeli
- Nadori, L. (1984). *Dalla pratica alla scienza*, Sds Coni, 2:2-5.
- Popper, K.R. (1997). *Il gioco della scienza*. Roma: Armando.
- Refrigeri, G. (1989). *Scienza e pedagogia dell'educazione fisica*. Teramo: Giunti&Lisciani.
- Refrigeri, G. (1998). *La laurea in Scienze corporee*, in API, nn.1-2.
- Ricci, G. (1991). *Fondamenti epistemologici per la didattica dell'educazione fisica*. Urbino: Montefeltro.