Editorial

As stated, "*The purpose of the Journal of Social Inclusion is to create and disseminate a new knowledge and understanding of the complex exclusionary processes that work to distance individuals, families, groups and communities from the societies in which they live, and the ultimate costs of these processes.*"

Exclusionary processes (and barriers) take a variety of forms, many of which have been identified in previous issues of the Journal. However, the papers in this issue raise another pertinent aspect; and that is how the inclusion - exclusion dualism is also represented in the relationship between desire for inclusion or inclusive practices and structural issues that can either facilitate or constrain the desire to be fulfilled.

This aspect is complex and can be depicted within a range of international situations which require vigilant attention. Intentions are consistently focused on the moral commitment and pursuit of better lives for people who have previously experienced exclusion. Sadly though, outcomes of these intense commitments are affected by individual and structural constraints. Good outcomes can also be compromised because their attainment is beyond timelines set by powerful personnel who often work in shorter focussed periods; such as policy makers, funders, politicians, project workers, professionals and researchers. Therefore, the gains from this latter situation, if any, tend to be more instrumental and short term, but having little long term impact on people's lives for social inclusion.

So how can this conundrum of desire and constraint be addressed?

It appears that some particular reflections may assist. For example, to what degree can the changes that are sought be controlled? Are required actions treated as optional or imperative? What are the benefits for the changes to occur; but more importantly, what are the harms, costs and/or negative implications if the changes are restricted, stopped or don't take place at all?

Whilst seemingly disparate in content, the papers in this issue highlight various considerations and impact; and therefore make an important scholarly contribution to our complex understandings of Social Inclusion.

Firstly, through a comprehensive review of literature, Amanda Mabin and Christine Randall identify how client motivation impacts successful rehabilitation outcomes for people with disability returning to work. They describe how, after the onset of work disability, return to work may not be a priority of the rehabilitation process; however as personal goals change, so do levels of motivation to reach them. If motivation increases, so do the chances of good outcomes; if motivation is constrained, success is lessened. Mabin and Randall describe a number of factors that influence people's motivation, e.g. internal motivation, key stakeholders, social supports, external regulation, perceived costs and benefits, hope and individual beliefs surrounding working identity. Importantly, they also discuss how rehabilitation interventions are impacted by systems, regulations and limiting time frames which affect the sustainability of client motivation. As this macro context can be de-motivating, Mabin and Randall therefore propose that more advocacy by professionals is needed to make systems more motivating to ensure better outcomes for persons with disability to return to work.

Line Hille Laursen and Majen Espvall examine the characteristics of two types of social capital among the residents of a marginalised local community in Gellerup, Denmark. Although the neighbourhood has undergone urban renewal in recent years to improve social cohesion and community development, this paper highlights how presumed social capital benefits are impacted. Acknowledging that the lack of studies showing the impact of renewal plans on social capital can be explained by how social capital is conceptualised by different disciplines, Laursen and Espvall sought to understand the level and character of social capital within the community, as affected by internal and external relationships. They subsequently found that the experiences of bridging and bonding social capital varied according to aspects such as age, geographical origin and years lived in Gellerup. An important finding of this research was that opportunities for financial support and job references were limited; and that a 'one size fits all' approach of social capital can hide significant differences. In order to build social capital (and enhance social inclusion), they contend that

certain levels of pre-existing resources are required to address poverty and work opportunities. They conclude that emphasis on the absence of support networks and trusting relationships, as are the concerns within social capital analyses, are not enough within renewal projects. What types of social capital are being built, and the effectiveness of other strategies such as educational aspirations and employment opportunities should be critical considerations of scholars and politicians.

Margaret Ward, Jill Franz and Barbara Adkins report on a study of the voluntary provision of inclusive housing, as encapsulated within the Livable Housing Design initiative. In this paper, 'visitability', a term to ensure accessibility to all housing and to encompass opportunity for participation in community life, is used as a key aspect of inclusive housing practices. As stated, the initiative is an agreement among Australian housing industry and community leaders in 2010 to a national guideline and voluntary strategy to provide minimum access features in all new housing by 2020. Ward, Franz and Adkins explore whether the housing industry will respond voluntarily; and the results of their research indicate that a dependency of the initiative on voluntary action by the building industry is indeed problematic. Whilst this remains so, and a lack of inclusive housing continues uncontested by the wider community, people with disability will continue to experience isolation, exclusion and marginalisation. Furthermore, on a wider scale, this study highlights how treating such basic provision as an 'optional extra' rather than a mandated right, perpetuates both a lack of regard for the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (to which Australia is a signatory) and a moral expectation of an inclusive life for all.

In the final paper of this issue, Beverly Scarvelis, Beth Crisp and Sophie Goldingay discuss the impact of intercountry adoption programs which have brought children from racially and culturally diverse backgrounds to live as Australians. Specifically, they explore the experiences of people who arrived as children between the ages of 4 and 9 years in the 1980s and early 1990s from the Rangsit Children's Home in Thailand; and the role of schools to facilitate inclusion into life in Australia. Their research shows that this was not an unproblematic experience. Scarvalis, Crisp and Goldingay highlight that facilitating social inclusion was often restricted by the incapacity of school communities to respond to the multiple dimensions of social

exclusion that the children experienced. These restrictions resulted in not only decreased educational attainment in youth, but also employment options in adulthood. The authors conclude that for schools to be more effective there needs to be changes to policies and curriculum in order to be responsive to diverse student needs; and to create an inclusive, respectful environment for all students.

This issue concludes with two commentaries.

In the first, Allison Lynch discusses the life story of Alice Jamieson as written in the memoir *Today I'm Alice*. This is a story that describes the impact of the incestuous abuse that Alice experienced and the development of Dissociative Identity Disorder. Lynch asks readers to consider how the solitary lives of people with disability may be the result of sinister causes; but that telling of stories can be deeply beneficial.

Second, Elisha Riggs, Karen Block, Taffie Mhlanga, Christine Rush and Mollie Burley write of a program in Victoria, Australia. The *Latrobe Valley Newly Arrived Driver Education Program*, in partnership with local stakeholder agencies, offers the opportunity for refugee-background community members to attain a driver's licence through theory classes, learning driving skills and undertaking a road test. From an evaluation of the program for which interviews were undertaken with nine program mentees from diverse African backgrounds and two mentors, the authors found that although the program helped some participants to gain a licence, a lack of mentors was highlighted as a major impediment. Options to address this issue are discussed.

Attaining social inclusion requires a deep, complex understanding not only of barriers and challenges, but also addressing (often hidden) structural aspects that silently serve to restrict the opportunity for many to experience better lives. The articles and commentaries in this issue identify what some of these may be and how they could be addressed.

Jayne Clapton PhD
Editor