

Hybridizing knowledge, technologies, and relationships: OWG and inclusive co-design in the age of Artificial Intelligence

Corrado Muscarà ¹

¹ Università degli Studi di Catania; corrado.muscara@unict.it

Abstract: This contribution aims to explore educational co-design as an essential methodology for building life plans for students with disabilities and, more generally, for creating inclusive school environments. It aims to highlight the importance of training the members of the Operational Working Group for Inclusion (OWG), which must take an active role in shared planning, acting as a reflective and generative device for inclusive processes. With a view to hybridization between different disciplinary areas, the intervention focuses on the dialogue between special pedagogy and the sciences of education and training on the one hand, and technologies on the other, to promote educational alliances involving families, school professionals, and members of local communities. Educational technologies and artificial intelligence, when critically integrated into co-design processes, can foster active participation and cooperation among OWG members, fostering shared educational responsibility. The use of digital tools (such as Google Workspace and Padlet), augmentative and alternative communication platforms (e.g., Mind Express and Symwriter), and educational artificial intelligence systems (such as adaptive tutors or chatbots) helps to renew educational relationships and develop transmedia skills within the OWG. This calls for reflection on how the OWG can be reorganized as a generative space of collective responsibility, moving beyond the concept of simple bureaucratic compliance. In this context, digital technologies and artificial intelligence can become an integral part of a knowledge ecology capable of navigating complexity and supporting a democratic and authentically inclusive school.

Keywords: Operational Working Group; School Inclusion; Digital Co-design; Artificial Intelligence; Professional Reflectiveness

1. Introduction

In recent years, the issue of inclusive education has become increasingly important in the international debate on education and personal development, emerging as one of the key indicators of the quality and fairness of education systems (Canevaro, 2013; European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2022; Holmes et al., 2022). Inclusion is not exclusively a pedagogical issue, but also an ethical and political one, as it concerns the possibility for every person to participate fully in social and cultural life. From this perspective, schools are called upon to act as social contexts capable of embracing diversity and valuing differences, promoting processes of active participation for every pupil and student. However, despite regulatory and cultural developments in many countries, the creation of a truly inclusive



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access
publication under the terms and
conditions of the Creative Commons
Attribution (CC BY) license
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

system remains a complex challenge, involving the organisational, professional and relational dimensions of school life (Ainscow, 2020; Florian, 2015; Slee, 2018).

In Italy, the tradition of inclusion has its roots in Law 517/1977 and was subsequently developed mainly in Law 104/1992 and Legislative Decree 66/2017, amended by Legislative Decree 96/2019, which reinforced the principle of shared educational responsibility between schools, families and local communities. A further decisive step on the issue of inclusion was taken with the Ministerial Directive of 27 December 2012, which extended pedagogical attention to Special Educational Needs (SEN), recognising that every pupil, at certain points in their school career, may need personalised support measures. This directive has helped to consolidate an inclusive vision of the system, based on the idea that diversity is the norm in schools and not an exception to be managed.

These regulations establish the right of every pupil and student to a personalised educational and training path: a Personalised Education Plan (PDP) for pupils with other types of special educational needs; and an Individualised Education Plan (PEI) for pupils with disabilities, which is developed collectively within the Operational Working Group for Inclusion (OWG).

The OWG is a crucial tool for the shared design of inclusive pathways, but it is also an area where tensions, critical issues and opportunities for innovation arise, as has already been highlighted by investigations conducted in some Italian regions (Muscarà, 2024). Often, in fact, the complexity of procedures risks reducing the OWG to a formal requirement rather than a place for genuine reflection and professional cooperation (Cottini, 2019; Canevaro, Ciambrone & Nocera, 2021).

In an educational context increasingly characterised by the hybridisation of languages, the use of digital technologies and the spread of Artificial Intelligence (AI), the work of the OWG can be a key laboratory for exploring new forms of participation and educational and teaching design. The contemporary challenge is to combine the Italian tradition of inclusive pedagogy with the emerging perspectives of digital education and personalised learning, promoting a culture of collaboration and professional reflection (Mulè, 2024).

In light of these reflections, the question arises as to whether the Italian model of inclusion can effectively dialogue with international trends, taking the OWG as a key device for building a truly inclusive, reflective school oriented towards “educational democracy”.

2. Towards inclusive hybridisation: between pedagogical tradition and digital innovation

In recent decades, the international debate on disability and education has gradually shifted its focus from the concept of integration – centred on the adaptation of the pupil to the context – to that of inclusion, understood as the transformation of the education system as a whole (SipeS, 2024; Slee, 2018; Booth & Ainscow, 2011). Inclusion is now conceived as a process that redefines the very nature of school and its ethical and pedagogical mandate. As Florian argues, teaching in a way that allows everyone to learn means overcoming the distinction between “ordinary” and special education, valuing differences as resources for collective learning (2015). Diversity is a structural and generative condition of the educational process. Each student brings with them a wealth of experiences and languages which, if welcomed and brought into dialogue, broaden the cognitive and relational horizons of the class group. Booth and

Ainscow emphasise that inclusion involves a constant review of school cultures, policies and practices to reduce barriers to learning and participation (2011).

In the Italian context, scholars and experts in special education emphasise that difference is not a limitation to be compensated for, but a resource from which to rethink practices and relationships (Canevaro & Ianes, 2022). This perspective is linked to Dewey's concept of democracy (1916), which sees the school as an ethical community and a laboratory for participation and democracy.

Recent research in inclusive education highlights the need for a systemic approach based on interdependent cultures, policies and practices (Ainscow, 2020; Mitchell & Sutherland, 2020). The Index for Inclusion remains one of the most effective reference models for the continuous improvement of educational institutions (Booth & Ainscow, 2011).

At the national level, Italian legislation – from Law 517/1977 to Law 104/1992, Legislative Decree 66/2017, Legislative Decree 96/2019 and Ministerial Decree 182/2020 – has consolidated the right to inclusion as a structural dimension of the education system. However, as noted by Cottini (2019), D'Alonzo (2015), Dell'Anna, Bellacicco and Ianes (2023), there remains a risk that tools such as the PEI and the OWG will be seen as formal requirements, losing their reflective and planning function. For the OWG to truly become a space for shared educational responsibility, it needs to be rethought as a community of practice (Wenger, 1998), in which teachers, families and specialists collaborate to make shared decisions. This approach echoes Morin's (2001) complex vision and Bateson's (1976) ecology of mind, according to which knowledge arises from the interaction between people and contexts.

From this perspective, educational technology and artificial intelligence (AI) can be seen as cultural mediators capable of expanding opportunities for participation. According to Cuban, technology alone does not automatically produce innovation, but only does so when integrated into conscious pedagogical frameworks (2001). The effectiveness of digital tools depends on intentional and reflective use, supported by adequate training (Cottini & Morganti, 2015).

Contemporary applications of AI in education – from adaptive learning systems to chatbots – open up new opportunities, but also raise ethical and methodological questions. Holmes et al. highlight the need to ensure algorithmic transparency and safeguard the complexity of educational processes (2021).

Building an inclusive school therefore means intertwining cultural, pedagogical and technological dimensions within a framework of shared educational responsibility. The hybridisation of knowledge, tools and relationships can guide the school community towards a renewed culture of participation, in which inclusion is not only a goal to be achieved, but a daily practice that is regenerated through reflection and cooperation. From this perspective, the OWG can become the ideal place to translate this vision into concrete processes of pedagogical co-design.

3. OWG as a reflective community: digital co-design and pedagogical co-responsibility

Interpreting OWG as a community of pedagogical practices involves a decisive methodological shift: from principles to shared construction processes. OWG is not merely a place for synthesising information, but a complex methodological device that integrates different professional and cultural perspectives, generating meanings and decisions through cooperation between different actors. On an epistemological level,

it is based on a processual and systemic logic that considers educational design as a situated investigative activity. In this perspective, the co-design methodology draws on models of collaborative and reflective research (Schön, 1983; Mortari, 2007), in which knowledge emerges from dialogue and negotiation between subjects with different skills and roles.

The latest perspectives on cooperative inquiry reinforce this view, emphasising how participants become active co-researchers and how knowledge is generated through successive cycles of action and shared reflection (Green, 2025; Russ, 2025). In Italy, experiences of participatory school-university research (Pentucci, 2021) and studies on transformative and collaborative methodology (Fabbri, Bracci, & Romano, 2021) confirm that educational design cannot be built on those who learn, but with those who learn, in a dialogical context that recognises the plurality of knowledge as an epistemic resource. This shifts the focus from standardised procedures to the dialogical quality of decision-making processes, understood as a condition for the transformation of educational practices.

The methodological approach of the OWG is rooted in professional reflexivity and the ability to learn from experience. Educational decisions are not merely technical acts, but the result of an interpretative process in which the perspectives of curriculum and support teachers, school administrators, families, students, health and social specialists, and representatives of local institutions converge. This intertwining of knowledge configures the OWG as a device for epistemic and organisational mediation, capable of translating the plurality of demands into shared guidelines.

The participation of local members – social, health and education service operators – plays a crucial role: they broaden the scope of planning, connecting schools to welfare systems and community resources. In this way, the OWG establishes itself as a network interface, capable of connecting the educational dimension with the social, health and cultural dimensions, avoiding the fragmentation of interventions and promoting continuity between school and the local area.

The co-design methodology is implemented through iterative dynamics, i.e. cyclical and reflective processes of analysis, planning, action and review. These steps do not constitute a rigid sequence, but a continuous pedagogical cycle that is renewed every time educational needs and/or contextual conditions change.

The practices that characterise this approach include:

- listening to and interpreting training needs from multiple perspectives, built through discussion between the different professionals in the OWG and the evaluation of family and student narratives;
- co-defining educational and social objectives, taking into account not only teaching aspects, but also overall well-being and participation in community life;
- integrated planning of teaching and educational strategies, including the choice of teaching mediators, technological tools and support actions coordinated with local services;
- documentation and shared reflection, in which the production of minutes, observation grids and digital portfolios becomes a common asset and a basis for improvement;
- formative and dialogic assessment, aimed at reworking the educational project and capitalising on the knowledge produced by the group.

The methodological quality of co-design is therefore measured by the OWG's ability to transform each operational phase into an opportunity for collective learning and educational and didactic co-design. The value of the process lies not only in the results achieved, but also in the possibility of critically re-examining the experience, generating new shared meanings and consolidating a culture of shared responsibility. For this to happen, the group must maintain the centrality of the educational relationship and the awareness that the technical dimension – however important – always remains at the service of the pedagogical one. Only in this balance can co-design become a truly transformative device, capable of combining methodological rigour and reflective openness.

In this perspective, digital tools and artificial intelligence can act as mediators of cognitive cooperation, facilitating information sharing, decision traceability and content accessibility. However, their use requires conscious pedagogical guidance, capable of governing their use in a critical and transparent manner. The integration of AI systems into educational contexts requires reflection on the relationship between data, interpretation and educational responsibility, as every technical choice has epistemic and ethical implications that affect the very concept of knowledge, participation and personal care.

As evidence of the intense debate on this topic in Italy, the *Giornale Italiano di Pedagogia Speciale* (Italian Journal of Special Education) has dedicated a specific issue to the topic, with contributions such as *Pedagogia speciale e intelligenza artificiale: tecnologie e formazione per un'inclusione consapevole* (Special Education and Artificial Intelligence: Technologies and Training for Conscious Inclusion) (Lo Piccolo et al., 2025), which highlight the urgency of conscious training and digital humanism. A recent study on Artificial Intelligence and Inclusion conducted by Bruni and Murgia (2025) highlighted how, among trainee teachers, there is a coexistence of the perception of the inclusive potential of AI and the fear of a loss of educational control in the absence of a solid digital culture.

At the international level, some scholars have put forward the need to ensure transparency, fairness and human-in-the-loop in AI-based education systems, in order to avoid biases and algorithmic reductionism that would compromise the ethical-pedagogical dimension (Memorian & Doleck, 2024; Porayska-Pomsta & Holmes, 2022).

The OWG's methodological approach is therefore underpinned by a strong ethical dimension, which recognises interprofessional dialogue not only as an organisational necessity but also as a pedagogical principle. Every decision taken within the group entails a collective epistemic responsibility: that of building knowledge without exclusion, embracing complexity as a value and keeping the whole person at the centre. Reflectiveness thus becomes an exercise in awareness and mutual care, aimed at balancing innovation, equity and the protection of rights. Artificial intelligence and digital technologies, if used critically, can strengthen the transparency and fairness of decision-making processes; if, on the other hand, they are used automatically or reductively, they risk emptying pedagogical mediation of meaning. The task of the OWG becomes that of managing complexity, keeping technology at the service of the educational relationship and shared responsibility.

4. Digital mediation and inclusive co-design

The dialogue between special education and educational technologies opens up a space for reflection that could allow the OWG to become a dynamic laboratory, in which the digital experience becomes an integral part of the educational alliance.

Far from being mere operational tools, digital technologies are relational and cultural environments that profoundly influence modes of communication, learning times and forms of educational cooperation. They do not merely support existing practices, but contribute to redefining them, generating new spaces for interaction and shared knowledge construction. As Selwyn observes, “educational technology is not simply a neutral tool; it is deeply intertwined with social, cultural, political and economic contexts” (2020, p. 26), highlighting how digital technology participates in the very construction of educational practices and relationships.

From this perspective, the introduction of digital technology into inclusive co-design processes cannot be understood as a simple technical update, but as a real ecological change, capable of redefining the very meanings of participation, shared responsibility and educational reflexivity (Postman, 1992).

In the context of OWG, digital tools could be a resource for expanding opportunities for collaboration. Platforms such as Google Workspace for Education or Microsoft Teams could enable shared and transparent working, facilitating the creation of common documents and the sharing of materials. This way of working, in addition to making information more accessible, could encourage continuous participation processes, even outside formal meetings.

Digital tools such as Padlet or Miro, which allow for the collective visualisation of ideas and pathways, could facilitate the representation of each participant's thoughts and the construction of a shared space for reflection. As Rashid, Yunus and Wahi observe, “Padlet motivates students to participate, encourages interaction and improves mutual learning” (2019, p. 618), while, according to Van Leeuwen and Janssen, “collaborative learning technologies can support democratic and shared knowledge construction through ICT” (2019, p. 85). In this sense, digital technology would take the form of shared writing of the educational project, capable of giving visibility to the contributions of all those involved.

Augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) is a particularly significant area for promoting inclusion in co-design processes (Galdieri, 2022). Tools such as Mind Express, Symwriter and The Grid 3 offer expressive possibilities to students with complex communication needs, allowing them to actively participate in building their own life project. The inclusion of AAC in the OWG could represent not only operational support, but also an ethical and cultural act. The use of multimodal languages allows diversity to be valued as a source of mutual learning and redefines the boundaries of educational communication. In this sense, AAC, rather than a set of techniques, could be interpreted as a “pedagogy of the voice”, capable of restoring communicative dignity to each individual and generating a culture of listening within the group.

In recent years, artificial intelligence (AI) has begun to be tested in various educational contexts, offering tools for analysis and decision-making support. Adaptive learning systems, digital tutors and educational chatbots can provide valuable information on learning paths, enabling greater personalisation of interventions. However, the use of such resources requires critical analysis. As repeatedly argued by several scholars, AI cannot replace pedagogical mediation, but it can become an ally if used

with awareness and transparency (Porayska-Pomsta, Holmes & Nemorin, 2024). Data, in fact, only make sense when interpreted in the light of experience and context. It is possible to imagine that, within the OWG, digital analysis tools could support collective reflection, providing elements for discussion and shared evaluation of educational pathways. From this perspective, artificial intelligence could help to promote a more dialogical and documented approach to design, in which quantitative information is intertwined with the qualitative dimension of the educational experience (Mulè, 2025).

The integration of technologies into inclusive co-design processes, while offering new opportunities, continues to present significant challenges. Inequalities in access, differences in digital skills and a risk of technicisation of educational practice persist. These critical issues invite us to consider technology not as an automatic solution, but as a field of research and pedagogical negotiation (Lo Piccolo et al., 2025). It may be useful to think of the training of teachers and OWG members as a continuous process, aimed not only at acquiring technical skills, but also at building a reflective and dialogical attitude. In this perspective, digital competence is intertwined with relational competence, giving shape to a pedagogical knowledge capable of critically reading technologies and orienting them towards educational ends.

Similarly, artificial intelligence could be considered not as a substitute agent, but as a tool for amplifying collective reflexivity (Mulè, 2025). The critical use of digital technologies can, in fact, support the transition from a culture of procedure to a culture of participation, in which co-design is realised as a practice of educational co-responsibility. In this direction, it could be hypothesised that digital technology, if integrated with pedagogical sensitivity, could contribute to regenerating the culture of the OWG as an ecology of cooperative learning, in which relationships between people, knowledge and tools become opportunities to build a school capable of inhabiting the complexity of the present and generating inclusion.

5. Conclusion and future prospects for a reflective and digital OWG

The analysis conducted has attempted to demonstrate how the OWG can be rethought as a reflective, ethical and digital community, capable of combining the Italian pedagogical tradition of inclusion with the challenges posed by technological innovation and artificial intelligence. From a place of bureaucratic compliance, it can be transformed into a space for generative educational co-responsibility, where the plurality of knowledge and experiences translates into a permanent laboratory for research and co-design.

The transition from a prescriptive to a dialogical model involves a profound cultural and methodological reorganisation. Professional reflexivity emerges as a core competence for supporting the quality of decision-making processes, while technology is configured as a mediating environment and not as an end in itself. The challenge is therefore to hybridise knowledge, relationships and tools, preserving the human and relational dimension of educational action within complex digital ecosystems.

In this context, digital technologies and artificial intelligence can offer new opportunities for participation, documentation and shared assessment, provided they are integrated into an ethical and pedagogical framework that guides their use towards transparency, fairness and personal care. The adoption of collaborative digital tools, augmentative communication practices and intelligent systems for analysing educa-

tional pathways can broaden the forms of cooperation between teachers, families and local services, strengthening the educational network.

Future prospects require significant investment in the initial and in-service training of OWG members, understood not only as the acquisition of technical skills, but also as the development of a reflective and inclusive digital culture. It is necessary to promote training courses based on collaborative research practices, in which the use of technology becomes an opportunity to explore new ways of thinking about and implementing inclusion. In this sense, interdisciplinary training and school-university action research can provide fertile ground for consolidating pedagogical knowledge capable of embracing complexity and critically interpreting innovation.

In terms of research, promising avenues are opening up for the empirical analysis of digital co-design experiences and for assessing the impact of artificial intelligence on the quality of inclusive processes. Future studies could investigate how AI tools, if integrated in a participatory and transparent manner, can enhance collective reflexivity, supporting a culture of pedagogical co-design.

Finally, the prospect of a digital humanism of inclusion invites us to think of the OWG not only as an organisational device, but as an ethical community capable of generating new educational meanings and building bridges between schools, local communities and technologies. In an age marked by technological acceleration, the task of special pedagogy and inclusive education is to keep alive the link between technology and responsibility, between innovation and humanity, so that digitalisation becomes a tool for emancipation and not exclusion.

As Morin reminds us, “knowledge is always an uncertain adventure [...] the task of knowledge is to navigate an ocean of uncertainties through archipelagos of certainties” (2000, p. 21). With this in mind, the OWG can become a laboratory for pedagogical hybridisation, where the encounter between people, technologies and knowledge generates new forms of co-responsibility and educational participation, keeping alive the link between innovation and humanity.

References

- Ainscow, M. (2020). *Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences*. In *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6 (1), 7–16.
- Bateson, G. (1976). *Verso un'ecologia della mente*. Milano: Adelphi.
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for Inclusion. Developing Learning and Participation in Schools* (3rd ed.). Bristol: CSIE.
- Bruni, F., & Murgia, E. (2025). *Intelligenza artificiale e Inclusione: la percezione di insegnanti in formazione su utilità e prospettive di adozione*. In *Journal of Inclusive Methodology and Technology in Learning and Teaching*, Anno 5 (1).
- Canevaro, A. (2013). *Scuola inclusiva e mondo più giusto*. Trento: Erickson.
- Canevaro, A., & Ianes, D. (Ead) (2022). *Un'altra didattica è possibile: Esempi e pratiche di ordinaria didattica inclusiva*. Trento: Erickson.

- Canevaro, A., Ciambrone, R. & Nocera, S. (2021). *L'inclusione scolastica in Italia. Percorsi, riflessioni e prospettive future*. Trento: Erickson.
- Cottini, L. (2019). *Didattica speciale e inclusione scolastica* (2^a ed.). Roma: Carocci.
- Cottini, L., & Morganti, A. (2015). *Evidence-based education e pedagogia speciale: Principi e modelli per l'inclusione*. Roma: Carocci.
- Cuban, L. (2001). *Oversold and Underused: Computers in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- d'Alonzo, L., Bocci, F. & Pinnelli, S. (2015). *Didattica speciale per l'inclusione*. Brescia: La Scuola.
- Dell'Anna, S., Bellacicco, R., & Ianes, D. (2023). *Cosa sappiamo dell'inclusione scolastica in Italia? I contributi della ricerca empirica*. Trento: Erickson.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2022). *Key Principles for Promoting Quality in Inclusive Education*. Odense: EASNIE.
- Fabbri, L., Bracci, F. & Romano, A. (2021). *Apprendimento trasformativo, ricerca collaborativa e approccio practice-based. Una proposta per lo sviluppo professionale dell'insegnante*. In Annali online della Didattica e della Formazione docente. Vol. 13 (21). <https://annali.unife.it/adfd/article/view/2326>
- Florian, L. (2015). *Inclusive Pedagogy: A transformative approach to individual differences but can it help reduce educational inequalities?* In Scottish Educational Review, 47(1), 5–14.
- Florian, L. (2015). *Inclusive Pedagogy: A Transformative Approach to Individual Differences*. In Educational Review, 67(2), 179–195.
- Galdieri, M. (2022). *Comunicazione aumentativa alternativa. Inclusione e didattiche innovative*. Roma: Studium.
- Green, H. (2025). *Transforming teaching through cooperative inquiry. Educational Action Research*. In Educational Action Research. Connecting Research and Practice for Professionals and Communities, 33 (4), 617-637.
- Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2022). *Artificial Intelligence in Education: Promises and Implications for Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Center for Curriculum Redesign.
- Holmes, W., Porayska-Pomsta, K., Holstein, K., Sutherland, E., & Baker, T. (2021). *Ethics of AI in Education: Towards a Community-Wide Framework*. In International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 32 (2).
- Lo Piccolo, M., Pistone, L., Pasqualetto, L., Andolina, L. & Campanella G. (2025). *Pedagogia speciale e intelligenza artificiale: tecnologie e formazione per un'inclusione consapevole*. In Giornale Italiano di Pedagogia Speciale, V. 13 (1), pp. 130–138.
- Memorian, B. & Doleck, T. (2024). *Human-in-the-loop in artificial intelligence in education: a review and entity-relationship (ER) analysis*. In Computer in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans, Vol. 2 (1).
- Mitchell, D., & Sutherland, D. (2020). *What Really Works in Special and Inclusive Education* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Morin, E. (2000). *La testa ben fatta. Riforma dell'insegnamento e riforma del pensiero*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.
- Mortari, L. (2007). *Apprendere dall'esperienza. Il pensare riflessivo nella formazione*. Roma: Carocci.
- Mulè, P. (2025). *Intelligenza, intelligenza collaborativa e intelligenza artificiale generativa tra modelli e ricerche empiriche*. In Educrazia, 1 (2).

- Muscarà, C. (2024). *The Operationa Working Group for inclusion: perspectives and dilemmas. Exploratory survey*. In R. Viganò & C. Lisimberti (Eds.). *A cosa serve la ricerca educativa? Il dato e il suo valore sociale. Atti del convegno Nazionale SIRD*. Lecce: Pensa Multimedia.
- Slee, R. (2018). *Defining the Scope of Inclusive Education. Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Pentucci, M. (2021). *Riflettere sulla pratica per trasformare la pratica: primi esiti da un percorso di ricerca collaborativa in contesto di didattica d'emergenza*. In *Nuova Secondaria Ricerca*, n. 10.
- Porayska-Pomsta, K. & Holmes, W. (2022). *The Ethics of Artificial intelligence in Education. Practices, challenges and debates*. New York: Routledge.
- Porayska-Pomsta, K., Holmes, W., & Nemorin, S. (2024). *AI in education: Risks, ethics, and equity*. In *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(3), 855–873.
- Postman, N. (1992). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Rashid, S., Yunus, M.M., & Wahi, W. (2019). *Using Padlet for collaborative writing among ESL learners*. In *Creative Education*, 10 (3), pp. 610-620.
- Russ, C. (2025). *Co-operative inquiry: Qualitative methodology transforming research*. In *Qualitative Research*, 25(1), 78–94.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Selwyn, N. (2020). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Bloomsbury Academic.
- SipeS (2024). *L'inclusione non si ferma. Cammina sempre. Volume in ricordo di Andrea Canevaro*. Trento: Erickson.
- Slee, R. (2018). *Inclusive Education Isn't Dead. It Just Smells Funny*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Van Leeuwen, A., & Janssen, J. (2019). *A systematic review of teacher guidance during collaborative learning in primary and secondary education*. In *Educational Research Review*, 27, pp. 71-89.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.