Evaluation of the Cambridge House Playdagogy Programme

Final Research Report (Strand 1)

Prepared for:

Cambridge House

Prepared by:

Dr Rachel Sandford & Prof Richard Giulianotti

School of Sport, Exercise & Health Sciences
Loughborough University

Date: April 2016

Loughborough University

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

1.1 The Cambridge House (CH) Playdagogy programme seeks to challenge disability discrimination by promoting inclusion for all within sport/game activities, questioning disabling attitudes and fostering positive interactions between disabled and non-disabled peers. It contributes to a growing body of work on Positive Youth Development (PYD) and Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) and is underpinned by principles relating to constructivist theories of learning, play-based education and anti-oppressive education. Playdagogy embraces the social model of disability as a means of understanding disability as a social construction/creation.

1.2 An evaluation of the Playdagogy programme was undertaken collaboratively by the University of Leeds and Loughborough University between January and December 2015. This specific report outlines findings relating to Strand 1 of the evaluation (undertaken by Loughborough), which focused on how Playdagogy: increases the participation of disabled children in sport/games; addresses issues around accessibility to/in sport; and facilitates educators' and non-disabled children's understanding of disability, inclusion and equality in sport.

1.3 A predominantly qualitative methodology was employed, in order to explore the thoughts/experiences of individuals who were involved with Playdagogy and facilitate participant 'voice'. Ethical approval was sought prior to the commencement of research activities and relevant procedures relating to safeguarding, consent and anonymity were followed. In summary, research activities within this evaluation included: pre- and post-training surveys for educators; observations of Playdagogy activity sessions; individual interviews with adult stakeholders; and focus group discussions with young people.

1.4 Data were collated and analysed to identify key findings and points of interest. Quantitative data relating to participants' responses in the surveys were used to generate descriptive statistics. Qualitative data were analysed thematically using a constructivist grounded theory approach, in order to ascertain various groups' views regarding their experience/understanding of Playdagogy and identify factors for potential programme development.

1.5 Findings are presented in 3 sections: feedback from the pre- and post-training surveys; key themes emerging from the interviews (adult perspective); and key themes emerging from the focus groups discussions (youth perspective).

(i) Finding from the **survey data** indicate that: there is a perceived value to Playdagogy for practitioners working with young people in sport/physical activity

contexts; although many educators feel they already have inclusive practice they acknowledge they could benefit from greater knowledge in this area; Playdagogy training is perceived to be sufficient at present, but could be enhanced (e.g. longer/more sessions, focus on activities for specific impairments more context-specific discussions).

(ii) Findings from the **interview data** indicate that: while Playdagogy is perceived to have value, there is debate about where it best 'fits' within the school curriculum; adapting activities to meet the needs of a specific context and group of participants is perceived to be vital; and impact is felt to be enhanced when there is 'buy-in' (from educators, school staff and participants) and where transfer of learning is explicitly encouraged.

(iii) Findings from the **focus group data** suggest that: Playdagogy sessions are viewed positively and are perceived to offer something 'different' from normal PE lessons; young people value the opportunity to take part in the sessions with individuals from across school years/class groups; improved communication skills are perceived to be a key benefit of Playdagogy; there is a mixed picture in terms of the transfer of learning from activity sessions to wider school/day-to-day life; the level of engagement of teaching staff is important in articulating and reinforcing educational messages.

1.6 Key messages to highlight are that the CH Playdagogy programme is perceived to offer something 'different' and have a valuable role to play with regard to equipping practitioners to deliver inclusive sport/physical activity sessions. In addition, there are clear benefits for those who participate in the programme, most notably in terms of enhanced understanding of impairment and knowledge of activities/games to enhance inclusive practice (for educators/teachers) and developing social/communication skills (for young people).

1.7 Key recommendations for programme development include: considering whether multiple training sessions might better facilitate the acquisition of challenging material and support its translation into practice within specific contexts; looking more carefully at the process of 'engagement' and thinking about if/how 'buy-in' to Playdagogy ideals can be encouraged more via the training process or initial conversations with schools; and considering whether the creation of additional resources for schools to aid the exploration of key messages outside of activity sessions might support transfer of learning and identify Playdagogy as a more cross-curricular programme.

1.8 It is hoped that the information outlined in this report, alongside that contained within the Leeds report, can go some way to enhancing the pedagogical potential of Playdagogy and its impact on individuals/organisations in the future.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The Playdagogy programme was first developed by Pl4y International. Originally designed for use with children aged 6 to 11 years, it has been implemented within many French primary schools and has been adapted for use within non-educational settings. According to its originators, Playdagogy is a teaching methodology supporting children's learning and development through the playing of games and sports. The programme seeks to convey educational 'messages' via the medium of games/physical activities, providing young people with an active and fun pathway to learning. Cambridge House (CH) has collaborated with Pl4y International to bring Playdagogy to the UK, adapting it to be employed with young people aged 5-13 years. The educational messages CH wished to convey within its programme relate to the issue of disability discrimination. CH's version of Playdagogy seeks to challenge disability discrimination by promoting inclusion for all within sport/game activities, questioning disabling attitudes, fostering positive attitudes towards disabled people and positive interactions between disabled and non-disabled peers. The goal is to enable and empower disabled children whilst raising awareness of disability discrimination amongst, and creating 'allies' of, their non-disabled peers.

According to CH, the desired outcomes of its Playdagogy programme include:

(a) Creation of educational tools and an accredited curriculum around disability that is fun and inclusive;
(b) Development of a pedagogical methodology based upon sport;
(c) Creation of opportunities for 'Voice' for disabled children and for shared experiential learning;
(d) An increased participation of disabled children aged 5-12 in sport;
(e) An increased capacity of educators to address issues around disability with children;
(f) Better understanding among educators and non-disabled children of disabilities, inclusion, equality and adaptation.

CH hopes that this initiative will contribute to a reshaping of the culture around disability and sport, help to reduce discrimination and create a more equitable and just society.

In using games/physical activities as a vehicle through which to transmit educational messages to young people, Playdagogy contributes to a growing body of work on positive youth development (e.g. Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005; Holt, 2008; Armour &

Sandford, 2013) and Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) (e.g. Kidd, 2008; Giulianotti, 2011; Darnell, 2012). In both cases, there is an acknowledgement of the 'power' of sport to excite and engage young people, as well as offer opportunities to enhance personal, social and moral development and contribute more widely to positive, sustainable social developments. Indeed, the UN General Assembly Resolution (A/RES/63/135) specifically affirms the role of sport 'as a means to promote health, education, development and peace'. In focusing upon promoting understanding of inclusion and disability, Playdagogy can also be perceived to reflect a growing recognition of the importance of ensuring inclusion and equity in sport for disabled young people, critiquing "normalized conceptions and practices in youth sport" that have meant that physical education has not always been a 'happy place' for disabled children (Fitzgerald, 2009, 3-5). In this respect, the Playdagogy programme also contributes to initiatives such as TOP Sportsability (Youth Sport Trust), the Inclusion Spectrum framework (Stevenson & Black, 2011) and Mixed Ability Sport (www.mixedabilitysports.org).

In terms of an underlying philosophies, or theoretical framings, there appear to be three main perspectives underpinning the Playdagogy programme:

1. **Constructivist perspectives of learning** (Rovegno & Dolly, 2006) with pedagogical practice being shaped around techniques of questioning, problem-solving and debate (MacDonald, 2013) to encourage young people's active involvement in constructing knowledge and understanding in collaboration with those around them.

2. **Play-based education** (Henricks 2015) in which play is thought to promote child development including their social and emotional progress and to act as a laboratory in which children learn skills for life.

3. **Anti-oppressive education**, in particular an approach that Kumashiro (2000) has termed **'Education About the Other'** (EAO), which seeks to challenge stereotypes and social biases, promote empathy and encourage children to understand that 'people are different and difference should be celebrated' (Beckett 2015, 79).

Finally, CH's version of Playdagogy is informed by a particular conceptualisation of 'disability'. The original Playdagogy programme, which included a module entitled 'Le Handicap' was developed in France; it therefore reflects French 'disability politics'. CH has worked to adapt the original resources to reflect disability politics in the UK and a 'social model' understanding of disability. This model, which originates within the disabled people's movement in the UK, distinguishes between impairment (understood as a long-term limitation of a person's physical, mental or sensory

function) and disability (understood as a form of social oppression experienced by people who have impairments when they encounter a range of barriers - physical, economic, political, social and cultural - within a disabling society). The model has been said to have an 'educative function' (Barton 2003) potentially helping students to understand that disability is a social construction/creation and thus contestable.

1.2 Research Aims

In short, the CH Playdagogy programme can be seen to have two key goals:

1. To enhance the participation of disabled children in sport and make sport more 'inclusive'.

2. To develop a sports-based program infused with/influenced by an anti-(dis)ableist pedagogy that seeks to challenge disability discrimination more broadly.

Informed by a participatory perspective of evaluation, this research was designed to comprise two distinct but interconnected strands, each one focused on these core 'goals', as described below:

Strand 1 (led by Loughborough University) focused upon the first goals. It explored how Playdagogy: seeks to increase participation of disabled children aged 5-13 in sport; addresses accessibility in/of sport; enhances educators and non-disabled children's understanding of disability, inclusion and equality in sport; and creates opportunities for 'voice' for disabled children in relation to participation in sport.

Strand 2 (led by the University of Leeds) focused upon the second goal. It explored the extent to which Playdagogy: creates a 'fun and inclusive' sports-based 'methodology' for addressing 'disability discrimination'; facilitates the 'voice' of disabled children; allows both disabled and non-disabled children to learn about/challenge the concepts of disability and disability discrimination; and impacts the confidence/capacity of educators to address issues around disability, equality and inclusion with children.

Although distinct in terms of focus, findings from the two strands of the evaluation should be viewed together in order to give a holistic view of programme impact.

1.3 Report structure

This report documents the findings of the evaluation of the CH Playdagogy Programme, undertaken between January and December 2015. The report outlines the core research activities undertaken and presents data relating to: the

observation of Playdagogy sessions by the research team; the perspectives of those involved in the development, training and delivery of Playdagogy sessions; and the experiences of participants (a youth voice perspective). As noted above, this particular report is concerned with presenting data relating to *Strand 1* of the evaluation and, as such, it has a specific focus on how Playdagogy increases the participation of disabled children in sport/games and addresses issues around accessibility to/in sport. Importantly, it also focuses on how the programme facilitates educators' and non-disabled children's understanding of disability, inclusion and equality in sport.

This report builds upon the mid-term report (submitted June 2015) and provides an overview of the data collated throughout the evaluation. This introduction is followed by a brief section outlining the research methods and data analysis process (Section 2) before a results section provides an overview of the key findings (Section 3). The final section seeks to summarise key messages from the evaluation and outline implications for programme development (Section 4) before the report closes with references and appendices.

2. Methods

2.1 Overview of the Research

This evaluation employed a predominantly qualitative methodology, designed to explore the thoughts and experiences of various individuals who were involved with the Playdagogy programme. By providing numerous opportunities for open answers and explanation/expansion of comments, this approach also sought to deliberately seek out, hear and acknowledge participant 'voice' (Bodgan and Biklen 1998). Techniques that give voice and articulate participant perspectives have been identified as a valuable means of enhancing participants' engagement with the research process and are viewed as particularly useful within qualitative research (e.g. Chandler et al., 2015). Moreover, there is growing recognition that such approaches are essential when undertaking research with young people (Hallett & Prout, 2003), particularly those who may be considered vulnerable or marginalised (e.g. Sandford et al., 2010).

2.2 Ethical Approval

Ethical approval for this evaluation was sought prior to the commencement of research activities. As there are two distinct strands to the work (see section 1.2) it was necessary to seek ethical clearance through both partner institutions; at Loughborough, this was via the Ethics Approvals (Human Participants) Sub-Committee [Ref no. R15-P009]. In both cases, this process ensured that the research team complied with requirements relating to safeguarding procedures, informing participants about the research, obtaining necessary consent and ensuring anonymity of individuals and organisations.

2.3 Data Collection

A mixed method approach was developed for this research, in order to facilitate the generation of relevant data and support opportunities for participant voice. The research activities undertaken included: pre- and post-training surveys for those who will/may deliver Playdagogy (hereafter termed educators); observations of Playdagogy sessions in a number of case study schools; individual interviews with various stakeholders (including CH staff and educators); and focus group discussions with young people.

5

In summary, data were collated through the following methods:

1. Pre and Post-Training Surveys

Two surveys were designed (in collaboration with CH) to be distributed to educators who took part in Playdagogy training. These made use of some Likert-scales as well as including both open and closed questions and were intended to determine the impact of the training on individuals' understanding of and preparedness for delivering Playdagogy [see Appendix 1 for survey questions]. Across the period of the evaluation approximately 16 training sessions were delivered, but for the purpose of this report a sample of 6 training sessions (comprising a range of 'contexts') has been analysed.

2. Observations

Semi-structured observations of a purposeful sample of Playdagogy sessions were carried out within schools. These were selected to include sessions run in diverse contexts and at different stages in the programme and were intended to: examine the Playdagogy programme 'in action'; consider the perceived effectiveness of different elements of the initiative; identify elements that appeared to work well; and highlight potential areas for development. In total, 6 schools were visited and 10 observations undertaken.

3. Interviews

Semi-structured individual interviews were conducted with key adult stakeholders involved in the development and delivery of Playdagogy. These interviews were conducted face-to-face or via telephone. In each case, the interviews were broadly intended to explore individuals' understanding and perception of Playdagogy, as well as the perceived impact of the programme on those who participate in it (See Appendix 2 for interview schedules). In total, 4 individual interviews were undertaken; 1 with a member of CH staff and 3 with educators (2 teachers and one youth worker).

4. Focus Groups

Focus group discussions were undertaken with some young people (both those with and without impairments) who had participated in Playdagogy sessions within the case study schools; one towards the beginning of the activity sessions and one towards the end (although in some cases only one discussion was possible). These were broadly intended to explore individuals' thoughts about/experiences of Playdagogy (see Appendix 3 for focus group schedules). In

total, 11 focus group discussions were undertaken in the 6 schools, involving approximately 50 pupils.

2.4 Data Analysis

Data generated through the research activities were collated and analysed to identify key findings and points of interest. The quantitative data relating to participants' responses in the surveys were collated and this numerical information was then used to generate descriptive statistics relating to, for example, individuals' current practice, understanding of Playdagogy and assessment of training effectiveness. With regard to the qualitative data, the focus groups and individual interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. These transcriptions, along with the open-ended responses from the surveys and observation field notes, were collated and analysed thematically using an approach akin to constructivist grounded theory (see Charmaz, 2000; Harry, Sturges & Klingner, 2005) in order to ascertain various groups' views regarding their experience/understanding of Playdagogy and identify factors to feed into on-going programme development. This constructivist approach facilitated a reading of the data in line with key programme features and evaluation aims, as well as opening up opportunities to identify novel or unexpected outcomes (Armour et al., 2013).

3. Analysis of Data

The following analysis of data is presented in 3 sections: feedback from the pre- and post-training surveys; key themes emerging from the individual interviews with programme staff/educators (adult perspective); and key themes emerging from the focus groups with young people (youth perspective). The observation data will be drawn upon to provide additional context and insight across all three areas. Key messages relating to programme effectiveness and potential development are highlighted throughout.

3.1 Pre- and Post-Training Surveys

As noted in section 2.3, for the purpose of this evaluation a sample of six training sessions was identified (from the 16 delivered) and an analysis of the data collated within these undertaken.

3.1.1 Pre-Training Survey

Pre-training survey feedback from the six sessions reviewed was received from 58 participants, 46 of whom were male and 12 were female. Of these fifty-eight, 54 identified as having no disability, while 4 elected not to answer this question. The participants ranged in age from 16 – 50+ years, with the majority (72%) being between the ages of 19 and 35 years. The participants all had experience of working with young people within an educational context, with the majority (83%) working with individuals in Key Stage 1 (5-7 years) and Key Stage 2 (7-11 years); although around a third of the participants also indicated they regularly worked with older age groups (see Table 1).

➤ *This would seem to be consistent with the target age range for the Playdagogy programme, but also indicates the perceived potential for the initiative to impact older age groups.*

Q.1 What Key Stage do you currently work with?					
	Key Stage 1 5-7 years	Key Stage 2 7-11 years	Key Stage 3 11-14 years	Key Stage 4 14-16 years	+16
No. of participants	48	48	21	23	20

Table 1: Participant responses regarding the ages of children they work with

The majority of participants (n=41) indicated that they 'currently work with disabled children', although over a quarter (n=15) noted that they did not. The data also indicate that most participants (74%) had experience of working with young people

with learning impairments (n=43) although there was also significant experience of visual impairments (n=32), hearing impairments (n= 38) and mobility impairments (n=33). In addition, two individuals indicated that they had experience of 'Other' impairments, citing 'Autism' and 'Mental Health' as examples.

Although 71% of educators noted that they currently work with disabled children, only 33% of respondents (n=19) commented that they had received previous training relating to work in this area. Similarly, the responses given in the survey suggest a perceived lack of knowledge with regard to supporting disabled children to take part in physical activities and/or games, with 78% of respondents indicating that they either 'don't feel confident in my knowledge' or 'know a little but could know more'. A further 9% indicated that they were 'unsure' of their specific knowledge in this area.

> *This would seem to emphasise the importance of the Playdagogy programme for physical activity/sport practitioners, as a means of supporting their day-to-day practice.*

When asked how included they feel young people with disabilities are in their sessions, the majority of respondents (67%) noted that they felt they were 'fully included' or 'included enough'; suggesting that there was sufficient pedagogical knowledge to facilitate some level of inclusion. Nonetheless, the survey data also hint at the potential for improvement in this respect. Certainly, the qualitative responses to open-ended questions within the survey (see Appendix 1, questions 6 and 7) shed some light on the educators' thoughts, needs and perspectives with regard to supporting inclusion in sport/physical activity. For example, when asked about what they felt the 'key message' to convey to young people about disability and disabled people was, many educators embraced a rhetoric of inclusion. For example:

> *"I believe that all children should be treated the same and that everyone should be included no matter what the game is"*

> *"Sport is just as important (as other areas) and we all have rights to the knowledge"*

> *"ALL children, regardless of any disability they may or may not have, should be able to fully participate in all areas of life to the best of their ability"*

In addition, when asked to identify what they hoped to gain from the training session, it was clear that enhanced knowledge of impairments and how to support inclusion of all young people within sport/games-type activities were key factors for many educators. As the following quotes indicate:

"I hope to gain a better understanding regarding disabled people and how to better include them and integrate them into sporting activities"

"The ability and confidence to deal with children with a disability and knowing how to include them"

"How to change activities to benefit those (disabled) children, knowledge of disabilities"

Interestingly, there were also comments from some educators that suggested they saw sport/games as a vehicle for promoting wider messages about inclusion, as the following comment indicates:

"How to include all students into the sports we do and let me know how to make other children include students with disabilities in everything, not just sports"

➢ *Although educators already embrace the principles of inclusion, they recognise a need for specific information that can support processes of inclusion; Playdagogy is viewed as a means of facilitating this.*

3.1.2 Post-Training Survey

Post-training surveys were completed by 56 participants. The data collated from these surveys indicate a largely positive response to the training. Certainly, the responses indicate that all participants felt relatively confident that they could deliver Playdagogy sessions following the training, with 33 respondents (59%) commenting they felt 'very confident' and the remaining 23 respondents (41%) noting they felt 'confident enough'.

➢ *This suggests that the training is perceived to provide sufficient detail to allow individuals to understand the aims and objectives of the programme and gain some level of appreciation as to how they might implement it within their own practice.*

In addition to this quantitative data, the qualitative responses to open-ended questions (see Appendix 1, questions 5, 9 & 10) also identified perceived benefits with regard to enhanced knowledge, understanding and the translation of this into practice. For example, when asked what they felt they had 'gained' from the training, educators talked about having increased confidence regarding issues of impairment/inclusion, being able to understand situations better and having capacity to plan activities to engage young people with varying abilities. For example:

> *"Now I will be able to include all children and give them more creativity and freedom in the lesson"*

> *"More enjoyable and inclusive sessions for all young people in my group"*

> *"Increased confidence in discussing complex issues around disability and awareness. New and interesting methods of delivering education through sport and play"*

While there were many positives, the qualitative data also identified some potential areas for development within the *'Playdagogy'* training sessions. For example, when asked whether the training could have covered anything else, the educators made some important comments with regard to: the length of the training; knowledge of activities for specific disabilities; more discussion around the practicalities of delivering *'Playdagogy'* within different contexts; and the challenge of managing a balance between discussion and activity. For example:

> *"It could have been longer"*

> *"Maybe a bit more on the practicalities of how and when coaches can implement these (activities) as part of their deliver"*

> *"How to deal with teachers/heads who thing you/the children should be active at all times"*

> *"Specific activities for specific disabilities"*

Interestingly, the observation data also support this perceived need for additional/ongoing support.

> ➤ *These suggestions point to a perceived need by some educators for additional information to support their understanding and implementation of the Playdagogy principles, particularly in their own contexts.*

3.2 Interview Data

Over the course of the evaluation, 4 individual interviews were conducted with adults involved in the design and delivery of Playdagogy sessions; one interview with a member of CH staff and three with educators (2 teachers and 1 youth worker). The analysis of the data collated via these interviews highlights a number of key issues:

1. Perceived Value of Playdagogy
A key theme within all of the interviews was the perceived need for and value of the Playdagogy programme. It was felt to offer something 'different' to other initiatives

and fulfil various requirements for schools and organisations. One educator commented that he valued the focus on *"learning through activity"* and having sport as a vehicle for development; while another spoke of the potential for the programme to deliver both physical activity and personal development objectives (*"I think it fits quite nicely with the PE and PSHE curricula"*). In addition, one individual commented that it was the focus on *"being able to manipulate games to make them more inclusive"* that drew him to the programme.

However, there was also some debate around how to 'badge' Playdagogy and where it 'fits' best within the school curriculum; as one educator commented *"is it PE or is it something else?".* While it was acknowledged that the programme could naturally contribute to a PE offer (given its focus on using sport/games), there were also evident tensions with regard to whether it could fulfil physical activity 'targets'. For example, one educator commented that they had worried the children *"weren't active enough"*, so had increased the length of sessions to facilitate the inclusion of discussion <u>and</u> activity. In addition, some educators felt that it had a better fit within the PSHE (Personal, Social and Health Education) or citizenship elements of the curriculum. A number of individuals talked about 'optimal' conditions for Playdagogy, with one person suggesting that it may work best with *"smaller groups…to facilitate discussion"* and another recommending its use with older age groups (*"with the younger ones…to get them to stop at the end and have a discussion…it can only go so deep"*).

2. *Thoughts about Activity Sessions*

It was clear from the interview with programme staff that the Playdagogy activities had been carefully thought through in terms of the messages they are intended to convey. This shows careful consideration in terms of design, which was also evident in some of the educators' understanding (*"some of the activities are really good in terms of getting messages across"*). However, it was not always clear whether the underlying principles were completely understood (or acknowledged) by the educators. For example, in one observation the researcher commented *"Is this Playdagogy? It's not clear – I'm not sure any explanation has been given for the game that is being played".*

It was clear from both the interviews and observations that some activities were perceived to be 'easier' to use than others, with educators favouring those that were more simplistic or had a more 'obvious' message (*"we want the children to discover the answers themselves through the activities"*). There were some concerns expressed about activities that were more complex, with suggestions that these could lead to messages being obscured, young people (particularly those with impairments) disengaging/being side-lined and educators having to *"give the*

answers". One educator also felt there was perhaps an *"over-reliance on team games"* which fuelled the competitive nature of individuals; favouring those without impairments and, at times, inhibiting inclusion.

3. Impact of Playdagogy

All of the educators interviewed noted positive elements of Playdagogy. Some individuals talked about the value of the training, while others highlighted its capacity to enhance their practice or aid young people's enjoyment/development. One individual described how the training had changed the way he and his team thought about inclusion (describing it as being *"a kit for their minds"*) while another commented on the way it had encouraged children to *"include other people more"*. It was evident that educators saw benefits for young people in terms of teamwork, understanding of impairments and confidence to get involved and 'play together'. In addition, it was clear that there was an aspiration for this to transfer beyond the activity sessions (*"I was thinking, well hopefully if they do something like this and see how easy it is to adapt the games that they play to include other people that (it) will take them outside of their social situation and into the classroom"*). However, there was also recognition that this would require the engagement of participants and school staff (see point 5, below).

4. Importance of 'Fitting' the Activities to the Context

Another key point raised by all of the interviewees was the importance of ensuring that activities were adapted to fit the specific needs of individuals and contexts. It was evident that this was an expectation of CH (being articulated during training sessions) but was also a key factor for educators. For example, one individual noted that they had adapted some of the game ideas, as they had foreseen that some of the young people in the session would have struggled to play *"in an inclusive manner"*. He had also reworded some of the questions for the discussion elements of certain games, in order to better fit the perceived levels of understanding in the class. In addition, another educator noted that they had felt the need to *"simplify the message"* at times, in order to ensure that the young people involved understood. A benefit of this, he commented, was that he had subsequently observed the young people adapting the games themselves. Likewise, another educator spoke of varying the length and detail of the discussion element of the sessions, depending on factors such as the *"age and context"* of participants. Some difficulties were also mentioned, however, with regard to adapting activities. For example, one educator highlighted the case of an activity that he felt could not be adapted to meet the needs of participants (*"we had one activity we just ruled out straight away...cross the river...we've got guys in the wheelchairs and we thought...how can we adapt it for the second part of the game?"*) while the field

notes from one observation include a note cautioning against the *"over-complication of games"* through adaptation.

5. Engagement and 'Buy-in'

As noted above, the educators identified transfer of learning as being a key potential impact of Playdagogy. However, the interviews also highlighted some views about the complexity of this process, with one educator noting that transfer required *"the key ideas being embedded throughout"*. Moreover, there was recognition of the role of the wider school/teaching staff in this process (*"they need to grasp the ideas"*). The same educator noted that many primary teachers lack specific knowledge about adapting sport/games are *"wary of inclusive activities"*, so he argued there is a need for *"ready knowledge"* to support their practice in this respect. The observation data certainly support the view that engagement of teaching staff facilitates potential impact, with more positive sessions being those in which school staff (both teachers and teaching assistants/carers) observe the activities being delivered, ask question themselves and engage with the discussion elements of the sessions.

Key messages from the interview data:
- *Playdagogy offers something 'different' but some attention is needed to determine its best 'fit' in the school curriculum; this may also help to enhance its pedagogical potential.*
- *Simple activities are often perceived to work best in terms of transmitting messages and care should be taken to avoid over-complication of games or the over-emphasis of competition at the expense of inclusion.*
- *The active engagement of all parties (educators, school staff and young people) is recognised as vital in terms of facilitating positive and sustained impact.*

3.3 Focus Group Data

Focus group discussions took place with young people in 6 schools following the observation of activity sessions. Each focus group discussion comprised between 2 and 5 children (the majority involved 4) and included both those with and without impairments. It was initially intended that the same children would participate in the first and second focus group discussions (i.e. towards the beginning and end of programme activities) but this was not always achieved. In addition, it should be noted that in some cases only one focus group discussion was possible. A thematic analysis of the data generated through these group discussions, supported by field notes, led to the emergence of a number of key themes, each reflecting the thoughts, perspectives and experiences of the young people involved in the

14

Playdagogy activity sessions. These are outlined in the table below, along with an explanation of the theme and some illustrative quotes (see Table 2).

Key messages from the focus group data:

➢ *Playdagogy sessions were perceived as being enjoyable and offering something different to usual 'PE'; this was attributed both to the novelty of the activities and the mixing of ages/year groups.*

➢ *The core benefits of Playdagogy are perceived to be enhanced social/communication skills, but some individuals also recognise knowledge gained in terms of understanding issues of impairment/inclusion.*

➢ *The extent to which transfer of learning is recognised/understood by young people varies across contexts, suggesting that there is variable practice from educators/schools in this respect.*

➢ *Although opportunities for disabled 'voice' are facilitated within the Playdagogy structure, these voices are still somewhat muted in practice; additional thought with regard to how to facilitate/encourage opportunities for 'voice' (beyond questioning) may be needed here.*

Theme	Explanation of Theme Issues	Illustrative Quotes
ENJOYMENT OF PLAYDAGOGY SESSIONS	• The overwhelming response from young people when asked about Playdagogy was that they had enjoyed the activity sessions; • The activity sessions were often described as being 'good', 'fun' and 'interesting'; • The novel games and delivery style of the educators were two key factors in young people's enjoyment.	*"It was fun because we get to do different things to usual"* *"The young people all seem engaged, there are smiles and a lot of the children are laughing as they cheer on team-mates"* [observation notes] *"It helped us learn in a fun and active way"*
COLLABORATIVE NATURE OF THE ACTIVITIES	• One of the things young people most enjoyed about the Playdagogy sessions was the ability to spend time with friends; • A number of children also identified making new friends as a benefit of Playdagogy; • The mixing of ages and year groups was a key factor within this theme; • Playdagogy games were also recognised as being inclusive and encouraging people to work together.	*"Yes, it is good because you can make new friends and things"* *"I enjoyed working together as a team. Working with different people that I don't usually play with"* *"I think it encourages us to play more with people we haven't played with before"* [What was the best thing about Playdagogy?] *"Getting to know people… you get to know new people as well as do the sports"*
DISTINCTION FROM 'USUAL' SCHOOL GAMES/ACTIVITIES	• It was evident that Playdagogy sessions were viewed as something different to the usual school PE offer; • The focus on learning about impairment and inclusion was identified as a unique factor, with the discussion elements of Playdagogy seen as important here; • A number of children commented that they felt Playdagogy sessions were better than their usual PE provision; • However, some children noted that they preferred their usual PE lessons, as they could be more active.	*"They (Playdagogy sessions) include disabilities and in normal PE they don't"* *"In PE we only learn about one or two things, but we learn about a variety of things (in Playdagogy)"* *"It's more fun (than normal PE) because we do warm ups in a different way, because we do it like…how…a disabled Paralympian would do it"* *"I like PE more, we can play more games and be more competitive"*

DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL SKILLS	• When asked what benefits they felt they had received from Playdagogy, the most common response was the development of communication skills; • The requirement to work collaboratively in some activities was seen to develop teamwork and communication skills; • There was a recognition that individuals need to learn to work together to help each other.	*[What do you think you have learnt?] "socialising, communicating, learning things from each other"* *"It's taught me that when someone has a disability, I should help them get involved"* *"We weren't doing very well in the game so (the educator) told us we had to talk to each other to work out what to do"*
INCONSISTENT FOCUS ON TRANSFER	• Some young people were able to talk quite confidently about how they might transfer the understanding gained from Playdagogy to other aspects of their school and day-to-day life; • Other pupils struggled to see the relevance of Playdagogy beyond the activity sessions themselves; • The degree to which transfer was overtly discussed and reinforced by educators and teaching staff within the sessions seems to play a key role here (from observation notes).	*"They're (the messages from Playdagogy) helpful when we're playing in the playground…(we can) take some of the ideas from theme onto the playground and make them public"* *When the pupils struggle to answer a question about the meaning of impairment (the educator) encourages them by saying 'think about what we've talked about over the past few weeks' [observation notes]* *The students appear to be just playing football and when I asked about what the educators talk to them about, they just mentioned rules and tactics. [observation notes]*
DOMINANCE ON NON-DISABLED 'VOICE'	• It was evident that the majority of discussion about Playdagogy came from the non-disabled children; • As such, there was often a sense of their comments referring to 'others' and distancing themselves from the experiences they talked about; • There was also occasionally a perceived need for those without impairments to 'help' those who have them (a suggestion of 'helplessness'); • The voices of disabled students were also noticeably muted within activity sessions, although some young people did speak up.	*"it's like if we see a person on the street who is deaf or like blind, we can guide them"* *There is a lot of talk of 'they' within the young people's conversations [observation notes]* *Although the educators are making a point of asking the disabled children their views on certain questions, they rarely say more than a few words. The dominant voices are those of the non-disabled pupils – they seem more confident to speak (perhaps more used to answering questions?). [observation notes]*

Table 2: Summary of findings from the focus group data

4. Summary of Key Findings

This section summarises the core messages arising from the analysis and highlights key implications for programme practice. It is intended that these findings will help to facilitate the ongoing improvement and development of the CH Playdagogy programme.

4.1 Survey Data

In summary, the survey data indicate that:

- There is a perceived value to the Playdagogy programme for practitioners working with young people in sport/physical activity contexts;
- Although many felt they do a sufficient job with regard to supporting inclusion in their practice, the majority of educators still felt they could benefit from greater knowledge of how to best support the inclusion of disabled children through sports/physical activities;
- The Playdagogy training is perceived to be sufficient to help transmit the core messages about the programme and prepare educators to implement some activities in practice, but some useful additions could be: to increase the time available; include information about activities for specific impairments; and create more opportunities for context-specific discussions/practice.

4.2 Interview Data

The data generated through the interviews with programme staff and educators highlight that:

- There is acknowledged value to the Playdagogy programme, but some debate about where it best 'fits' within the school curriculum;
- It is important to ensure that Playdagogy activities are adapted to meet the needs of a specific context and group of participants - both educators and school staff have a role to play here;
- There are potential benefits from participation in Playdagogy (for individuals and schools) but impact is enhanced when there is 'buy-in' from all stakeholders (educators, school staff and participants) and transfer of learning is encouraged.

4.3 Focus Group Data

The findings derived from the focus group discussions suggest that:

- Playdagogy activities are viewed positively and are recognised as being different to PE lessons, primarily due to the overt focus on impairment and inclusion;

- The opportunity to take part in the sessions with individuals from across school years and class groups is a positive element of the sessions;
- There are perceived benefits for young people from participation in Playdagogy, particularly in terms of improved communication skills;
- There is a mixed picture in terms of the transfer of learning; the level of engagement of educators/teaching staff in articulating and reinforcing educational messages is a key factor here.

4.4 Key Messages & Implications for Ongoing Programme Development

In summarising the data generated through this strand of the evaluation, it is important to note that:

- The CH Playdagogy programme is perceived to offer something 'different' and have a valuable role to play with regard to equipping practitioners to deliver inclusive sport/physical activity sessions and explore issues of disability discrimination with young people.
- There are clear benefits for those who participate in the programme. From an adult perspective, this is most notably in terms of enhanced understanding of impairment and knowledge of activities/games to enhance inclusive practice. For young people, the key benefits relate to developing social/communication skills.

In light of the above findings, the following comments/recommendations are also made for consideration by CH in terms of ongoing programme development.

- ➢ The existing training is seen as sufficient, but with potential to be enhanced. It may be worth considering whether multiple training sessions might better facilitate the acquisition of new (and challenging) material and support its translation into practice. Moreover, additional time may also serve to accommodate the desire, expressed by a number of educators, for more authentic, context-specific learning opportunities that would allow them to more clearly situate the learning within the communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) in which they work.

- ➢ Programme impact is clearly facilitated by the active engagement of individuals and 'buy-in' from school staff; this emphasises findings from previous research (see Armour et al., 2013). Essentially, this engagement allows key messages around impairment and inclusion to be heard, embraced and embedded within the broader school context. CH may wish to consider if/how 'buy-in' could be encouraged more via the training process and through initial conversations with schools.

➢ The transfer of learning is recognised as being vital in the field of positive youth development (e.g. Armour & Sandford, 2013) but has been identified as 'patchy' within this evaluation due to the variable practice of educators/schools. There would seem to be a real opportunity to enhance the impact of Playdagogy through encouraging a more effective transfer of learning from the activity sessions to wider school and community contexts. This could be done through increased emphasis on transfer within the training sessions, but also perhaps through the creation of additional resources for schools to support continued exploration of key Playdagogy messages outside of activity sessions. This may also help to clarify Playdagogy's relevance for and 'fit' with the broader school curriculum.

4.5 Summary

The key issues outlined above can be seen to represent a number of ways in which the CH Playdagogy programme can potentially be shaped and developed to enhance and improve the experience for those involved in delivering and undertaking activity sessions. It is evident that the programme has already had some positive impact and it is hoped that the information outlined in this evaluation report, alongside that contained within the Leeds report (relating to strand 2 of the evaluation) can go some way to enhancing the pedagogical potential of Playdagogy and its impact on individuals/organisation in future stages of the initiative.

References

Armour, K.M. & Sandford, R.A. (2013) Positive Youth Development through an Outdoor Physical Activity Programme: Evidence from a Four-Year Evaluation, *Educational Review*. 65(1), 85-108.

Armour, K.M., Sandford, R.A., Duncombe, R. (2013) Positive Youth Development and Physical Activity/Sport Interventions: Mechanisms leading to Sustained Impact, *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 18(3), 256-281.

Armour, K.M., Sandford, R.A., Duncombe, R. (2013) Positive Youth Development and Physical Activity/Sport Interventions: Mechanisms leading to Sustained Impact, *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 18(3), 256-281.

Barton, L. (2003) *Inclusive Education and Teacher Education. A Basis for Hope or a Discourse for Delusion.* London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Beckett, A.E. (2015) "Anti-oppressive pedagogy and disability: possibilities and challenges." *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 17 (1), 76-94.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998) Q*ualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods (3rd ed.).* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Chandler, R., Anstey, E. & Ross, H. (2015) Listening to Voices and Visualizing Data in Qualitative Research: Hypermodal Dissemination Possibilities. *Sage Open*. DOI: 10.1177/21558244015592166

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist & constructionist methods. In N.K Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd Edition) (pp. 509-536). London: Sage.

Darnell, S. (2012) *Sport for Development and Peace: A Critical Sociology*. London, Bloomsbury Academic.

Fitzgerald, H. (2009) (Ed) Disability and Youth Sport. London, Routledge.

Fraser-Thomas, J.L., Côté, J. & Deakin, J. 2005. Youth sport programs: an avenue to foster positive youth development. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy,* 10(1), 19-40.

Giulianotti, R. (2011) 'Sport, Transnational Peacemaking, and Global Civil Society: Exploring the Reflective Discourses of "Sport, Development, and Peace" Project Officials, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 35 (1), 50-71.

Hallett, C. & Prout, A. (2003) Hearing the Voices of Children. Abingdon, Oxon, RoutledgeFalmer.

Harry, B., Sturges, K.M., & Klingner, J.K. (2005). Mapping the process: An exemplar of process and challenge in grounded theory analysis. *Educational Researcher*, 34(2) 3-13.

Henricks, T.S. (2015) *Play and the Human Condition.* Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Holt, N. (2008) (Ed) *Positive Youth Development through Sport*. London, Routledge.

Kidd, B. (2008) A new social movement: Sport for development and peace. Sport in Society, 11(4), 370-380.

Kumashiro, K. K. (2000) ''Toward a Theory of Anti-oppressive Education.'' *Review of Educational Research*, 70 (1), 25-53.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacDonald, D. (2013) Understanding learning in physical education. In J. Wright, D. MacDonald & L. Burrows (Eds) C*ritical Inquiry and Problem-Solving in Physical Education* (pp. 16-30). Abingdon, Oxon, Routledge.

Rovegno, I. & Dolly, J.P (2006) Constructivist perspectives on learning. In, D. Kirk, D. MacDonald & M. O'Sullivan (Eds) *The Handbook of Physical Education* (pp.242-261). London, SAGE publications.

Sandford, R.A., Armour, K.M. & Duncombe, R. (2010) Finding their Voice: Disaffected Youth Insights on Sport/Physical Activity Interventions, in: M. O'Sullivan & A. MacPhail, *Young People's Voices in Physical Education and Sport* (pp.65-87). London: Routledge.

Stevenson, P. & Black, K. (2011) *The Inclusion Spectrum incorporating STEP*. Available via www.theinclusionclub.com

Weblinks
TOP Sportsability https://www.youthsporttrust.org/content/top-sportsability

Appendix 1

Playdagogy Training Surveys

1. Pre-training Survey
2. Post-training Survey

Pre-Training Evaluation for Playdagogy

Organisation: _____   Position:

_____

Age: _____   Gender: _____   Disabled: Y / N :

1. Which Key Stage are the children you currently work with in?

KS1 (5-7) ☐	KS2 (7-11) ☐	KS3 (11-14) ☐	KS4 (14-16) ☐	16+ ☐

2. Do you currently work with disabled young people?   Yes / No

   If Yes:

   a) How many?

1-5 ☐	5-10 ☐	10-20 ☐	20-50 ☐	50+☐

   b) Please indicate whether you have ever worked with a child or children who have:

1 Visual impairments ☐	2 Hearing impairments ☐	3 Learning disabilities/ cognitive impairments ☐	4 Mobility impairments ☐	5 Other impairments, please state:

   c) In your view, how included in physical activities and/or games are these children?

1 Not at all ☐	2 A little, but not enough ☐	2 Unsure ☐	4 'Enough' but we could do more ☐	5 Fully included ☐

3. Have you received any previous training about how to enable the participation of disabled children in physical activities and/or games?   Yes / No

4. How would you rate your current knowledge about how to support disabled children to take part in physical activities and/or games?

1 I don't feel confident in my knowledge ☐	2 I know a little, but could know more ☐	3 Unsure ☐	4 I have enough knowledge ☐	5 I am very knowledgeable ☐

5. How confident are you about talking to children (disabled and non-disabled) about what it is like to be a disabled person, disability discrimination and the importance of disability equality?

1 Not at all ☐	2 Not very ☐	3 Unsure ☐	4 Somewhat ☐	5 Very ☐

6. For you, what is the key 'message' to convey to all children about disability and disabled people?

_____
_____
_____
_____

_____

7. What skills or knowledge do you expect to get from the Playdagogy training?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

8. Do you think discrimination against disabled people is treated by schools as seriously and/or as important an issue as other 'ism's' such as sexism and racism? Y/N

   a) In a few words would you explain your answer please?

_____
_____
_____

Post-Training Evaluation for Playdagogy

Organisation: _____

Gender:_____   Age:_____

1. How confident are you that you can deliver a Playdagogy Session?

2 Not at all ☐	2 A little, but not enough☐	3 Unsure ☐	4 Enough, but could be more ☐	5 Very confident ☐

2. How confident are you in addressing issues around disability in the debate format of the sessions?

3 Not at all ☐	2 A little, but not enough☐	3 Unsure ☐	4 Enough, but could be more ☐	5 Very confident ☐

3. How do you feel you understand the social model of disability?

1 Not at all ☐	2 A little, but not enough☐	3 Unsure ☐	4 Enough, but could be more ☐	5 Very good understanding ☐

4. How effective do you think this model is for helping children understand issues related to disability?

1 Not at all ☐	2 OK, but not very effective ☐	3 Unsure ☐	4 Good but could be better ☐	5 Very effective ☐

5. What do you hope that you will gain from the experience of implementing Playdagogy?

_____
_____
_____

6. What are you hoping the children you work with will gain from Playdagogy?

_____
_____
_____

7. How did you rate the trainer?

1 Very poor ☐	2 OK, but could be better ☐	3 Unsure ☐	4 Good ☐	5 Very good ☐

b) If you answered 1, 2 or 3: What could have been done better?

8. Would you recommend this training to a friend/colleague?   Yes / No
a) If not, why not?

_____
_____
_____

9. Is there anything we didn't cover as part of the training that you would like to see included?

_____
_____
_____

10. If you have any further comments, queries or concerns please note these below:

_____
_____
_____
_____

Appendix 2

Educator Interview Schedule

Playdagogy Evaluation

Interview Schedule for Educators (teachers, coaches, youth workers who have implemented the programme)

1. How did you become involved with Cambridge House's Playdagogy Programme? (Follow-up questions about experience of Playdagogy training)

2. How would you describe the aims/goals of Playdagogy?

3. What were your aspirations for the Playdagogy programme a) personally (i.e. what did you hope you would 'gain')?; b) for the children/young people you work with (i.e. what did you hope they would 'gain'?)

4. How confident did you feel about implementing the programme?

5. Did you decide to adapt any of the programme e.g. individual sessions, or certain aspects of Playdagogy? If the answer to this question is 'yes', then why/how?

6. What would you say were the strengths of the Playdagogy programme? (Explore issues relevant to each strand of the evaluation)

7. Did you experience any challenges implementing the programme?

8. What, if any improvements do you think might be made to the Playdagogy programme?

9. If you were highlighting the positive outcomes of the Playdagogy programme as you implemented it, what would these be?

10. Would you do it again? (Explore reasons for answer of yes/no)

11. Are there any ways in which the ideas or approaches introduced within Playdagogy might be transferred to other activities in your school/centre?

12. Do you have any further comments or questions you would like to make/ask?

Appendix 3

Young people's focus group discussion schedules.

Evaluation of the Cambridge House Playdagogy Project

Focus Group Schedules for Young People

Interview 1

1. What do you think the Playdagogy project is all about?
   a. What have you heard about it?
   b. How has it been explained to you?

2. Why do you think you were you chosen to take part in the project?
   a. How did people get chosen?
   b. Who asked you if you wanted to take part?

3. What is it like doing these activities?
   a. With people from different year groups?
   b. Are they similar to activities you might do in PE/other lessons?
   c. How would you explain what you have done today to a parent, family member or friend?

4. What do you think you might learn through taking part in Playdagogy?
   a. What might it help you do?
   b. How do you think you will learn these things?
   c. What do you think the games you did today were trying to teach you?
   d. How might you be able to use your new skills/knowledge?
      i. At school/home

5. What have been the good things about Playdagogy so far?

6. What have been the difficult things?

7. What do you understand by the terms 'disability' and 'inclusion'?
   a. (Where) have you heard them used before?
   b. Are they words you hear at school/home?

8. Were there any things you were nervous/worried about before taking part in Playdagogy?

9. Do you have any questions you would like to ask about Playdagogy?

Interview 2

1. What can you tell me about the things you have done in Playdagogy so far?
    a. What activities have been done?
    b. What issues have been covered?

2. What did you enjoy most about being involved in the Playdagogy project?
    a. Which was your favourite session?
    b. Favourite activity?
    c. Why?

3. Was there anything that you found difficult about Playdagogy?
    a. Any particular activity/session?
    b. Why?

4. Could anything have been improved/made more fun for you and/or for others?
    a. With regard to the activities?
    b. With regard to the discussions?
    c. With regard to the settings/location?

5. Did you learn anything new or surprising from the Playdagogy sessions?

6. If you were explaining to a friend or their family what Playdagogy is 'all about', what would you say?

7. Thinking about things outside of the Playdagogy project, what do you think could be done to help disabled and non-disabled children play together better?

8. Has your understanding of the terms 'disability' and 'inclusion' changed at all?
    a. How is this different?

9. Is there anything else you would like to ask/say about Playdagogy?