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Perceptions of disability sport

Special treatment

PWD needed treatment/care, separated/disability specific sport

Accessibility & participation

Society needs to be accessible for PWD, organise sport ‘as normal as possible, only special when needed’,

Integration

Organisational integration in mainstream sport

Inclusion & human rights

Equal rights, free choice, full participation for all, create no unnecessary barriers, UN CRPD

See Haegele & Hogde, 2016; Misener & Darcy, 2013; Smith & Bundon, 2018
Dutch policy on disability sport

• Since 2000 Dutch policy on disability sport intensified

• Dutch government is committed to:
  • Increase participation in sport of PWD; inclusive sport & PA

Through:
  • Support inclusive PA-programs & interventions
  • Improve accessibility (financial, social, physical..)
  • Research and data collection

• National programs on DS
  • Until 2015: Different temporary programs > sport stimulation programs
  • 2015-2018: “Active without boundaries” > strengthening local & regional infrastructure
  • 2018-2021: “National sports agreement” > inclusive sport & physical activity for all citizens

• Focus on accessible sport clubs and (adapted) activity programs!
Survey sports clubs

- Online panel survey Dutch sports clubs (n=407)
- What is the ‘additional’ demand from PWD for mainstream sports clubs?
- Improve match demand (PWD) & supply (activities/clubs)

1. To what extent and how is sport for PWD organized and embedded in mainstream sports clubs?
2. Which factors hinder or stimulate the development, improvement and structural embedding of sports programs for PWD in mainstream sports clubs?
3. What knowledge and support do sports clubs need?

Source: results are published here (in Dutch).
### Clubs with members with a disability (1)

#### Percentage of mainstream clubs with 1 or more members with a disability (mwd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members with disability, total</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members with physical disability</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members with behavioural problems</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members with a hearing impairment</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members with a chronic disease</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members with an intellectual disability</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members with a visual impairment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- On average 11 mwd per club
- 6% of all members
- 72% clubs have 1-11 mwd, 28% clubs have >11 mwd
- Larger clubs (60%) have more often >11 mwd

Source: Mulier Instituut research panel sports clubs, 2018
Special groups & instructors (1)

- 75% clubs have no special of qualified instructors/trainers
- 16% clubs have 1 of more qualified instructors
- 9% 1 of more special volunteers
- Larger clubs more often have >11 mwd, special groups & qualified instructors
- Clubs >11 mwd more often have special/qualified instructors and special groups
- Clubs with special groups more often have special/qualified instructors

**Percentage of mainstream clubs* with special groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Clubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual disability</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impairment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic disease</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural problems</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impairment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*with members with a disability
Source: Mulier Instituut research panel sports clubs, 2018
Adaptations & modifications (1)

- 70%: no form of adaptation or modification in activities
- 30%: some form of adaptation:
  - 16% in coaching
  - 13% in rules/regulations
  - 10% in materials
  - 9% in group size
  - 7% in field size/facilities
- 50%: program is not embedded structurally in sports club
- 21%: clubs have 1 or more permanent persons responsible

C. van Lindert, Vista 2019
## Willingness and ability (2)

### Percentage of clubs that are willing and able to include (more) pwd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>Unwilling, not able</th>
<th>Unwilling, able</th>
<th>Willing, not able</th>
<th>Willing, able</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impairment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural problems</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic disease</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual disability</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impairment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mulier Instituut research panel sports clubs, 2018
Large potential (2)

- Willing & able: 67% sport clubs
- Willing but not able: 36% sport clubs
- Not willing but able: 5% sport clubs
- Not willing & not able: 28% sport clubs
Motives (more) mwd (2)

- 70% social responsibility
- 38% member growth
- 27% PWD are already a target group
- 10% external stakeholders want this
- 9% instructors and board want this
- 8% opportunity to recruit more volunteers
- 5% opportunity to get support
- 4% opportunity to get funding
- 3% members want this

➢ Initiative comes often from within the club: coaches, board, parents
Obstacles for (more) mwd (2)

Percentage of clubs that experience obstacles to include (more) mwd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Physical disability (incl. VI &amp; HI)</th>
<th>Intellectual disability</th>
<th>Behavioural problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers, instructors, coaches</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation, activities &amp; materials</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and retention of target group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; accessibility</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mulier Instituut research panel sports clubs, 2018
Need for support (3)

• 58% clubs with mwd, had no support

• 30% clubs don’t need (additional) support

• 70% do need support:
  ➢ Recruitment of volunteers and instructors
  ➢ Support from a sports professional
  ➢ Exchange knowledge/experiences with other clubs
  ➢ Recruitment of funding/sponsorships
Conclusions

• “Additional” demand from pwd depends on type of sport and disability
• Good atmosphere is key factor
• Sufficient volunteers are needed
• Don’t treat pwd differently
• Not much specific adaptations in activities needed
• Special group needs qualified instructors

Recommendations

• Start small scale
• Ask support from local government and community sport coach
• Ask support from family of pwd
• Work together with other clubs
• Promote the club & program
• Lay responsibility on 1 of more volunteers

➢ Willingness is there. But not always the ability/desire.
➢ Mismatch between what pwd want/need & what club think pwd want/need
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