



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

Evaluation of Cambridge House's Playdagogy Project

FINAL REPORT

April 2016

Prepared by:

Dr Angharad Beckett,
Associate Professor of Political Sociology,
Deputy Director of the Centre for Disability Studies,
School of Sociology & Social Policy,
University of Leeds,
Leeds,
LS2 9JT.

Tel: 0113 3434409

Email: A.E.Beckett@leeds.ac.uk

© Angharad E. Beckett, University of Leeds.



"I learnt that just because someone's disabled it doesn't mean that they are totally different from you...like *they're humans too*. ...I thought they were different...before we started Playdagogy"

Quote from child respondent in Playdagogy Evaluation.

Executive Summary

Cambridge House's (CH) Playdagogy programme seeks to convey educational 'messages' via the medium of games and physical activities, offering young people an active and fun pathway to learning. CH has chosen to make 'disability discrimination' the focus of its Playdagogy programme. This is important because discrimination against disabled people remains a significant problem within the UK and internationally. In seeking to challenge this form of discrimination via a sports-based education programme, CH is a pioneer. To date, insufficient work has been undertaken vis-a-vis anti-oppressive education and disability. Whilst some work has been undertaken to conceptualise 'anti-disablist' or 'anti-ableist' pedagogies, this work is seldom traced into associated curricula, teaching and learning strategies. CH's Playdagogy Programme is therefore an important and innovative development.

This report summarises findings from Strand 2 of an evaluation study of the Playdagogy Programme. This strand was conducted by Dr Angharad Beckett, University of Leeds. Strand 2 focused upon whether/how Playdagogy functions as a sports- or play-based educational methodology for addressing disability discrimination and promoting positive attitudes towards disabled people; whether/how it enhances shared experiential learning about disability within school/non-school settings; and whether/how it increases the capacity of educators to address issues around disability with children.

The study involved interviews with CH staff and educators involved in implementing Playdagogy; analysis of pre- and post-training surveys completed by educators trained to implement Playdagogy; observations of Playdagogy sessions; focus group discussions with child participants in Playdagogy sessions.

Key findings were as follows:

- a) Playdagogy training enhances the knowledge and confidence of educators, supporting them to address issues relating to disability and discrimination with children.
- b) The Playdagogy Programme challenges disabling attitudes and encourages children to develop more positive and enabling attitudes towards disabled peers and others.

These findings are encouraging. In relation to further development of Playdagogy, the following recommendations are proposed:

Key recommendations include, that CH:

- a) staff be sensitive to and challenging of persistent attitudes held by educators that reflect an 'Individual Model' understanding of disability.
- b) extends its training for educators to allow them to gain a better understanding of the Social Model of Disability and to prepare them for challenging and sensitive discussion points.
- c) provides additional resources for educators which would allow them to enhance their understanding of disability politics prior to implementing Playdagogy.
- d) considers providing educators with advice about, or directing them towards existing resources that support the transfer of key messages of Playdagogy into other school activities.
- e) ensures educators understand connections between the Playdagogy games/activities and discussion.
- f) considers how best to support children to engage critically with 'Tragedy Model' thinking about disability and to question and transform 'the norm'. The final Playdagogy session 'Get Creative' has excellent potential in this regard, but could be enhanced further.
- g) is informed by the responses of children within this evaluation and includes more opportunity for discussion about assistive technologies, inclusive design and issues of 'fairness'.
- h) considers forming a collaboration with a disabled people's organisation in the development of Playdagogy, drawing upon their expertise in 'disability equality training' and demonstrating its understanding of a core principle within the disabled people's movement of 'Nothing About Us Without Us'.

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Introduction to the Playdagogy Programme	5
1.2 Key Challenges/Dilemmas	7
1.3 Introduction to the Evaluation Study	10
1.4 Structure of the Report	11
2. Methodology	12
2.1 Overview of Research	12
2.2 Ethical Approval	12
2.3 Data Collection	12
2.4 Data Analysis	15
3. Findings	16
3.1 Conversation with Cambridge House Staff	16
3.2 Surveys of Educators	17
3.3 Interviews with Educators	20
3.4 Focus Groups with Children	21
4. Conclusion and Recommendations	26
5. References	28
Appendix 1: Playdagogy Training Surveys	30
Appendix 2: Educator Interview Schedules	35
Appendix 3: Child Focus Group Interview Schedules	37

1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction to the Playdagogy Programme

The Playdagogy programme was first developed by P14y International. Originally designed for use with children aged 6 to 11 years, it has been implemented within many French primary schools and 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. It seeks to convey educational 'messages' via the medium of games and physical activities, providing young people with an active and fun pathway to learning. Cambridge House (CH) has collaborated with P14y International to bring Playdagogy to the UK and has adapted it for use with young people aged 5-13 years. The educational messages CH wishes to convey within its programme relate to the issue of disability discrimination. This is important because discrimination against disabled people remains a significant problem within the UK (and indeed internationally). 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) The creation of educational tools and an accredited curriculum around disability that is fun and inclusive;
- b) The development of a pedagogical methodology based upon sport;
- c) The creation of opportunities for 'voice' for disabled children and for shared experiential learning;
- d) Increased participation of disabled children aged 5-12 in sport;
- e) 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 Playdagogy will contribute to reshaping of the culture around disability and sport, helping to reduce disability discrimination within *and beyond* sport, thus contributing to the creation of a more equitable and socially just society.

The Playdagogy Programme 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 offering opportunities for enhancing personal, social and moral development and contributing 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 understandings 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 and 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 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 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 believed 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 'Education About the Other' (EAO) (Kumashiro, 2000), 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 the Playdagogy programme is informed by a particular conceptualisation of 'disability'. The original Playdagogy Programme, which included a module entitled 'Le Handicap' was developed in France. CH has worked to adapt the original resources to reflect disability politics in the UK and a 'Social Model of Disability' understanding of disability. This model, which originated within the disabled people's movement in the UK, distinguishes between impairment, which is understood as a long-term limitation of a person's physical, mental or sensory function, and disability, which is 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 (UPIAS, 1976). Whilst the model has not gone uncontested, it has been recognised as having a useful 'educative function' (Barton 2003, 9). It can be employed to help students to understand that disability is a social construction/creation and is thus contestable.

1.2 Key challenges

This section outlines two key challenges CH faced when developing its Playdagogy Programme and considers how it addressed these issues.

The first challenge related to the issue of anti-oppressive education and disability: to date, educational initiatives designed to challenge disabling attitudes and promote positive attitudes towards disabled people are few and far between. Within the UK, the work of Richard Rieser and Micheline Mason for **Disability Equality in Education**¹ and Rieser's ongoing work (www.worldofinclusion.com) provide the best known examples of work in this area. Academically speaking, however, little research has been conducted that explores anti-disablist or anti-ableist pedagogy, the form this might take, or how such pedagogy might inform the development of relevant educational initiatives and curricula (Beckett 2009). A significant question facing the CH team was, therefore, what approach to take. It is clear from conversations with CH staff that they spent considerable time researching this issue.

In previous work I have surveyed educational initiatives that have been developed to address other forms of discrimination e.g. racism. It is possible to identify two main approaches (Beckett 2009). The first involves 'celebration of diversity' (in relation to anti-racist initiatives this equates to multicultural strategies, often dubbed the 'saris, samosas and steelbands' approach) and the second is a more overtly political approach which draws upon various critical pedagogies to challenge oppressive social relations. In relation to the role that education might play in tackling disablist attitudes and promoting disability equality, I have proposed that it is possible to conceive two approaches:

1. A 'disability as part of diversity' approach, which although well-meaning, nevertheless runs the risk of being politically 'wishy-washy';
2. A genuinely emancipatory form of 'anti-disablist' education that, in addition to enhancing children's critical engagement with issues of difference, seeks to enhance children/young people's understanding of the causes and effects of prejudice and discrimination against disabled people. (Beckett 2009)

Whilst I have argued that we must move towards the more emancipatory approach, if disability discrimination is to be addressed properly (Beckett 2015), there continue to be many within educational and policy circles who would resist such an approach, criticising it on the basis that it imports 'politics' into the classroom.

¹ Sadly, this organisation has now closed due to funding pressures, which says a great deal about why initiatives such as Playdagogy are important. More organisations need to take up this type of important work.

It was thus very interesting to note that whilst CH opted to adopt an approach which predominantly, and perhaps understandably given the current climate within education, reflects this 'disability as part of diversity' strategy, that they are clearly moving *towards* a more 'anti-disablist' approach.

To provide further explanation here: CH's Playdagogy programme has many of the characteristics of what Kumashiro (2000) has usefully termed 'Education About the Other'. A disability-focused version of EAO would be characterised thus:

"challenging stigmatization that leads to discrimination and internalized oppression. Raising awareness of disabled people's 'ways of being' (their lives), encouraging acceptance of impairment as part of human diversity, celebrating disabled people's achievements, challenging disablist stereotypes and questioning the association of impairment with 'abnormality'... Students would be encouraged to see the 'person first' before the label and understand that disability is socially constructed and contestable. Raising awareness about disability discrimination (personal and institutionalized) and the role of the disability movement in claiming civil rights would probably be part of this approach, discrimination being understood as resulting from 'social biases'." (Beckett 2015, 79)

Such an approach may well encourage recognition of, and respect for, difference amongst students (Kumashiro 2000, 35). This is important and valuable. It is not without dilemmas, however. Keith (2010, 540) suggests that this type of pedagogy is at risk of promoting 'anaemic love'. There is a risk that it will avoid 'addressing the contentious and difficult' (ibid 540) aspects of disability discrimination. It is for this reason, therefore, that it was *very important* that CH decided to 'politicise' its Playdagogy programme by basing it upon the Social Model of Disability. This model, which originated within the disabled people's movement in the UK (UPIAS 1976) has been a powerful 'oppositional device' (Beckett & Campbell, 2015) employed by disability activists as part of their struggle for equality and social justice. Most importantly, the Social Model of Disability stands in opposition to what Oliver (1990) termed the 'Individual Model of Disability'. The latter model views the 'problem' of disability to reside in the bodies and minds of individuals, which are viewed as 'abnormal' and 'defective'. According to this way of thinking, disability is a personal tragedy that requires treatment, rehabilitation and, where possible, cure. In other words, it tends to lead to a focus on 'fixing' individual people, not 'fixing' the disabling society. So-called 'Tragedy' and 'Charity' models of disability are familiar forms of the individual model in action. The problem with this Individual Model is that historically it has led to such things as enforced 'treatment', the confinement of disabled people, their social exclusion and construction as 'dependent'. The term 'invalid', which was used to describe disabled people until relatively recently, is associated with this Individual Model thinking and has been said to have contributed to the invalidation of disabled people and their constitution as 'strangers' or 'Others'.

In adopting the Social Model of Disability, CH therefore chose to conceptualise disability quite differently: as a public issue, not just a personal 'trouble'. In this respect CH is 'pioneering'. The Playdagogy Project has the potential to be an important and innovative development, contributing to anti-disablist educational strategies in the UK.

The second challenge related to the use of simulation within the original Playdagogy Programme, as adopted from PI4y International. The use of simulation in disability awareness training is highly controversial. It has been much criticed by disability activists, internationally. It is also contested academically. A useful summary of the debates in this area can be found in Herbert (2000).

For its proponents, simulation is said to foster insights and empathy, support the exploration of personal values and be a useful strategy to convey social messages. It is a method for 'experiential learning'. This appears to be the underlying justification for the use of simulation within Playdagogy. Critics of simulation have, however, pointed to the following issues:

- (a) 'Despite reported benefits of using disability simulation...empirical evidence that supports its utility to facilitate positive attitudes towards persons with disabilities is weak' (Herbert 2000, 5).
- (b) Simulation can prompt unhelpful responses from non-disabled people, for example Pfeiffer (1989 in Herbert 2000) found that people simulating the use of wheelchairs reported feeling 'demeaned' by the experience. Wurst and Wolford (1994 in Herbert 2000) found that students who engaged in simulation exercises reported feeling 'fortunate' that they did not have an impairment (reflecting 'Tragedy Model' thinking about disability).

CH thus faced a dilemma when using simulation. Current advice on the use of simulation is as follows:

- not to rely solely on simulation exercises when wanting to change attitudes towards disabled people;
- not to make simulation too short in duration, because this is likely to create negative responses (e.g. how 'awful' it must be to be visually impaired);
- students need to be orientated properly to the experience and educators need to be clear about what they are doing. Are they simulating impairment, or raising awareness about environmental and social restrictions faced by people with impairments, or both?
- students need enough time to reflect on the experience;
- simulation needs to be solution focused, considering how we can remove barriers, and enable disabled people in given situations;
- it is better to blend simulation with other approaches, principally with:
 - (a) Direct interaction with disabled people through recreational pursuits;
 - (b) Reading or watching videos about disability issues;

- (c) Talking to guest speakers who are disabled people and can explain what it is like to experience disability.

During the period of this evaluation, and via discussions with external advisors, CH demonstrated that they are sensitive to the challenges associated with simulation. They made efforts to attend to 'best practice' guidelines with regard to the use of simulation. It should be noted that simulation is not the only activity used within Playdagogy. The programme does involve direct interaction between disabled and non-disabled children via recreational pursuits. There was some effort made to ensure that it was not only 'impairment' that was being simulated, but also 'disability' and that the objective was to find enabling solutions to disabling barriers. This was positive. The use of simulation within Playdagogy might, however, be refined further with reference to the above guidance.

1.3 Introduction to the Evaluation

There were two strands to this evaluation. The first focused upon the Playdagogy programme's concern with increasing the participation of disabled children aged 5-12 in sport and accessibility in/of sport; and enhancing educators and non-disabled children's understanding of disability, inclusion, equality and adaptation in sport. This strand of evaluation was undertaken by the team at Loughborough University and will be considered in their report.

Strand 2 focused upon the Playdagogy programme's concern with developing a sports- or play-based educational methodology for addressing disability discrimination and promoting positive attitudes towards disabled people; enhancing shared experiential learning about disability within school/non-school settings; and increasing the capacity of educators to address issues around disability with children.

The general style of the Evaluation was participatory. This involved taking a partnership approach, with the external evaluators acting as 'critical friends' to the project. Our objective was to provide CH with an effective evaluation that supported the management and leadership of its Playdagogy project and contributed to the strengthening of the Playdagogy programme. We sought to identify ways in which the Playdagogy programme may be making a positive impact, making 'enhancement' rather than 'judgement' our primary objective.

Reaching a firm judgement on the efficacy (or not) of the Playdagogy project was not our objective in this Evaluation. To reach such a judgement would necessitate a more in-depth and sustained evaluation of the impact of the programme than was possible with the resources (funding, staffing etc.) available. The conclusions and recommendations made in this report are therefore tentative e.g. they should be understood as *indications* of positive impact and *suggestions* regarding elements of the project that might benefit from further consideration.

1.4 Structure of Report

This report builds upon the mid-term report (submitted June 2015) and provides an overview of the data collected throughout the evaluation. The remaining sections of the report consider the methodology employed within this evaluation, key findings, conclusions and recommendations for the development/enhancement of the Playdagogy Programme.

2. Methodology

2.1 Overview of Research

This evaluation employed a predominantly qualitative methodology designed to explore the thoughts and experiences of various individuals (e.g programme staff, trainers/educators, teachers and young people) who were involved with the Playdagogy Programme. By including multiple methods and providing numerous open questions which allow for explanation/expansion of responses, this approach sought to capture and acknowledge participant 'voice' (Bogdan and Biklen 1998). There is growing recognition that such approaches are essential, particularly when undertaking research with young people (Hallett & Prout, 2003) and those who may be considered vulnerable or marginalised (e.g. Sandford et al., 2010).

2.2 Ethical Approval

This strand of the evaluation had ethics approval from the Cross-Faculty Ethics Committee (AREA FREC), University of Leeds. The research abided by the British Sociological Association's Statement of Ethical Practice in all regards, including in relation to informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality. No child was interviewed without prior consent of their parents/guardians. Children's consent to being involved in focus groups was recorded on tape at the start of each focus group. An information sheet was sent to parents/guardians by CH making them aware that some Playdagogy sessions may be observed and the purpose of these observations and children were also informed about the reasons for observers being present. All adult respondents to the surveys were informed that the survey data might be used as part of this evaluation. Adult consent to be interviewed was recorded on an information and consent form sent to them prior to their interview. Beckett had CRB clearance prior to the commencement of fieldwork.

2.3 Data Collection

The research activities undertaken within this evaluation included: pre- and post-training surveys for those who may potentially deliver 'Playdagogy' (hereafter termed educators); observations of 'Playdagogy' sessions in case study schools; individual interviews with various stakeholders (including CH staff and educators who had *already implemented* Playdagogy); and focus group discussions with children.

The following table summarises the approach taken:

METHOD	PURPOSE	FURTHER DETAILS
Interviews with key staff at CH involved in the design of the program.	To understand the 'instructional system' and goals of Playdagogy and how the 'teaching methodology' works to achieve the desired goals.	One interview undertaken with key member of CH team.

<p>Pre- and Post-Training Surveys for potential educators.</p>	<p>Survey 1: administered before the training took place. Intended to: acquire basic biographical information about each educator; capture perspectives and understanding around the aims of Playdagogy; examine aspirations for the programme (for the educators themselves and the young people they work with); and explore how confident educators felt about engaging in this type of initiative.</p> <p>Survey 2: administered following the training session. Intended to: assess the perceived impact of the training session with regard to preparing educators for delivering Playdagogy; explore perceptions about the key messages inherent within Playdagogy (e.g. with regard to the Social Model of disability); examine individuals' perceived confidence to discuss these issues with young people; and seek individuals' thoughts about possible development of the training sessions.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 1 for surveys.</p>	<p>January-December 2015, approximately 16 training sessions were delivered to educators by CH staff. A sample of 6 training sessions was selected for analysis. These were purposefully sampled to include educators working in schools, football clubs and sports organisations.</p> <p>A total of 58 pre- and 56 post-training survey responses was analysed.</p>
<p>Observations of a purposeful sample of Playdagogy sessions to include sessions at different stages in the programme.</p>	<p>To examine the Playdagogy programme 'in action'; note interactions between the educators and pupils as well as between disabled and non-disabled pupils; consider the perceived effectiveness of different elements of the 'Playdagogy' programme (i.e. the games and discussion points); identify elements that appeared to work well; and highlight potential areas for development.</p>	<p>In total 6 schools where Playdagogy was being implemented were visited. Difficulties in securing access at convenient times meant that some schools were only visited once, but most were visited twice. In total 10 observations were undertaken.</p>
<p>Semi-structured interviews with a purposeful sample of educators who had implemented Playdagogy. Conducted in person or via telephone.</p>	<p>To capture their experiences of implementing the programme and gain insight into their understanding of the goals of Playdagogy. To examine whether they chose to adapt any aspects of the programme (and why); their</p>	<p>Interviews were conducted with 3 with educators (2 teachers and one youth worker). These lasted between 25 minutes and 1.5 hours and we were guided by the</p>

	<p>perceptions of the strengths and impact of the programme; any suggestions they might have for improvements etc. Please see Appendix 2 for interview schedule for educators.</p>	<p>respondents regarding the length of time they wished to discuss these issues.</p>
<p>Focus groups with child participants in Playdagogy sessions within 6 case-study schools.</p>	<p>Interview 1 in an early Playdagogy session: to capture their understanding of the concepts of 'disability' and 'inclusion'; what they think is the purpose of the Playdagogy programme; what they are enjoying about Playdagogy.</p> <p>Interview 2 during a later Playdagogy session: to capture their experiences of Playdagogy. What did they enjoy about this experience (what were the 'best bits')? What did they learn during their Playdagogy sessions? If they were explaining to a friend or their family what Playdagogy is 'all about', what would they say?</p> <p>Please see Appendix 3 for focus group interview schedules.</p>	<p>Although it was intended that two focus group discussions would be undertaken in each school, difficulties with delivery in some contexts meant that only one group discussion took place in one of the 6 schools. In total, 11 focus group discussions were undertaken, involving approximately 50 pupils.</p> <p>Focus group discussions lasted on average 30 minutes.</p> <p>Originally, it was intended that these focus groups would involve both disabled and non-disabled children (ideally, equal numbers). In practice, schools identified which children would take part in the discussions in consultation with parents. Most of the children we interviewed were non-disabled. Where disabled children did take part in discussions their views did not differ noticeably from those of the non-disabled children. Where they did, these were noted. CH might consider extending this evaluation in the future to capture the views of a larger number of disabled children.</p>

2.4 Data Analysis

The core research activities employed within the evaluation (i.e. observations, focus groups, interviews and surveys) generated a large amount of data, which was collated and analysed to identify key findings and points of interest. The quantitative data relating to participants' responses in the pre- and post-training surveys were collated and entered into an Excel spreadsheet. These numerical data were then used to generate descriptive statistics (i.e. the frequency of a particular response or the percentage of the total data set that this represented) relating to, for example, participant demographics, individuals' understanding of the Playdagogy programme and the general response to the training material. With regard to the qualitative data, the focus groups with young people and individual interviews with programme staff, trainers and teachers (conducted both face-to-face and via telephone) were audio-recorded and then transcribed. These transcriptions, along with the open-ended responses from the pre- and post-training surveys and observation field notes, were then 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 design and 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. Findings

Findings from this evaluation are presented in 4 sections: key points arising from discussions with the CH staff member; key findings from the pre- and post-training surveys; key themes emerging from the individual interviews with educators; and key themes emerging from the young people's focus groups. There is no separate section discussing the observation data because this has instead been employed as important context for the analysis of the focus group discussions with young people. Without these observations it would have been difficult to understand the children/young people's comments about their experiences with the Playdagogy Programme. Further, observation data is also drawn upon in the conclusion, where reference is made to the need to provide educators with more guidance surrounding the importance of taking care when adapting the programme to meet the needs of their children. In particular, they may need some encouragement not to 'forget' that the games/activities are a vital element in the overall *learning strategy* of Playdagogy. It is important to note here that on one occasion we witnessed sessions where the Playdagogy Session plan had been 'modified' to become a 5-a-side football game followed by a discussion that was disconnected to the previous activity/game. On another occasion we witnessed a session where the educator had decided to condense the sports/games elements of Playdagogy Sessions into previous weeks and then run a session which was all discussion/debate with no sports/games element. This suggests that educators are not always understanding the connection between the games/activities and the discussion elements, and how the games have been designed to stimulate children's thinking about issues that are then explored within the discussions. CH may wish to consider how best to address this issue.

3.1 Conversation with CH staff member

This conversation helped the evaluation team to understand the objectives of each of the Playdagogy sessions and to clarify the objectives of the Playdagogy Programme as a whole. The 'key messages' that this staff member stated Playdagogy sessions and the programme set out to convey were as follows:

- The importance of adapting activities to ensure that everyone can participate;
- That there are 'ability expectations' embedded within many games and activities and that these can exclude people;
- That disabled people are not 'incapable', but they sometimes need to do things in different ways;
- That barriers exist within society which disable people who have impairments;
- That it is possible and important to develop 'enabling environments';
- That 'Tragedy Model' thinking about disabled people is problematic.

This conversation was helpful. It allowed us to refine the questions that we asked children in order to assess whether these Playdagogy messages were being 'received' by them.

3.2 Survey of Educators

The survey results proved instructive. As noted in the methodology, for the purpose of this evaluation a sample of six training sessions has been identified (from the 16 delivered) and an analysis of the data collected within these has been undertaken. In each session, participants were provided with a pre-and post-training survey to complete in order to gauge their understanding of the aims and key 'messages' being conveyed by Playdagogy and their level of confidence regarding delivery of the programme.

Pre-Training Survey

Pre-training survey feedback was received from 58 participants, 46 of whom were male and 12 were female. Of these fifty-eight, 54 identified as non-disabled, 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. All participants 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).

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

With regard to their current practice, 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 indicate that most participants (74%) had experience of working with young people with learning impairments (n=43) although there was also significant experience of working with children who have 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.

With regard to respondents' views about how confident they would feel talking to young people about disability and issues of disability discrimination, there was a mixed view: 59% felt 'somewhat' or 'fully' confident, while 15% felt 'not very' or 'not at all' confident and almost a quarter of respondents (n=14) were 'unsure'. There was also somewhat of a difference of opinion with regard to the question of whether disability discrimination was perceived to be treated as seriously by schools as some other important issues such as racism or sexism, with 27 respondents (46%) commenting that they felt it is and 23 (40%) that it is not. This is an intriguing insight into the contexts in which Playdagogy is operating/being introduced.

Findings from responses to question 6 of the survey also proved to be instructive. Participants were asked what they believed is the most important message to convey to children about disability. A few participants suggested that the key message was that it was important to be 'patient' with disabled people, for example one respondent commented that the key message was to 'to be patient with them and talk clearly' (sic). This type of comment reflects an understanding of disability which is close to the Individual Model as described in section 1.2. More positively, most educators believed that the key message would be about 'inclusion', 'participation', 'respect' and encouraging friendship between disabled and non-disabled children. The following are some example comments from educators regarding their perceptions of the main 'message' of Playdagogy:

"Inclusion"

"People may look and act differently, but everyone at school is there to learn, progress and improve themselves."

"That we are all different and special in many ways."

"Just because they cannot do what you can do, doesn't mean they are not capable".

"To appreciate the differences and not be afraid to address them in a positive way. That disabled people are very capable..."

Post-Training Survey

Post-training surveys were completed by 56 participants (no demographic breakdown was available) and due to the surveys being anonymous, it was not possible to correspond pre- to post-training surveys for each participant. The data collated from these surveys, however, indicate a largely positive response to the training experience. 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 provided sufficient detail to allow individuals to understand the aims and objectives of the programme and gain some level of appreciation regarding how best to implement it within their own practice.

The post-training surveys also showed an increased level of confidence, when compared to the pre-training survey results, among respondents, with regard to their capacity to address issues of disability within the debate sections of Playdagogy. The majority of respondents (92%) indicated that they felt either 'very confident' (n=27) or 'confident enough' (n=25) to engage young people in this type of discussion. A small percentage of participants (8%) indicated, however, that they were unsure or less confident in this regard. Although this is a small number of participants (n=4), it does perhaps highlight the individual nature of impact and identify the need for additional support/training/resources to be available for educators, if necessary, following completion of the training session.

The survey data also indicated that following the training the majority of participants (94%) believed that they had a 'good enough' (n=28) or 'very good' (n=25) understanding of the Social Model of Disability, with only three individuals (6%) suggesting that they were unsure about this concept. Given that this model is a central aspect of the Playdagogy Programme, this is encouraging. Again, however, the availability of further resources which educators might use to refine their understanding of this model following completion of the training, might be helpful.

Interestingly, responses indicated that most respondents recognised the relevance of the Social Model to the Playdagogy programme and recognise its capacity to aid children's understanding around issues of disability, impairment and inclusion. Indeed, 70% of respondents (n=39) noted that they felt it was 'very effective' in this respect, with a further 19% (n=11) suggesting it had 'good' potential. This would suggest that the focus within the training on the Social Model of Disability is providing participants with adequate opportunities to consider the relevance of this model and implications of it for their practice. It should be noted, however, that 11% of respondents felt less certain in this area and so additional scope for critical debate and discussion of the Social Model and disability politics more broadly could potentially be included within training sessions.

In relation to qualitative responses within the survey, these revealed that participants believed that implementing Playdagogy would have positive impact for them and for the children with whom they work. The following quotations provide examples of the positive impacts educators envisaged in relation to their own practice:

"Greater inclusion within my school as a whole"

"Broaden my and the young people I come into contact with's knowledge, acceptance, tolerance and understanding of all people."

"The ability to answer children's questions confidently regarding people with impairments."

"Increased confidence in discussing the complex issues around disability and awareness."

"New and interesting methods of delivering education through sport and play."

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

That one educator believed that they would be able to transfer knowledge gained within their Playdagogy training to their school as a whole, was a positive finding. How educators might be supported to recognise this potential within Playdagogy and to achieve this transfer, is something that the CH team might wish to consider for the future.

Most participants indicated that they believed/hoped that children with whom they worked would benefit from Playdagogy by gaining an improved understanding of impairment and disability, developing an empathetic and empowering attitude and gaining an enhanced respect for disabled

people. The following are some example quotations in which educators state what they hope children will gain from pedagogy:

“Better understanding of disability, and understanding of how to overcome barriers to include everyone, they’ll hopefully apply this within life in general.”

“Confidence in their own ability and understanding other people’s ability and impairments.”

“Ways of helping disabled people without being patronising”

“Better understanding of impairment and disability and how to create a more level playing field for all. More confidence to ask questions and enter discussion around these topics.”

“Positive attitude”

“Understanding of human rights and no barriers. Inclusion of people regardless of ability. Empathy.”

“Shared experience. Greater understanding. Empathy for others.”

“Understanding and how to include others”

“Understanding and how applies to everyday life”

“How to work together to achieve a common goal”

These are inspiring aspirations and important because if educators have these goals in mind when implementing Playdagogy, then this is likely to be reflected in their implementation. There was certainly evidence from these surveys that educators had responded positively, understood and were committed to the goals of the Playdagogy Project.

3.3 Interviews with Educators

Three in-depth interviews were undertaken with Educators who had been trained by CH and had already implemented the Playdagogy Programme. All three respondents stated that their Playdagogy training had been very good – as one respondent commented, the training *‘completely held me all day’*. The same respondent stated that his ideas about disability had been challenged because *‘you kind of think of it as very personal...don’t you’*. This comment suggested that this educator had moved from ‘Individual Model’ to ‘Social Model’ thinking about disability. All three respondents stated that they had chosen to implement Playdagogy because they believed it would support greater inclusion of disabled children by non-disabled children in the settings where they are working and improved interactions between *all* children. The two respondents who were teachers working in schools stated that they perceived Playdagogy to be a cross-curricular activity, blending PE with PSHE/Citizenship.

In terms of the key messages they believed Playdagogy conveyed to children, they stated that it was about *‘accepting difference’* and building *‘inclusive environments’*. One educator said that he

believed it would make children more questioning of the social environment – *'a bit more exploring about different things in the environment'*.

All of the teachers expressed a real commitment to the goals of Playdagogy. Two of the educators had already ensured that staff under their management, or their colleagues, had received training in the Playdagogy methodology, because they saw this as a vehicle for changing staff attitudes and practices in addition to the attitudes and practices of children. They did, however, state that they had experienced some personal challenges when implementing Playdagogy, not least when engaging children in the 'debates and discussions' element of the programme. As one respondent commented *'we found a few issues coming out...that children were saying stuff...that we didn't really know how to handle...the word "spastic" came out during the whole thing, from one of the kids...and like me and my colleague, we were a little bit shocked...(...) sometimes we just looked at each other and we were like "what do we do now?!"'*. Another educator described similar 'tricky moments'. One educator suggested that the Playdagogy training might include more about how to address this type of issue in a positive manner.

All of the educators interviewed explained that they had made some adaptations in their delivery of Playdagogy. For example, one had been selective about the sessions that were run, in effect running a slightly shorter programme. Interestingly, however, he recognised that the final session 'Get Creative' was particularly important and that the preceding sessions needed to build towards this. Another educator explained that he had shifted the balance between physical activities and debate within some sessions, giving children more time for debate, since he considered this to be very important. He explained that he had already been undertaking work with his class about *'how we are all different and how we all have different needs'* and he wanted the Playdagogy Programme to enhance this work. All displayed a good degree of reflexivity with regard to their own practices. They were intending to run the Playdagogy Programme again, but each had ideas about how they would improve upon their initial implementation.

3.4 Focus Groups with Children

Rich and fascinating data emerged from the focus group discussions with children. In summary, it was evident that although many children began their Playdagogy sessions expressing a range of attitudes towards disability and disabled people that were of concern, in that they had the potential to be disabling, by the latter Playdagogy sessions children were more likely to be thinking critically about their previous 'ideas' about disability/disabled people, to display enhanced understanding of disability as a social justice issue and to express a desire to be more inclusive and empowering of disabled people. This is not to say that this 'transition' in attitudes was uniformly present amongst the children interviewed. Certain ideas about disability, in particular 'Tragedy Model' perspectives, in which children perceive the lives of disabled people to be 'sad' appeared to be more persistent and can be seen in transcripts from focus groups conducted in all schools visited. Moving forward, it will be important that Playdagogy sessions seek to challenge the overly sentimentalized narrative of the

Other's experience that is associated with this 'Tragedy Model'. If children become 'stuck' in this way of thinking, or repeat this type of narrative about disability, then there is a risk that they will not engage sufficiently with disability as a social injustice issue, instead viewing disabled people as a group with 'grievable lives' (Zembylas 2009, 94). This type of compassion 'may (. . .) reinforce the very patterns of economic and political subordination responsible for such suffering' (Spelman 1997 in Zembylas 2009, 94). Such narratives are too readily 'consumable' (i.e. disposable) and thus ineffective.

The following sections seek to demonstrate the 'shift' in attitudes that appeared to take place amongst children during the Playdagogy Programme.

From disabling attitudes...

In the focus groups undertaken with children at the start of their time on the Playdagogy Programme it was clear that their initial ideas about disability and disabled people reflected what is termed the 'Individual Model' of disability. In this model, or way of thinking, disability is perceived to be an individual problem caused by impairment (Oliver 1990). This model tends to result in a focus on 'cure and care' of disabled people, rather than their empowerment; it is associated with the view of disability as a personal tragedy, to be avoided, eradicated or normalized as far as possible (French and Swain 2004). Comments such as 'I feel really sorry for them' were often made, as were references to disabled people needing our 'care'. This finding reflects previous research (Beckett 2014).

Discussions in these 'early' focus groups also revealed that children tended to associate disability with incapacity and lack of competence. That many children talked about the things that disabled people cannot do, or defined disabled people as people who 'can't do stuff' is not surprising. Again, this reflects findings from previous research (Beckett 2014), which found that when many children think about disability they focus upon listing the things that a disabled person cannot, in their opinion/experience 'do', and refer to the ways in which disabled people's bodies in their opinion do not function 'properly'.

Whilst these comments should be of concern, it was also clear that their initial ideas about disability and disabled people were already starting to be challenged through the Playdagogy discussions and this was certainly evident within the focus groups that took place towards the end of a cycle of Playdagogy sessions.

Towards more enabling attitudes...

In focus groups conducted with children in later sessions of their Playdagogy Programme, it was evident that there had been a positive shift in their attitudes and understanding. In what follows, key themes are identified, with example quotations from children provided:

Theme	Example quotation/s from children
Challenging the concept of 'otherness' – children said that they had learnt via Playdagogy that disabled people are not different <i>in any fundamental way</i> from non-disabled people.	<i>'I learnt that just because someone is disabled it doesn't mean that they (are) totally different from you...like they're humans too. Like I thought they were different...before we started Playdagogy.'</i>
Disabled people are able to lots of things. Sometimes disabled people can do things that are very difficult for many non-disabled people to do, like reading Braille.	<i>'I think its about like how like people with problems...they can still do stuff'.</i> <i>Being able to read Braille 'it's clever' because it is like the 'enigma code!'</i>
Disabled people might need the right type of assistance to do some things (discussions of inclusive design took place, assistive technology and appropriate personal assistance). Under this theme we might also consider their comments about how to be a sighted guide to someone who has visual impairments. Many children stated that it was a very responsible job and required certain attributes and 'etiquette'.	<i>"If someone was blind, they might use guide dogs or sticks, and on the zebra crossing the floor is lumpy".</i> <i>Guides must not be 'angry people', they need to be 'calm' and 'a friend'.</i> <i>When seeking to assist a disabled person it is important not to 'go too much into what's wrong with them' and 'not overcrowd them'.</i>
Inclusion is important.	<i>Inclusion means asking 'hey, do you want to join our game?'</i> <i>We learnt 'how to join in all the people with disabilities'</i> <i>'I've learnt that it's important to make sure we do things that let everyone join in'</i> <i>We could take this onto the playground. The ideas in Playdagogy 'they're helpful when we're playing on the playground like, take some of the ideas...onto the playground and make them public!'</i>
Its important to understand what it is like to be a disabled person (they spoke about bullying they had witnessed and inaccessible environments they had encountered).	<i>Playdagogy 'makes us understand how other people, disabled people, feel.'</i> <i>'I think it's so you can put yourself in</i>

	<p><i>the...different ability people's shoes.'</i></p> <p><i>Playdagogy's goal is to allow 'people around the world...to understand what it feels like and they can, like stop making fun of people'</i></p> <p><i>It makes me think about 'all the times I've seen...disabled people being bullied by people in the streets....it makes me want to make them not feel ashamed to do <u>anything</u>'</i></p>
<p>The importance of friendship - children said that they had learnt how to make friends with a disabled person.</p>	<p><i>'Your first friend in secondary school might be a blind person'. If we had a friend who had an impairment 'we would understand how they feel and help them'</i></p> <p><i>'I think it's (playdagogy learning – ed) useful everywhere, because...you never know, you can make a new friend and...cooperate with them a lot'</i></p>

Additionally, focus group discussions revealed that many children had enjoyed learning about Braille or Sign Language through the discussion/debate elements of Playdagogy and wished to learn more about this. One child said that he would like to learn more about the lives of people and see whether their experiences in life were 'fair' or not. Other children expressed an interest in learning more about assistive technologies in general and sports equipment that enabled disabled people to play sports e.g. football.

When asked what they had enjoyed most about Playdagogy, children mentioned that they had enjoyed the opportunity to debate and voice their own opinions in a '*debating situation*' and they said that they had been encouraged to listen to each other. As one child commented '*it's not only about your opinion, it's other people's as well*'. They had enjoyed learning about about other people's 'abilities' and had had lots of fun whilst learning. Team-work was mentioned by a number of children as something they had valued, as exemplified in this quotation '*I enjoyed working as a team. Working with different people that I don't usually play with*'.

When asked whether they believed that they would be able to transfer their new knowledge gained via the Playdagogy sessions to other parts of their daily lives, children provided some interesting responses. Some said that they could envisage transferring their knowledge '*to the wider school*', other children had been discussing the key messages from Playdagogy with their parents, one child said that they had replicated the Playdagogy sessions at home with their siblings.

These findings suggest that the Playdagogy sessions had encouraged critical thinking amongst children, challenging certain negative attitudes and assumptions that they may have held about disabled people and promoting some more positive understandings/attitudes. This is very encouraging. It is important, however, to strike a note of caution. Despite many positive aspects to the discussions with children at the end of their Playdagogy Programme, children on the whole continued to describe disabled people in terms which imply a certain 'distancing' between 'them' and 'us' and a continuing assumption that disabled people are 'not normal'. Whilst it would be challenging for any 6-10 week programme to address this issue completely, the CH team might wish to reflect upon this and consider whether it is possible to devise games which are even more challenging and transformative of 'the norm'. Perhaps this might be achieved by devising more games that unsettle and transform the ability expectations that are built into many sports and play-based activities.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Findings from this Evaluation suggest that there have already been many positive outcomes from Cambridge House's Playdagogy Project. Of particular note are the following:

- a) The manner in which Playdagogy training enhances the knowledge and confidence of Educators, supporting them to address issues relating to disability and discrimination with children.
- b) The manner in which the Playdagogy Programme challenges disabling attitudes and encourages children to develop more positive and enabling attitudes towards disabled peers and others.

Findings suggest a number of ways in which the Playdagogy Programme might be developed and enhanced, building upon its initial successes:

- a) It is important during training for educators that CH staff are sensitive to any persistent attitudes amongst educators that reflect an 'Individual Model' understanding of disability and seek to challenge these attitudes in a positive and constructive manner. If these attitudes are not challenged, then there is a risk that they will impact on the implementation of Playdagogy by educators, undermining the programme's objectives.
- b) CH might consider extending its training for educators to allow more time for critical debate and discussion about the Social Model of Disability and supporting educators to refine their understanding of this model. Educators would also benefit from, and value, more training regarding how best to address difficult issues e.g. disablist language during the discussion elements of Playdagogy.
- c) CH might consider providing additional resources for educators which would allow them to enhance their understanding of disability politics prior to implementing Playdagogy.
- d) CH might consider providing educators with advice about how best to transfer the key messages of Playdagogy into other school activities and make connections within the wider curriculum. Alternatively, or in addition, they might signpost educators to resources that are already available and which assist teachers in addressing the issue of 'disability' as part of the wider curriculum, see for example: <http://worldofinclusion.com/resources/>
- e) Educators may need to be reminded of the important connections between the Playdagogy games/activities and discussion/debates and be supported to understand that both are key to the Playdagogy learning strategy.
- f) CH might consider how to support children to engage critically with 'Tragedy Model' thinking about disability and to question and transform 'the norm'. The latter might be achieved by encouraging them to recognise the ability expectations embedded within many sports and play activities and encouraging them to think about how these expectations could be transformed. The final Playdagogy session 'Get Creative' has excellent potential in this regard, but could be enhanced further.

- g) CH might be informed by the responses of children in this evaluation when thinking about how to develop the Playdagogy discussion points/questions. Children were keen to learn more about assistive technologies, inclusive design, Braille and Sign-language and to talk more about issues of 'fairness'. Educators might be encouraged to extend discussions on these points.
- h) Finally, it is strongly recommended that CH considers working in partnership/collaboration with a Disabled People's Organisation that has experience of implementing disability equality training. When using simulation it would be advisable if this was to be accompanied by opportunities for children to meet with and talk to disabled adults about the experience of disability. Experienced disability equality trainers would also be able to advise CH on how best to support educators to address 'sensitive' issues with children and challenge disablist language. Working with members of a disabled people's organisation would also demonstrate CH's understanding of disability politics and one of the most important principles of the disabled people's movement which is: **'Nothing About Us Without Us!'**

The issues outlined above represent a number of ways in which the Playdagogy Programme might 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 Loughborough report (relating to strand 1 of the evaluation), will help CH to enhance the pedagogical potential of Playdagogy and maximise the impact of this important initiative.

5. 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.
- 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. (2009) 'Challenging disabling attitudes, building an inclusive society': considering the role of education in encouraging non-disabled children to develop positive attitudes towards disabled people, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30 (3), 317-329.
- Beckett, A.E. (2014) Non-disabled children's ideas about disability and disabled people, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35 (6), 856-875.
- 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). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- 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.
- Swain J. and French S. (2004) 'Whose Tragedy: Towards a personal non-tragedy view of disability'. In Swain J., French S., Barnes and Thomas (eds.) *Disabling Barriers – Enabling Environments*. (2nd ed.) London: Sage.
- 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.

Herbert, J.T. (2000) 'Simulation as a Learning Method to Facilitate Disability Awareness', *Journal of Experiential Learning*, 23 (1), 5-11.

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

Keith, N. 2010. 'Getting Beyond Anaemic Love: From the Pedagogy of Cordial Relations to a Pedagogy for Difference.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 42 (4), 539-572.

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.

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

Oliver, M. (1990) *The Politics of Disablement*. London: Macmillan Education.

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

Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation. 1976. *Fundamental principals of disability*. London: UPIAS.

Zembylas, M. 2009. 'Making Sense of Traumatic Events: Toward a Politics of Aporetic Mourning in Educational Theory and Pedagogy.' *Educational Theory*, 59 (1), 85-103.

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) <input type="checkbox"/>	KS2 (7-11) <input type="checkbox"/>	KS3 (11-14) <input type="checkbox"/>	KS4 (14-16) <input type="checkbox"/>	16+ <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	--	---	---	---------------------------------

2. Do

you currently work with disabled young people? Yes / No

If Yes:

a) How many?

1-5 <input type="checkbox"/>	5-10 <input type="checkbox"/>	10-20 <input type="checkbox"/>	20-50 <input type="checkbox"/>	50+ <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------

b) Please indicate

whether you have ever worked with a child or children who have:

whether you

1 Visual impairments <input type="checkbox"/>	2 Hearing impairments <input type="checkbox"/>	3 Learning disabilities/cognitive impairments <input type="checkbox"/>	4 Mobility impairments <input type="checkbox"/>	5 Other impairments, please state:
--	---	---	--	------------------------------------

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

1 Not at all <input type="checkbox"/>	2 A little, but not enough <input type="checkbox"/>	3 Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>	4 'Enough' but we could do more <input type="checkbox"/>	5 Fully included <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	--------------------------------------	---	--

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 I know a little, but could know more <input type="checkbox"/>	3 Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>	4 I have enough knowledge <input type="checkbox"/>	5 I am very knowledgeable <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	--------------------------------------	---	---

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 Not very <input type="checkbox"/>	3 Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>	4 Somewhat <input type="checkbox"/>	5 Very <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------

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?

Many thanks for taking time to complete this survey. We value your responses.

Post-Training Evaluation for Playdagogy

Organisation: _____ Gender: _____
Age: _____

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

2 Not at all <input type="checkbox"/>	2 A little, but not enough <input type="checkbox"/>	3 Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>	4 Enough, but could be more <input type="checkbox"/>	5 Very confident <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	--	---

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

3 Not at all <input type="checkbox"/>	2 A little, but not enough <input type="checkbox"/>	3 Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>	4 Enough, but could be more <input type="checkbox"/>	5 Very confident <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	--	---

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

1 Not at all <input type="checkbox"/>	2 A little, but not enough <input type="checkbox"/>	3 Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>	4 Enough, but could be more <input type="checkbox"/>	5 Very good understanding <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	--	--

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

1 Not at all <input type="checkbox"/>	2 OK, but not very effective <input type="checkbox"/>	3 Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>	4 Good but could be better <input type="checkbox"/>	5 Very effective <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	---	---

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 OK, but could be better <input type="checkbox"/>	3 Unsure <input type="checkbox"/>	4 Good <input type="checkbox"/>	5 Very good <input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

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:

Many thanks for taking time to complete this survey. We value your responses.

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

Child focus group interview 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?