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Defining And Measuring The Outcomes Of Inclusive Community For People With Disability, Their Families And The Communities With Whom They Engage.

Erin Wilson, Scope

Work Towards Inclusive Communities: A Non Government Organisational context

This paper focuses on the context of a major non government disability service provider. Scope (Vic) is a not-for-profit organisation providing disability services throughout Melbourne and Victoria to more than 4,500 children and adults with physical, intellectual and multiple disabilities. Additionally, Scope works with a range of community agencies to enhance their capacity to offer services and support to people with a disability. Scope (Vic) is one of the largest disability agencies in Victoria, with an annual budget of around $50M, 1300 staff, and over 100 sites around Victoria.

Scope has recently endorsed a new Strategic Plan that articulates a vision and strategic direction around supporting people with disabilities to achieve their potential in welcoming and inclusive communities (Scope, 2005, p. 3). Scope’s strategic plan articulates a broad framing of inclusion that moves beyond an understanding of inclusion as ‘participation’ in a range of community activities and life domains, towards a vision of a reconstituted community that is fundamentally different in the way it understands its membership and the activities, rights and responsibilities of these members. In this way, Scope’s conceptualisation of ‘inclusion’ is consistent with, though moves beyond, the understanding implied in concurrent Victorian State Government policies on disability where ‘access’ and ‘participation’ are synonyms for inclusion.

Given this interest in creating welcoming and inclusive communities, along with people with disability achieving their potential within them, Scope has begun work to develop an outcomes measurement framework to map achievements and change in these arenas. Inevitably, measurement of outcomes is dependent on understandings of inclusion.

In order to appropriately contextualise Scope’s outcomes measurement research, this paper begins with an articulation of the various understandings of inclusion including those emerging within Scope, and those existent in literature and Victorian State Government disability policy.

Broader Definitions of Inclusion

The literature on inclusion is both broad and extensive, and encompasses a number of key framings. ‘Inclusion’ can be understood as a concept in its own right, embracing a range of understandings, or partnered with other concepts, such as ‘social inclusion’ or ‘community inclusion’ to foreground a particular set of concepts and values. Whilst this paper lacks the space to offer a detailed analysis of the literature on inclusion, it is important to summarise the understandings relied upon for this paper. Schleien, Green and Stone (1999) provide a useful distinction of three characteristics of inclusion which provide a fruitful way of distinguishing between definitions in use. They argue that ‘the concept of inclusion may best be viewed as a continuum that includes three levels of acceptance’ (p. 1). They define these levels as: 1) physical integration, being the right to and actuality of physical accessibility; 2) functional inclusion as the ‘ability to function successfully’ in given environments; and 3) social inclusion as social acceptance and participation in positive interactions with others (pp.1-2). Smull and Sanderson (2001) similarly make this distinction for the success of outcomes in person centred approaches. They discuss the continuum of inclusion utilising the notion of an individual ‘being present’ in an event or community, ‘having presence’, and ‘actively participating’ (Smull & Sanderson 2001, p. 139). Such schema draw on and echo critiques of ‘integration’ which contrast physical integration as physical location, or presence, of people with a disability in communities, (particularly via non institutionalised settings), and social integration which involves both the quality of personal relationships as well as ‘sense of’ connectedness to communities of choice (Cummins & Lau 2003). Adding to this schema the literature on person centred approaches within disability services, suggests that, at all times, determining the meanings of any point on such continuums will be highly personalised, contextualised and therefore widely divergent across the disability population.

Whilst the inclusion literature ranges widely beyond these conceptual framings, this set of concepts - that emphasises distinctions between physical presence and a range of wider social and participative outcomes which are highly individual in nature - provides a useful scaffolding for analysing the definitions underpinning existing policy discourses.

Overview of the Policy Context: How Community Inclusion and Outcomes of This Are Understood.

Policy influences practice in at least two ways: it can determine what service models and
initiatives are funded; and, it provides a standards monitoring and compliance framework to which funded services are accountable. This policy context provides a useful data set to analyse prevalent understandings and priorities around inclusion. It also provides a contrasting context to Scope’s understanding of inclusion, as generated through dialogue with people with disabilities and the communities they engage with.

There are two significant policy domains which influence the work of the disability sector in Victoria and the development of outcome measures in this arena: 1) the Commonwealth policy environment, and 2) the State Government policy environment.

At the Commonwealth level, disability services are currently operating within the third Commonwealth State Disability Agreement (CSTDA). This Agreement specifies five national strategic policy directions along with performance monitoring and reporting requirements. The most recent Audit Report of the Auditor General (Commonwealth of Australia 2005) identifies a significant shortfall in regard to measuring outcomes specified in the CSTDA. In particular, it identifies a core objective of the CSTDA in the following way:

> The Commonwealth and States/Territories strive to enhance the quality of life experienced by people with disabilities through assisting them to live as valued and participating members of the community.

(Commonwealth of Australia 2005, p.11)

The Report identifies that as yet ‘no indicators of the quality of life of people with disabilities, their participation in the community, their value in community, or any related parameters’ are included in the performance framework of the CSTDA (Commonwealth of Australia 2005, p. 16). Development in this area is part of Recommendation 1 of the Report. This echoes concerns raised by the Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision in its 2004 report, which identified that no State/Territory had effective measurement indicators or methods to assess quality of life, wellbeing or social participation of people with disability. This discussion utilises the terminology of participation and social value rather than inclusion, but broadly affirms this arena as a key goal of government funding. Additionally, these findings provide a clear Commonwealth policy directive for immediate work in the area of development of measurement indicators and methods to do with quality of life and social participation for people with a disability. Despite this, it is not clear what role the Commonwealth government might have in addressing this omission.

At the Victorian State Government level, the disability policy discourse proposes a view of community inclusion as largely one in which people with a disability have access to and participate in communities of people without a disability. Whilst the goals of the Victorian State Disability Plan 2002-2012 suggest that people with a disability should ‘have the same opportunities as all other citizens’ across social, economic, cultural, political and spiritual life domains (Department of Human Services (DHS) 2002, p.11), this is quickly reinterpreted somewhat more narrowly as access, participation and decision making control.

The Revision of the Victorian Standards for Disability Services (DHS, 2006a) consistently frames community participation and inclusion as occurring in communities in which people with a disability are largely absent at present. Whilst this addresses social justice and equity goals, it simultaneously negates the value of the multiple communities with which people with a disability currently engage including communities comprised of peers, paid workers, families and others. The revised Standards identify five outcome domains as follows:

1. **Individuality**… a person having individual characteristics, goals, wants, aspirations and support needs.
2. **Capacity**… identifying and encouraging a person’s abilities and potential whilst recognising their lifestyle and cultural diversity.
3. **Participation**… a person’s engagement and involvement in their community.
4. **Citizenship**… the individual being part of a community where all members have equal rights and responsibilities.
5. **Leadership**… direction setting and showing the way. This concept applies equally to individuals, support providers, communities and government agencies.

(1)Interestingly, the area of client decision making control is frequently linked to measures of service responsiveness. In such cases, it is suggested that where services appear responsive to client preferences, this is an indicator or clients having decision making control and choice. Unfortunately the two are not synonymous and such proxy measures that equate client choice with service responsiveness risk emphasising the agency of service provider at the expense of the agency of the person with a disability.
The latest Revised Quality Framework for Disability Services, Draft Evidence Indicators (DHS 2006b) is part of a further development of the Revised Standards and further reduces their parameters. In this subsequent draft Quality Framework (DHS 2006b), the ‘Outcome Principle’ for the above standard of Participation is defined as:

Each individual is able to access their community. (DHS 2006b, p. 1)

Its matching ‘Outcome Standard’ is likewise understood as

Support providers work with individuals to assist them to actively engage in their community. (DHS 2006b, p. 1)

Within this policy definition, participation and engagement are synonymous with access or physical location. Whilst some of the principles and outcomes definitions of other standards (such as for Capacity) remain less rigidly defined, they do not in any way direct attention to an overt and broad understanding of the life domains in which people with disabilities might exercise or increase their capacity or meet their individual needs. Despite this, DHS has significantly expanded their focus from that of previous Standards. Whilst the limitations of these most recent Revision of the Victorian Standards for Disability Services may reflect a pragmatic and incremental approach to change management, it paves the way for (but does not yet achieve) a more ambitious framing of outcomes for people with disabilities and the communities with whom they engage.

Scope’s Emerging Framework of Outcomes

Against this discourse of community inclusion, Scope commenced work to define and identify methods of measurement for outcomes related to both the building of inclusive community (Scope strategic priority 2) and the outcomes of person centred approaches (Scope strategic priority 1). Whilst these two priorities are interdependent, this discussion will focus only on the definition and measurement of inclusive community.

At the outset of this work it was apparent that: i) the indicators and measurement methods proposed in the Revision of the Victorian Standards for Disability Services (DHS, 2006) were insufficient to capture the range of experience and aspirations encountered amongst Scope clients; ii) that these aspirations could be aligned to diverse fields of academic literature (eg. to do with quality of life, wellbeing, citizenship, social capital, community belonging etc). and iii) that whilst there were efforts to identify and measure the ‘health’ or ‘resilience’ of identified communities (for example, by local governments), there appeared to be no significant work being undertaken to identify the outcomes community members experienced as a result of engaging with and ‘including’ marginalised groups such as people with a disability. Whilst this last is a significant focus of the Scope outcomes measurement research, it will not be further discussed here. This discussion will focus attention on definitions of outcomes for people with a disability.

An early literature review of outcome definitions across a range of fields including that of disability, led Scope researchers to the conclusion that existing tools do not map the breadth of life experience and aspiration of people with a disability. Many tools, necessarily, respond to the context of their creation. This has meant, in some cases, a predominant focus on basic human right issues and outcomes, responding to the lack of privacy, safety and autonomy in, often institutional, settings. While these outcomes foci are critically important, Scope researchers immediately witnessed a disjuncture between them and the broader outcomes being daily reported by clients and staff in Scope. Scope staff and clients were reporting, for example, aspirations and outcomes for people with a disability around sexuality, consumer roles, political influence, influencing community attitudes (often via agency in cultural activities), forging changes in public spaces, among others.

As part of the strategic planning process within Scope, it was also clear that significant changes in the disability sector would be occurring over the next five to ten years (and beyond). The development of an outcomes framework, with fully tested methods and tools, would itself take three to five years. This suggested that any outcomes measurement framework needed to look beyond the immediate activities, priorities and outcomes of the present to forecast the range of these in the future. As a result, the project team decided to adopt a working or emerging model that sought to articulate outcomes across a full range of life domains: personal wellbeing and civil citizenship; social citizenship; economic citizenship; political citizenship; cultural citizenship; and environmental citizenship. These domains seek to frame the major areas in which each target group (i.e. people with a disability, families and support circles, and communities) aspire to and experience outcomes. The domains are an analytical and conceptual device to assist in articulating and affirming the range of these aspirations and experiences. They are, of course, interconnected and overlapping in many ways.

As part of this working model, the project team has taken the notion of citizenship, with its long history of definition stemming from Marshall (1950), and adapted it somewhat to suit our purposes. The notion of citizenship used here, builds on historical views of citizenship formed
around civil, political and social aspects (Marshall 1950), and incorporates later understandings of economic and environmental citizenship along with more recent ideas of cultural citizenship (Delanty 2002; Morris 2005). Foremost in this definition of citizenship, the researchers seek to promote the idea of agency. Citizenship is not merely a right or a responsibility, it is a form of agency across a range of domains that asserts the right and capacity to make meaning, influence and take actions (Wilson 2005).

In this context, each outcome domain is currently understood as described in Table 1 (next page). The ideas presented in this emerging framework remain largely conceptual at this stage. It is important that the framework not become reified. It is, at best, a working hypothesis. Critically, any framework of outcomes definition and measurement must be led by the ideas and experiences of those whose outcomes we seek to understand. As a result, the next stage of the research will conduct focus groups with people with a disability, their families and circles of support, Scope staff, other community service agencies, and community groups and members with whom Scope clients engage. These focus groups will record and privilege the thinking and language of those experiencing outcomes. As a result, we can anticipate that the emerging framework will be re-shaped accordingly.

The emerging framework provides a useful way to categorise and analyse outcome definitions found within the existing literature. A short summary of this analysis is offered in the next section.

Overview of outcomes measurement literature relevant to disability

During 2005 Scope undertook a broad scale literature review. Given the scale of literature dealing with outcomes definition and measurement, the review focused on literature explicitly identifying outcomes for people with a disability, along with recent literature in person centred approaches to practice within disability (given the prevalence of this practice model in the field). It also drew on literature in the field of Early Childhood Intervention, again given the significant focus this area of practice receives in the disability field. Finally, the review encompassed a spattering of key literature in the broader fields of social capital, social network, citizenship and quality of life.

The intention of the review was to: i) identify definitions of outcomes and their sub domains; and ii) identify methods of measurement in use. Additionally, researchers divided outcomes according to outcomes focusing on individuals, outcomes focusing on small but specific cohorts (eg particular service users), and outcomes related to a large population set (eg local government area). Following this broader review, an analysis of outcome definitions was undertaken using the Scope emerging outcome framework as an organising tool. It is this analysis that is summarised here, rather than a critique of the literature it documents. The analysis is illustrative in evidencing the kinds of outcomes focused on in the literature to date. Whilst this focus relates to contextual and historical factors, unfortunately it also continues to unwittingly limit and confine the way outcomes are understood for people with a disability.

The analysis evidences that outcome definition and measurement data is dominant in the domain of Personal Wellbeing. Far less attention appears to have been paid to the areas of Economic, Political, Cultural and Environmental citizenship, and where it has, outcome definitions remain limited. For example, in the economic domain, activity has focused on the areas of employment, poverty, and education/training, largely ignoring the range of economic roles available including industrial relations, consumer, property owner, etc. Some of this imbalance or neglect could be attributed to the choice of literature surveyed. However, it is the author’s contention that a larger scale review would reveal similar conclusions which largely reflect, as well as contribute to, the ongoing preoccupation of service providers, funders and policy makers with limited understandings of inclusion and life potential for people with a disability.

This paper will present the analysis of two of the dominant outcomes measurement frameworks in use within disabilities to evidence the above proposition. The Personal Outcome Measures framework (Accreditation Ontario 2000) identifies eleven (11) of its twenty five measures in the domain of Personal Wellbeing. Allowing for some overlap, a further eight (8) relate to Social Citizenship, one (1) to Economic Citizenship, (2) to Political Citizenship, one (1) to Environmental Citizenship, and none (0) to Cultural Citizenship. Likewise, the National Core Indicators project in the USA reports a similarly constrained spread of what they term ‘consumer’ and ‘health, welfare and rights’ outcomes (Human Services Research Institute 2003, pp. 1 & 8). Unlike the Personal Outcome Measures framework, the National Core Indicators framework provides indicators relevant to individuals, specific cohorts and larger populations (note that only those listed for individuals are recorded in Appendix 1 attached). Outcomes can be categorised across the Scope domains as follows: fifteen (15) in the domain of Personal Wellbeing; ten (10) in
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Domain</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Key ideas/sub domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Personal wellbeing and civil citizenship** | The quality of personal life including health, wellbeing, happiness, autonomy, control and choice over identity, future, beliefs, values, thought, expression and spirituality.                                   | Quality of life  
Personhood, identity construction – sense of self  
Happiness  
Self esteem  
Wellbeing  
Health and safety  
Freedom of thought, expression, speech  
Individuality  
Autonomy  
Choice  
Self determination  
Individual freedoms: Liberty, Speech, Thoughts and Faith, Conclude valid contracts, Justice, Values, Beliefs |
| **Social Citizenship**                      | The quality of life in the social domain including a person’s agency (to make meaning, act, influence and contribute) in the areas of relationship, community connectedness and belonging.                             | Networks:  
• bonding (horizontal / closed)  
• bridging (between groups)  
• linking (to authority)  
Relationships  
Friendships (intimate → acquaintances)  
Community connectedness/ belonging  
Community inclusion  
Loneliness, isolation                                                                                           |
| **Political Citizenship**                   | The quality of life in the political domain including a person’s agency (to make meaning, act, influence and contribute) in the areas of public decision making, civic activity, consultation, advocacy and lobbying. | Civic activity  
Civic duties: rights and responsibilities  
Advocacy, Lobbying  
Democracy  
Choice  
Leadership  
Political participation                                                                                         |
| **Cultural citizenship**                    | The quality of life in the cultural domain including a person’s agency (to make meaning, act, influence and contribute) in the areas of cultural production and participation, broader attitude change and development, and recreational activities. | Participation in cultural or recreational events and activities.  
Influencing attitude / behaviour change  
Cultural production:  
• Performance  
• Art  
• Writing / authorship                                                                                         |
| **Economic citizenship**                    | The quality of life in the economic domain including a person’s agency (to make meaning, act, influence and contribute) in the areas of employment, education / training, a range of economic roles (e.g. as consumers and income generators). | Access to economic domain  
Employment  
Education and training  
Consumer roles  
Home/ property ownership  
Income level and source  
Direct payments  
Retirement  
Industrial relations agency                                                                                     |
| **Environmental citizenship**               | The quality of life in the environmental domain including a person’s agency (to make meaning, act, influence and contribute) in relation to their environment including constructed environments, public and private space. | Access to physical environment  
Shaping of/ access to public space  
Shaping of/ access to private space (housing etc)  
Shaping of/ access to public transport  
Built environment / constructed space  
Universal design                                                                                                 |
the domain of Economic Citizenship; six (6) in the domain of Social Citizenship; six (6) in Political Citizenship; one (1) in Environmental Citizenship; and none (0) in Cultural Citizenship. Reviewing the pool of outcome indicators from the breadth of literature reviewed, it is evident that most work has concentrated on the area of personal wellbeing and autonomy, followed by some interest in social, political and sometimes economic outcomes. Almost no attention, in the field of outcomes definition, has been paid to the areas of environmental or cultural agency. These results are summarised in Appendix 1 that provides a snapshot of outcome indicators for individuals (excluding those related to cohorts or larger populations).

The Lived Experience – Aspirations and Outcomes for People With Intellectual Disability in Scope

Throughout the development of the Scope framework to date, researchers have engaged with the stories of staff, clients and families about the aspirations people with a disability hold and the outcomes they achieve. In particular, the process of implementing both Person Centred Planning and Individualised packages within the organisation has provided a range of case studies to analyse, prior to a more rigorous data collection and analysis process focusing on a wider range of Scope clients, family and community members.

This section aims to offer a short selection of case studies to evidence the diversity of outcomes currently experienced by Scope clients with intellectual, multiple and complex disabilities, as well as some of the associated issues of practice and policy related to them.

Tom

Tom is a young man in his twenties with a lively sense of humour and keen interest in an active social life. He lives with his mum, has previously battled with the system, and suffered bouts of depression and severe pain. He utilises an electronic aid to communicate, and uses a wheelchair for mobility. Over the past two years, Tom has radically changed his life with the support of a person centred planning process, among other things. He has aspired to be employed, be recognised as an independent person and have opportunities to interact with people his own age. He now works one day per week in a bank as a mail clerk, has commenced painting and is now making a modest income from selling his art. He undertakes volunteering at a local library (having overcome policies around police checks and a requirement to physically sign his name which he is unable to do), and has a key to his own car (driven by his driver). He is a member of the local bowling club and enjoys a wide range of relationships with people in each of the areas in which he participates. He sees himself as a changed man, his pain is lessened and his outlook positive. His relationship with his mother has also changed as both have been able to move on with more independent lives.

Using the Scope emerging framework, it would appear that Tom has experienced outcomes in a range of domains. He has significant economic outcomes, gaining employment, participating in art training, and earning an income from self employment as an artist. In the civic domain, he is exercising his rights and responsibilities as a citizen and contributes to community services via his volunteering role. His achievements have led to outcomes in the personal wellbeing domain (i.e. lessened pain, and increased autonomy), and in the social domain through positively changed relationship with his mother and increased relationships with others. He enjoys cultural and recreational outcomes from his bowling and artistic activities.

Lennette

Lennette is an older woman who is keenly interested in people and travel. Her aspiration has been to travel on the Very Fast Train. She has intellectual and physical disabilities and uses a wheelchair for mobility. Her communication style includes some verbal articulation and gestures. For many years she has attended a day centre program from which she seeks a change. Using a flexible options approach, her day service funds have been somewhat reallocated to assist Lennette achieve the outcomes she aspires to. She now uses the train (not the Very Fast Train) to travel to regional Victoria on a weekly basis. She does this independently and has developed a network of acquaintances whom she visits and interacts with. She gets much enjoyment from seeing the sights and moving around the train stations and community.

Using the Scope framework, Lennette has achieved outcomes in the social, personal and cultural/recreational domains. Additionally, she has also achieved outcomes in the economic domain, enacting a desired role as a consumer, tourist and traveller.

These experiences are not well captured by the Personal Outcome Measures framework (Accreditation Ontario, 2000). Whereas this framework would enable Tom and Lennette to report outcomes generally in terms of choosing and realising personal goals, and satisfaction with
personal life situations, it does little to adequately document and map the kinds of domains Tom and Lennette engage with or the nature of their contribution. A similar analysis could be made using the Revision of the Victorian Standards for Disability Services (DHS 2006a) or draft Revised Quality Framework (DHS 2006b). This kind of reduction undermines efforts to both affirm and document the lives and aspirations of people with a disability as an active and diverse citizenry.

Other case studies within Scope evidence a wide range of outcomes and achievements of varying levels of satisfaction to the individuals involved. Most, even those with a very low level of achievement against goals, appear to demonstrate outcomes in multiple domains (particularly including that of personal wellbeing, given that the opportunity to make autonomous decisions is a necessary precondition of person centred outcomes). However, practitioners and clients report a similar range of issues and concerns. It remains the case that in many instances clients lack the most basic of influence over the things that matter to them in their life (even choice of soap). Such a history of thwarted autonomy and individuality has resulted in a preparedness to accept the ‘ordinary’, a lack of trust in change and the staff that are required to support it, and an unwillingness to risk again a dream that has previously been repeatedly shattered. To address this, staff report a need for: strongly contextualised and inter-subjective practice; management and policies that actively support such practice (and its risks); staff whose role it is to both build the capacity of others (inside and outside the organisation) and tackle structural barriers; a clear staff role to actively support the plans and aspirations of clients (i.e. ‘keep the plan alive’) despite the barriers; and a sensitivity to the complex and fragile nature of any work that involves entering into relationships between people. Additionally, families, clients and staff report problems in accessing financial resources to support the diverse aspirations of people with a disability, including resources such as appropriate and adequately maintained equipment and aids suitable to aspirations. Additionally, the prevailing discourse of risk management is seen as a significant barrier to the actualisation of the aspirations of people with a disability.

Conclusion

This paper explores an understanding of ‘inclusion’ that emphasises personal agency in a range of life domains. It evidences a lack of policy and outcomes measurement attention in this area. At present, both continue to constrain the way the aspirations and outcomes of people with a disability are supported and documented. In order to progress (and operationalise) this wider understanding of inclusion and the outcomes related to it there is substantial work to be undertaken. There appears to be sufficient evidence to affirm the further development of an outcomes framework utilising a wider range of domains as proposed here. This development work would include both the scoping of the range of outcomes as identified by a wide cross section of people with a disability, families and communities, and the development of appropriate tools to document and ‘measure’ the nature, quality and extent of these. It is hoped that such work will continue to be a catalyst for dialogue among all groups as to how a ‘good life’ for people with disabilities can be understood and achieved.
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Appendix One:
Comparison of Outcome Definitions From Literature Review Across Scope Outcome Domains: Focus on Outcomes for Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal wellbeing and civil citizenship</th>
<th>Social citizenship</th>
<th>Economic citizenship</th>
<th>Political citizenship</th>
<th>Cultural citizenship</th>
<th>Environmental citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- People choose personal goals&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People have intimate relationships&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People choose where they work&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People exercise rights&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Cultural belonging&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People use their environments&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People choose where and with whom they live&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People live in integrated environments&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People are treated fairly&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People are treated fairly&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Cultural needs of the individual addressed&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People have got their own house and the support that they want&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People are satisfied with their personal life situations&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People participate in the life of the community&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People are in paid work or in courses they have chosen&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Participation in local organisations and solution of local problems&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Cultural rights&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People choose their daily routine&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People interact with other members of the community&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Job satisfaction and pride&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Community activism including volunteerism&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Political involvement&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- connecting individual life stories with wider cultural discourses&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People have time, space and opportunity for privacy&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People perform different social roles&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Level of support networks and helping others (numbers, frequency, closeness)&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Political involvement&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Citizen power&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'Sense of community' ie. extent to which part of a readily available and supportive social structure&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People decide when to share their personal information&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People have friends&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Perceived social support&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Degree of acceptance (physical integration, functional inclusion, social inclusion)&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Social capital: participation local community; proactivity; trust/safety; neighbourhood connections; family/ friends connections; work connections&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Social capital: participation local community; proactivity; trust/safety; neighbourhood connections; family/ friends connections; work connections&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People realise personal goals&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People are respected&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Friendships&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Structure and quality of social relations (formality, size, structure, reciprocity)&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People are safe&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People are connected to natural support networks&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Frequency of interactions with friends and families&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Everyday social interactions&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Political involvement&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- connecting individual life stories with wider cultural discourses&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People have the best possible health&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People in people's lives understand them better and communicate with them better&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- the number and type of groups and networks of which individuals are members&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- the number and type of groups and networks of which individuals are members&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Citizen power&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'Sense of community' ie. extent to which part of a readily available and supportive social structure&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People are free from abuse and neglect&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People are more involved in their local community&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- levels of participation, reciprocity, feelings of trust and safety, social connections&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- levels of participation, reciprocity, feelings of trust and safety, social connections&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Social capital: participation local community; proactivity; trust/safety; neighbourhood connections; family/ friends connections; work connections&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Social capital: participation local community; proactivity; trust/safety; neighbourhood connections; family/ friends connections; work connections&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People experience continuity and security&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- People have richer networks of friends and relationships&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'Sense of community' ie. extent to which part of a readily available and supportive social structure&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'Sense of community' ie. extent to which part of a readily available and supportive social structure&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Social capital: participation local community; proactivity; trust/safety; neighbourhood connections; family/ friends connections; work connections&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Social capital: participation local community; proactivity; trust/safety; neighbourhood connections; family/ friends connections; work connections&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People say they are happier in their new life&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Level of support networks and helping others (numbers, frequency, closeness)&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- joining local community; proactivity; trust/safety; neighbourhood connections; family/ friends connections; work connections&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People have more control over their lives&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Perceived social support&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People have done something unexpected not simply followed the path that services laid out for them&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Friendships&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 'The power to name, create meaning, construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes'&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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