



University of Chester



This work has been submitted to ChesterRep – the University of Chester's
online research repository

<http://chesterrep.openrepository.com>

Author(s): Donna Bullivant-Evans

Title: Striving towards inclusion 'utopia': The implementation of a disability sport
inclusion programme in a sports development unit in Flintshire, Wales

Date: October 2014

Originally published as: University of Chester MSc dissertation

Example citation: Bullivant-Evans, D. (2014). *Striving towards inclusion 'utopia': The
implementation of a disability sport inclusion programme in a sports development
unit in Flintshire, Wales*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Chester, United
Kingdom.

Version of item: Submitted version

Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10034/344337>

**Striving towards inclusion 'utopia': the
implementation of a disability sport inclusion
programme in a sports development unit in
Flintshire, Wales.**

Dissertation submitted in accordance with the requirements
of the University of Chester for the Degree of Master of
Science

October 2014

Abstract

During the course of the past few decades there has been an increasing shift towards the protection of the rights of disabled people within UK policy (Barnes & Mercer, 1998; Thomas & Smith, 2009). Houlihan and Lindsey (2013) highlighted how there have been significant developments in British sport policy since 1990, and a wealth of literature which has explored sport policy and development (Houlihan & White, 2002; Bloyce & Smith, 2010; Bergsgard et al, 2007; Houlihan, 1991; 1997; 2005; 2012; Houlihan & Green, 2011; Houlihan & Lindsey, 2013). However, there does not seem to be the equivalent level of academic interest within disability sport policy. Thomas and Smith (2009) and Smith and Haycock (2011) outlined that whilst disability sport exists within policy; policy and political interest remains marginal and the practical responsibility for the coordination and development of disability sport opportunities will remain with disability sport organisations and be 'kept at arm's length from direct government involvement' (Smith & Haycock, 2011, p. 98). In this context, this thesis examines the policy implementation process of a disability sport inclusion programme from a figurational sociological perspective, in a local authority sports development unit in Flintshire, Wales. The thesis was based on semi-structured interviews with Disability Sport Wales' Partnership Manager and Sport Flintshire's Manager, and focus groups with ten Sports Development Officers from Sport Flintshire. It was found that there had been a shift towards inclusion being the group 'habitus' over a period of time, possibly due to the way in which the development team was managed and led. Whilst evident that policy implementation is a complex, multi-level 'game', 'insport', a Welsh disability sport inclusion programme was perceived to be a key tool which could potentially support the lengthening chains of interdependence of the disability sport figuration, and help local authorities strive towards inclusion 'utopia'. However, it was recommended that further research should be undertaken at a later stage of the 'insport' development programme in

order to gain greater sociological understanding of the policy implementation process.

Student Declaration

I confirm that this work has not been submitted for any other degree or examination. I have read and understood the University's regulations on plagiarism and I declare this as my own original work.

Signature:.....

Name: Donna Bullivant-Evans

Submission Date: 8th October 2014

Word Count: 20,372

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	2
Introduction	3
Chapter One: Literature Review	8
Chapter Two: Research Methods	24
Chapter Three: Presentation of findings and discussion of results	40
Chapter Four: Conclusion	78
References	83
Appendices:	99
Appendix 1- Interview Guide Schedule	100
Appendix 2- Focus Group Schedule	102

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank a number of people who have supported me in a variety of ways throughout the course of this thesis. I would initially like to express my appreciation to Dr. Daniel Bloyce who has provided me with invaluable guidance, expert knowledge and advice. Also, to all of the other lecturers at the Chester Centre for Research into Sport and Society for all their guidance throughout the entire masters' programme.

Thanks must also be extended to colleagues from Disability Sport Wales and Sport Flintshire who volunteered and agreed to participate in this study, as without their contribution, this thesis would not have been possible.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. My parents, for their continual and everlasting support and encouragement. Michelle, for supporting me, giving me a push in the right direction when needed and for running and decorating our home whilst this thesis was in progress. Without you, this thesis would never have been completed. Last, but certainly not least, Rousseau and Indigo, for inspiring me and motivating me to be the best I can possibly be in order to make you proud.

Introduction

During the course of the past few decades there has been an increasing shift towards the protection of the rights of disabled people within UK policy (Barnes & Mercer, 1998; Thomas & Smith, 2009). A person may be considered disabled if they have a 'physical or mental impairment that has a "substantial" and "long-term" negative effect on their ability to do normal daily activities' (HMSO, 2010).

The most significant changes in disability policy have been evident since the mid 1990s with the introduction of the Disability Discrimination Act (Barnes & Mercer, 1998). Houlihan and Lindsey (2013) highlighted how there have been significant developments in British sport policy since 1990, and since this time, there has been a wealth of literature which has explored sport policy and development (Houlihan & White, 2002; Bloyce & Smith, 2010; Bergsgard et al, 2007; Houlihan, 1991; 1997; 2005; 2012; Houlihan & Green, 2011; Houlihan & Lindsey, 2013). However, considering the importance and significance placed on sport policy in the UK, there does not seem to be the equivalent level of academic interest within disability sport policy. Disability sport has emerged as an area of policy interest over the past 40 years. Although Thomas and Smith (2009) and Smith and Haycock (2011) outlined that whilst disability sport exists within policy; policy and political interest remains marginal and the practical responsibility for the coordination and development of disability sport opportunities will remain with disability sport organisations and be

'kept at arm's length from direct government involvement' (Smith & Haycock, 2011, p. 98).

Within disability sport there has been increasing emphasis placed on the concept of 'mainstreaming' over the past fifteen years, although no consistent policy which has attempted to implement an inclusion agenda within organisations that plan and deliver sport and physical activity provision (Thomas & Smith, 2009). The Minister for Sport Review (1989) considered that 'mainstreaming' would be considered successful if disability sport was planned and coordinated by a National Governing of Sport, as oppose to a disability specific organisation. This would also involve appropriate policy development and implementation, whilst involving disabled people and considering equitable provision as part of the organisation's general duties.

Disability sport policy is an area which is currently under researched. More specifically, we know little about disability sport and policy implementation in Wales. Smith and Haycock (2011), recently explored the practice of disability sports development in local authorities in England and Wales, and this thesis aims to extend knowledge within Wales. Disability Sport Wales (DSW, formerly known as Disability Sport Cymru and The Federation of Disability Sport Wales) is the National and lead organisation in Wales for the development of disability sport (DSW, 2013a). This organisation has developed a disability sport inclusion programme entitled 'insport' which intends to 'support the delivery of inclusive opportunity throughout the sport and leisure network' (DSW, 2013, p. 1). The 'insport' programme has four standards, ribbon, bronze, silver and gold, and each has an attainment criteria which must be evidenced and presented before an organisation can achieve 'insport'.

There are three versions of 'insport'. This is to ensure that they are appropriate for the organisations whom are involved; National Governing Bodies of sport, Sports clubs and Local Authorities. The latter project within the programme is referred to as 'insport' development.

Thomas and Smith (2009, p. 71) explored the role of local authorities in the provision of sport for disabled people. It was concluded that there was not any coherent or consistent policy, 'or, indeed, anything approaching it' that was available at that time to enhance the mainstream or segregated sports development provision for disabled people. Thomas (2008) noted that whilst the publication of *Building on Ability* suggested that there should be a gradual shift of responsibility for disability sport towards mainstream sports organisations and local authorities, no clear roles, responsibilities or initiatives have been developed in order to make this a reality in the UK. In Wales, 'insport' may be the tool for National Governing Bodies, sports clubs and local authorities to take responsibility for disability sport. 'insport' may potentially assist local authorities in Wales to achieve inclusion and enhance the sport and physical activity provision for disabled young people and adults. DePauw and Doll-Tepper (2000, p. 139) argue that 'the underlying philosophy of inclusion does not automatically imply universal placement or one size fits all. Rather, inclusion must not be defined as a place (or placement) but rather inclusion must be reconceptualised as an attitude or process'. This concept will be considered throughout the research, and consideration will be given to the processual nature of inclusion and policy implementation.

A figurational sociology perspective will be adopted for the purposes of the research, as the key sensitizing concepts will allow for a comprehensive and appropriate understanding of the processes involved in disability sport policy implementation. This thesis is of particular importance as it seeks to enhance our limited sociological understanding of the disability sport policy implementation process in Wales. It is also the first time a specific programme has been developed and implemented, with the aim of shifting the responsibility for disability sport towards mainstream sport organisations and local authorities and making 'inclusion' a reality in the UK. Set in the above context, this thesis aims, from a figurational perspective, to address a gap in the literature in order to gain greater understanding regarding the complexities involved in disability sport and the policy process. More specifically, this research will explore 'to what extent does implementing a disability sport inclusion programme contribute towards an inclusion agenda in a sports development unit in Flintshire?' This study is based within Flintshire, and will provide a case study of the process of implementing 'insport' development ribbon standard within a local authority sports development team.

In order to address the research in question, the thesis will be divided into a series of chapters. The first will give a chronological review of the policies evident within the UK, initially from the 1600s but mainly from the 1940s when disability became at the forefront of society as a result of World War 2 (WW2), together with a review of the academic literature in relation to disability sport and sport policy implementation in the UK, and more specifically in Wales. The second chapter outlines the key sensitizing concepts and theoretical framework which this thesis is set within, namely figurational sociology, in addition to the methods which have been utilised in order to

conduct the research. The third chapter will present the main findings of the study, and use figurational sociology in order to attempt to make sense of the process of implementing a disability sport inclusion programme in a sports development unit in Flintshire. Finally, the conclusion will draw together the key findings of the research and the

extent to which the research question has been addressed. This chapter will also make suggestions for future research.

Literature Review

This literature review consists of two main sections. In order to understand the key issues around the history and development of disabled people in sport, it is important to firstly examine the emergence of disability as an issue in wider society. Consequently, the first section will explore the wider social processes at play, and the development of disability policies in the UK chronologically, which were designed to improve disabled people's experiences and power chances within wider society (Oliver & Barnes, 2008). This will give a more adequate appreciation of how disability sport policy and practice has developed and changed over time. In addition, this section will explore wider sport policy in the UK and more specifically disability sport policy in Wales. The second section attempts to review the available academic literature related to wider sport policy and disability sport policy implementation.

Disability Legislation in the UK

The first piece of legislation concerning disabled people came in to play in 1601 with the English Poor Law Act. This signalled 'the first official recognition of the need for state intervention in the lives of people with perceived impairment' (Barnes, 1997, p. 17). However, the impact of policy implementation up until the 1940s was extremely limited. For this reason, this section will concentrate on policy development from the

1940s. Post WW2 saw slow but changing attitudes to how disabled people were treated and perceived on a day-to-day basis, and the way in which they were governed. This resulted in the initial disability rights movement and development of policy for disabled people in the UK. Considering this, it is important to understand that the emergence of disability as an issue in society is rooted in a long-term process, which we can trace back to WW2 as part of the British welfare state, and the government's focus on social policy (Oliver & Barnes, 1998). The Welfare State emerged after WW2, to try to limit unrest amongst citizens and prevent unsettling times alike after the First World War. This resulted in an increase in commitment to financial input into health, education, employment and social security. Whilst disabled people had previously been included in wider policies as subgroups, post WW2 they were explicitly identified and targeted within social policy (Oliver & Barnes, 1998). Some felt this would increase the power chances of disabled people and give 'them' greater status in wider society, alongside political recognition. Ideally, specific populations should not need to be explicitly identified within policy; however, where there has been historic marginalisation of a 'subgroup' within society, positive action must be taken in order to address inequality. However, as a result, an unplanned outcome of targeting disabled people resulted in people with an impairment being perceived to be 'different' from the non-disabled members of society, a process which may have in fact contributed towards stigmatization and marginalisation in wider society (Goffman, 1963).

The first policy which specifically catered to the needs of disabled people as a single group was the 1944 Disabled Persons Employment Act; 'An Act to make further and better provision for enabling persons handicapped by disablement to secure

employment, or work on their own account, and for purposes connected therewith' (HMSO, 1944). This was the first Act of Parliament that aimed to improve the employment rights and opportunities of disabled people. Whilst this was an extremely positive step towards improved rights for disabled people, this and other legislation over the next few decades concentrated on welfare and the 'treatment' of disabled people in segregated environments (Thomas & Smith, 2009). WW2 brought disability to the forefront of society in the UK, and challenged some of the stigmatisation that was evident towards disability and disabled people, and was extremely significant in the development of sport for disabled people. War veterans were perceived to be heroes, and access to services were administered in order to provide rehabilitation. Physicians, steered by the pioneering Ludwig Guttmann, the 'universally accepted founder of the modern day Paralympic movement' (Brittain, 2010, p. 7), commenced using sport and physical activity as a form of therapy and rehabilitation for those who had acquired physical impairments as a result of WW2 (DePauw & Gavron, 2005). Guttmann was a physician Therefore, disability sport has been strongly linked with the 'post-war growth of an equal opportunities culture and the shifting discourse on the body and the treatment of the disabled' (Polley, 1998, p.11).

Further policies emerged in the 1940s, such as the National assistance act 1948 and the National Health Service Act 1948, which established institutions to provide care and support for disabled people in segregated environments (Thomas & Smith, 2009). Considering the development of disability policy in the 1940s, and disabled people starting to participate in sport at that time, it is surprising that disability sport only emerged as part of sport policy in 1968 as part of the first 'Sport for All'

campaign. This timely promotion may have been characterised by the 20th anniversary of the 'International Declaration of Human Rights' which reinforced people's rights to equality and independence in 1968 (Brems, 2008). The impact of this for disabled people was limited, and over the next few decades there have been further policies identifying disabled people which have had limited impact.

From 1970 onwards

In 1970 the 'Chronically sick and disabled persons act' was introduced, which increased disabled people's dependency on the welfare state (Barnes & Mercer, 1995). This sparked unrest amongst some disabled people who wished for a shift from welfare to equal opportunities and rights. Consequently, the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS) was developed in 1972, an influential group in the development of disability rights. This was the first British organisation established and run by disabled people, which was a huge change as previously non-disabled people had 'controlled' and governed policy and services for disabled people (Hargreaves, 2000; Thomas, 2003). This highlights how there are a number of different impairments within 'disability'. This particular organisation was developed specifically for those with a level of physical impairment. The UPIAS were the first group to develop the 'social model of disability'. Disability definitions and theories can be broadly grouped into two categories; the medical and social model. The medical model of disability has dominated for most of the twentieth century and suggests that 'disability is an impairment which is owned by an individual' and involves the 'loss or limitation of function' (Thomas & Smith, 2009, p. 7). The social model is perceived to be a more positive approach and mind set to disability, suggesting that 'disability' is a social construction and that social and environmental

barriers, discriminatory attitudes and negative cultural stereotypes, may assist to disable people with impairments (Barnes & Mercer, 2003, p. 1). Smith and Haycock (2011) highlight how important the move from the medical to the social model of disability was in order to initiate policy change regarding disability.

A shift towards integration in wider policy and sport provision

Sports Council for Wales (SCW) (2004, p. 3) highlighted how the 1978 Warnock report and the Education Act resulted in policy change relating to the integration of disabled pupils into the mainstream school system, with a focus on ability not disability. This was a significant development which had an effect on the provision of sport for disabled people; the mainstreaming of disabled children in education, was mirrored by mainstream organisations providing (or being required to provide) sport opportunities for disabled people at this time.

This shift continued throughout the 1980s, with a number of policies and developments occurring which potentially contributed towards the increased control of disability rights movements and a shift towards the inclusion of disabled people within education and sport. 1981 was declared the International Year of Disabled People, and the British Council of Disabled People (BCODP) was established as an umbrella body that supported and encouraged the development of hundreds of new organisations controlled by disabled people across the UK. At this time, The Education Act (1981), showed a shift towards the transference of disabled pupils from special to mainstream schools. The UK Minister for Sport in 1989 initiated a Government review of disability sport in Britain, which recommended that local authorities and home country Sports Councils should 'assume responsibility for

ensuring the provision and coordination of sport for people with disabilities at a local level' (Minister for Sport's Review Group, 1989). Furthermore it was suggested that 'Governing bodies should accept in principle that they will ultimately assume responsibility for disabled people in their sport and should set a timetable to achieve this' (Minister for Sport's Review Group, 1989, p. 10 and 21). Following this, the 'Federation of Sports Association for the Disabled' was established in Wales in 1990 to give an overarching structure to sport for disabled people in Wales. Within the UK, there was still a lack of clear coordination or understanding of the complex organisations involved within disability sport. Considering this, a National Disability Sport conference was assembled in 1996 in order to 'consider the future of disability sport in England' (Thomas, 2003, p. 114), and to 'lead towards the mainstreaming of disability sport in England by the year 2000' (Sports Council Disability Task Force, 1997; cited in Thomas & Smith, 2009, p. 38). Thomas and Smith (2009) noted in 2009 that mainstreaming was only a recent area of policy interest for most governing bodies of sport in England, therefore we could assume that the mainstreaming of disability sport was not realised by the year 2000 in England. Striving towards an inclusion agenda is a long-term process and it was only in 2009 that Wales' disability sport organisation Federation of Disability Sport Wales' (FDSW) Chief Executive highlighted inclusion to be a 'principle that we have got to build into all of our national sport development programmes from this point forward' HoC (2009, p. 4).

The Disability Discrimination Act

Further significant policy was developed in the UK in the mid-nineties after years of campaigning by disability activists. In 1995, the Conservative government developed the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA), with the aim of addressing discrimination

faced by disabled people in society (Thomas & Smith, 2009, p. 19). Sayce and Brien (2004, p. 663) argue that the 'Disability Discrimination Act 1995... is the direct result of sustained campaigning by disabled people'. The disability rights movement called for 'anti-discrimination and equal opportunities' (Doyle, 1999, p. 217) and the development of the DDA showed a shift in power 'from greater to smaller power differentials' (Thomas & Smith, 2009, p. 100). This was a significant change in policy relating to disabled people. The DDA defined discrimination as treating someone less favourably than someone else, 'for a reason which relates to the disabled person's disability; and cannot show that the treatment is justified' (HMSO, 1995, p, 20). Under the DDA a person is defined disabled if they have 'a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on his ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities' (HMSO, 1995, p. 1).

The emergence of disability in sport policy in Wales

With regards to the impact of wider disability policy in the UK on sport in Wales, throughout the 1990s, disabled people were specifically identified as a target population within a number of sport policies. The SCW showed their responsibility for policy and development of disability sport in the early 1990s with a 'Welsh Integrated Sports Plan' and an action plan; 'Sport for Disabled People 1991-1993' (SCW, no date). Such initiatives encompassed the SCW's aims of 'increasing participation, raising standards, training helpers and trainers, ensuring access to facilities and informing people of sport and recreational opportunities regardless of ability'. In 1994 SCW published 'Able to play: A review of policy and provision of PE and Sport for children with disabilities'. This highlighted that the SCW were 'not specifically targeting people with disabilities as it believes that would be contrary to the objective

of integration'. Alike in wider policy, due to the historic discrimination and marginalisation of disabled people in sport, it is important to explicitly address disabled people in policy and practice to ensure that barriers for disabled people participating in sport are appropriately tackled.

1995 and 1998 saw two important policies which may be considered to have shaped the future development of disability sport in Wales. SCW (1995), published 'Willing and able: the provision of sports opportunities for children with disabilities', which found a number of elements linked with a lack of strategic direction in Wales regarding disability sport and concluded that disability sport for children required further attention, and a coordinated approach was required in order to address inequalities that existed across the nation. At a similar time, Smith and Haycock (2011) outline that a vote was taken which resulted in a devolved Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) which meant a shift of power from the Welsh office to Assembly Members. This was specifically beneficial to sport policy as it meant that decisions could be made in relation to health and education (non-primary legislation) at a local level. Considering this, together with SCW's (1995) recommendations and the introduction of the National Lottery and Labour government, the SCW published a further policy strategy for Welsh sport entitled 'Young People First' (SCW, 1998). This identified that SCW were seeking to actively work towards the concept of 'Sport For All'. This policy made a series of recommendations, amongst which was that resources would be focussed towards disability sport provision due to an inequality of opportunity. Whilst the DDA was initially developed under Conservative Government, momentum was continued regarding the rights of disabled people through Labour's leadership. Consequently, Disability Sport Cymru (DSC) were

established in 1999, based on recommendations in the Young People First policy. This organisation aimed (and aims) to 'increase the number of people taking part in sport and physical activity by developing quality led community based opportunities through Wales' for disabled people (Federation of Disability Sport Wales (FDSW), 2008, p. 6).

A shift towards equality was prevalent in wider society in 2005, with an extension of the DDA 1995 to protect the rights of disabled people in employment, education and access to goods, facilities and services (HMSO, 2005). At this time, Disability Sport Cymru went through a process of re-branding and became the Federation of Disability Sport Wales (FDSW) (Smith & Haycock, 2011). Whilst the initial phase of FDSW was concerned primarily with increasing sport and physical activity provision for disabled people, there was a shift towards inclusive and integrated practice in the second phase of the scheme from 2005-2008; with development officers tasked to work with mainstream clubs and other partners to further increase the sport and physical activity opportunities for disabled people (DSW, 2005, p. 10). FDSW (2005, p. 3) accentuated external influences which impacted upon their strategic objectives at this time. These included reference to WAG's key physical activity policy '*Climbing Higher*', which aims to develop an 'active, healthy and inclusive Wales' (WAG, 2005, p. 6).

The Development of the Equality Act

In 2005 the Labour party were re-elected and within their manifesto they planned to establish an Equality and Human Rights Commission and introduce a single equality act which would simplify and modernise legislation. The first was achieved in 2007

with the amalgamation of a number of equality strand commissions, including the Disability Rights Commission, into one single 'Equality and Human Rights Commission' (Wadham et al, 2011). This assumed responsibility for promoting and enforcing equality and non-discrimination laws across all equality strands (O'Conneide, 2007). The Equality Act became an Act of Parliament in 2010, which superseded the 2005 DDA, and is the current legislation in place for the protection of disabled people in the UK. The legislation's purpose of advancing the equality of opportunity to all has also been evident within sport policy in Wales.

A shift towards inclusion and integration in sport in Wales

FDSW's corporate plan 2009-2013 looked to 'build... on (the) success' of the previous years of the community development programme with a focus on quality assurance, coach/volunteer education and training, and an 'inclusion agenda' (DSW, 2008, p. 27). Inclusion and integration have become a key focus for DSW with the development of an 'insport' programme. This aims to support National Governing Bodies (NGBs), clubs and local authorities to develop inclusive provision, opportunity and practices that will ensure that disabled people can gain access to appropriate levels of participation and performance (DSW, 2013). The 'insport' programme is a practical tool to support the implementation of DSW's inclusion agenda documented within Welsh sport policy. This brings us to the current day with regards to disability within sport and wider policy in the UK to date. The next section will provide a comprehensive review and critical analysis of the academic literature which is available regarding the implementation of policy in the UK, and more specifically disability sport policy in Wales.

The processual nature of sport policy

There has been an attempt by many to define and conceptualise what constitutes sport policy (Hoye et al, 2003; Hylton & Bramham, 2008; Houlihan & White, 2002; Bloyce & Smith, 2010; Bergsgard et al, 2007; Houlihan, 2012; Houlihan & Lindsey, 2013). Recognising the difficulty in adequately defining 'policy', Bloyce and Smith (2010, p. 13) summarise a number of key overlapping and interrelated features involved in the sport policy process:

all policies can be viewed as involving the following overlapping and interrelated features: human action aimed at achieving certain objectives: human action aimed at resolving... an identified problem; and human action aimed at maintaining or modifying relationships within an existing organisation, between different organisations, or a human figuration of some other kind.

Furthermore, when considering sport policy it is important to acknowledge that we are dealing with 'the study of dynamic, complex social processes or human figurations' (Bloyce & Smith, 2010, p. 13). Therefore we must focus our attention, not on the definition of sport policy, but the processes involved in sport policy. Van Bottenburg and De Bosscher (2011, p. 607) explained how 'sport policies do not develop in a vacuum, but are influenced by both general societal processes and developments in other policy areas'. This allows us to recognise the complexities involved in the sport policy implementation process, making it an interesting area to study in order to attempt to gain greater levels of understanding.

Sport: a resource to help deliver non-sport government objectives

Whilst the initial 'sport for all' policies and campaigns emerged in the late 60s, together with British government beginning to take a sustained interest in sport since the mid 60s; Houlihan and Lindsey (2013) highlight that 1990 onwards has been the most significant period regarding British sport policy. This time was significant due to a change in leadership. After a period of eleven years, Margaret Thatcher was succeeded by John Major who 'successfully placed sport back on the public policy agenda' (Houlihan & Lindsey, 2013, p. 2). This led to an increase in resources allocated towards sport and meant that sport was no longer on the margin of the government's agenda. Furthermore, Bergsgard et al (2007) outline that the increased salience of sport to government reflects the growing significance of sport in our culture, the multi-dimensional character of sport, and sport's 'malleability as a resource to help deliver non-sport government objectives' (such as enhancing social inclusion, tackling childhood obesity and community fragmentation) (Bergsgard et al, 2007, p. 3).

Due to the importance and significance placed on sport in the UK, there has been an increased level of academic interest in the area of sport and policy (Houlihan & White, 2002; Bloyce & Smith, 2010; Bergsgard et al, 2007; Houlihan, 1991; 1997; 2005; 2012; Houlihan & Green, 2011; Houlihan & Lindsey, 2013; King, 2009). Houlihan (2005) argued that despite such expanse of interest in this area, there is remarkably little analysis of policy which utilises the frameworks for analysis which wider policy adopts. Houlihan and Lindsey (2013) therefore adopted a modified version of 'the advocacy coalition framework' in order to analyse sport policy in Britain. Whilst this is a recent text regarding UK sport policy, there is no mention or emphasis of disability sport as an area of policy interest. Bloyce and Smith (2010),

also provide a comprehensive text which aims to examine some of the key issues which are evident regarding sport policy and development. Again, there is a lack of discussion regarding disability sport policy implementation. Whilst there are a number of texts regarding disability sport (Thomas & Smith, 2009; Smith & Haycock, 2011; DePauw & Gavron, 2005; Fitzgerald, 2009), and a dearth of literature on disability sport and inclusion within physical education (Smith, 2004; Thomas & Green, 1995; Smith & Green, 2004; Smith & Thomas, 2005; 2006; Houlihan & Green, 2006; Green, 2002), there is limited literature which specifically investigates the processes involved in disability sport policy (Thomas & Smith, 2009; Smith & Haycock, 2011). When considering disability sport policy in Wales, a gap in the literature is evident. This thesis aims to explore disability sport in a Welsh context, whilst investigating the implementation of National disability sport policy and programme in a local authority context.

Disability rights and legislation are of increasing importance, as outlined in the previous section of this chapter, but as is the policy implementation in sport. Le Clair (2012; p, 2) clearly identifies that 'the whole question of the gaps between legislation and policy that outline rights and the reality for those who want to exercise them, is a key concern in this next stage of disability sport'. With this in mind, it is important to evidence what literature is currently available regarding disability sport policy in the UK, and more specifically in Wales.

Smith and Haycock (2011, p. 91) found that in the late 1980s there was still a lack of interest 'paid to the sport development needs of disabled people in government policy'. It has also been claimed that there is a tendency for British Government to

'adopt a largely hands-off approach' to disability sport by encouraging other organisations to develop sport provision for this target group. Although there has been a shift towards an inclusion agenda within disability sport and wider sport policy in Wales, the extent to which this is currently being delivered is very different from one sport to another and one geographical area to another. Wales have evidence that disability sport is part of wider sport policy (Culture Committee, 2003; WAG, 2003); however it is evident that DSW play an integral role in ensuring that strategic objectives are achieved and worked towards. Smith and Haycock (2011, p. 97) indicate how disability sport has been integrated into 'local authority partnership agreements' (LAPAs) which are intended to allow local authorities greater autonomy in how future funding is distributed, with the aim of bringing about 'cultural change'. Considering this, Smith and Haycock (2011, p. 97) indicate that in future the 'responsibility for disability sport development will be that of a range of appropriate local authority staff' rather than the sole responsibility of the disability sport development officer. However, it would be difficult to gauge the full extent to which this will occur whilst disability sport organisations are funded to coordinate and implement sport programmes on behalf of the government. As this thesis unfolds, it is evident that this literature is already outdated, as LAPAs cease to exist. DSW however, have developed a disability sport inclusion programme which aims to consistently implement an inclusion agenda across Wales via the local authority sports development figurations and networks (DSW, 2013). Longevity is an area for concern within sports development policy; very often policies and programmes are short term and therefore difficult to research on a long-term basis and therefore analyse the policy implementation process.

Towards the 'mainstreaming' of disability sport

Over the last three decades there has been escalating emphasis placed on the mainstreaming of disability sport development within the policy and practice of sporting organisations (Thomas & Smith, 2009, p. 73). This has resulted in a number of changes in sport policy, from the perspective of disability sport and mainstream sport organisations. Such shift has resulted in equality being of increased importance since the start of the 1980s with sport policy emphasis moving towards the mainstreaming of disability sport away from disability sport organisations. At this stage it is important to explain what 'mainstreaming' is. Thomas and Smith (2009, p. 75) recognize that there is 'no universally accepted definition', but to put the issue into context, this research will utilise the English Federation of Disability Sport's (EFDS) proposal in a recent strategic plan that a shift towards mainstreaming is about NGBs and mainstream sporting organisations taking responsibility for the development and provision of sport opportunities for disabled people (EFDS, 2000).

Smith and Haycock (2010, p. 26) discuss the inconsistencies that exist in the provision of disability sport across England and Wales. This is also evident regarding the timescale of a shift towards 'mainstreaming'. Whilst EFDS were striving towards the inclusion of disabled participants in mainstream sporting opportunities in 2000 (EFDS, 2000), DSW identified that a key legacy aim of the 2012 Paralympics was to enable disabled people to participate in 'mainstream sporting activities'. This is something that DSW identified to be a priority 'from this point forward' in 2009 (HoC, 2009). Smith and Haycock (2011, p. 98) concluded that although there has been growing emphasis on the process of mainstreaming disability sport, policy and

political interest will 'remain marginal' and the practical responsibility for the coordination and development of disability sport opportunities will remain with disability sport organisations and be 'kept at arms length from direct government involvement' (Smith & Haycock, 2011, p. 98). The purpose of this thesis is to explore the extent to which local authority sports development officers plan, develop and implement sport policy and provision in an inclusive manner.

Bramham (2008) highlights that sport policy is a 'process'. Considering this, a figurational sociology perspective will be utilised in order to provide an adequate analysis of the complex processes involved in sport policy and development, paying particular attention to disability sport policy in Wales.

Sociological Theory and Research Methods

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. Firstly, to give a brief examination of the sociological perspective which forms the theoretical framework for this thesis; figurational sociology. This will outline a number of key sensitizing concepts in order to adequately explain and make sense of the views and experiences of sports development officers and managers working in a disability sport organisation, and a local authority sports development unit in Wales, in relation to the implementation of a disability sport programme and an inclusion agenda. Such key sensitizing concepts include; figurations, networks and chains of interdependency, power, habitus, unplanned outcomes, games models and involvement and detachment. Secondly, this section will give an introduction to, and justify the use of interviews and focus groups as research methods in order to appropriately address the research question.

Sociological Theory

Figurational sociology, which is also known as process sociology, developed from the work of Norbert Elias (1897-1990) from the 1960s onwards (Van Krieken, 1998; Maguire, 1988; Murphy, Sheard & Waddington, 2000). Whilst this perspective is relatively new, it has become well established and influential within the sociological

study of sport (Dunning, 1999; Waddington & Malcolm, 2008). Bloyce and Smith (2010) summarised how this perspective has been used increasingly in the analyses of policy processes within sport and health service management. Furthermore, Malcolm (2008, p. 261) argued that due to the prominence of figurational sociology within the study of sport 'we can move away from extended theoretical re-statements and assume that such information is readily available'. However, a number of key sensitizing concepts to figurational sociology will be explained.

The Figuration

The central concept of this theoretical approach is the 'figuration' itself. Elias identified 'figurations' to be 'a structure of mutually oriented and dependent people' (Elias, 2000, p. 316). The concept of the figuration was developed in order to address and overcome some of the issues associated with social theory problems. Elias argued that a number of 'unhelpful dualisms and dichotomies' were often evident within some sociological theories, such as the agent or structure, freedom or constraint or more notably the individual or society (Murphy et al, 2000). Considering the latter, Elias argued that such terminology and concepts do not truly capture the complexity involved in the dynamic and interdependent relationships between individuals in societies (Haywood et al, 1995). Moreover, Dunning and Hughes (2012), outlined how Elias developed the concept of 'figuration' to attempt to counter the notion that we are individuals who exist in a vacuum, separate and closed off from other people or 'social formations', or that 'society' exists separately from the people who comprise them; as 'static, isolated categories' (Murphy et al., 2000, p. 92). This concept reinforces the 'dynamic and relational character of social life' (Dunning, 2002, p.319). Elias (1978, p. 72) emphasised:

The figurations of interdependent human beings cannot be explained if one studies human beings singly. In many cases the opposite procedure is advisable- one can understand many aspects of the behaviour or actions of individual people only if one sets out from the study of the pattern of their interdependence, the structure of their societies, in short from the figurations they form with each other.

With this in mind, the figurational perspective is increasingly concerned with the *hominess aperti*, as oppose to *homo clauses*, as human beings are observed to be 'people bonded together in dynamic constellations' (Murphy et al, 2000, p. 92). In placing emphasis on people in the plural, Elias recognises the interweaving impact of multiple 'figurations'. In the context of this study, sports development officers are bonded together and affected by the actions and interests of disability sport organisations, sports councils, government ministers, policy-makers, and a variety of other partners involved in the planning, delivery and implementation of sport policy within local authorities in Wales.

Chains of interdependency

Closely linked to the concept of the figuration, are networks or 'chains of interdependency' (Dunning, 1996, p. 203). Figurational sociologists would claim that figurations can only be considered in plurality and that human beings would cease to exist independently of the figurations of which they are a part (Elias, 1978). Bloyce and Smith (2010, p. 2) highlighted the complex relationships involved between modern sport, sport policy and development and other aspects of the wider society', therefore adopting a figurational approach for this study will help to give adequate

explanation and recognition for the number of interdependent relationships and variables at play in the development and implementation of a disability inclusion agenda within sports development. Mennell and Goudsblom (1998, p. 18) explained that 'as webs of interdependence spread, more people become more involved in more complex and more impenetrable relations'. Therefore in a sports development context, it may be evident that development officers are required to pay more attention to more people and partners, in a wide variety of circumstances. Green (2003, p. 17) clarifies that when figurationalists speak of relationships, this is not necessarily the 'face to face' kind. This gives explanation to the existence of lengthened chains of interdependence as people may be part of a figuration or 'chain of interdependence' without having to have physically met every person amongst the 'chain'. To capture the existence and complexity of networks of interdependence, Salumets (2001, p. 11) summarises that we now live in a society where 'everything and everyone is connected'.

Habitus

Figurational sociologists place emphasis on people's existence in relation to others. Therefore everyone exists in a figuration and network of some sort. Green (2003) notes that within a figuration, the personality or 'habitus' of people exists and develops. The concept of 'habitus' describes 'the durable and generalized disposition that suffuses a person's action throughout an entire domain of life, or in the extreme instance, throughout all life' (Camic, 1986, p. 1046). Considering this, we must recognise the significant impact that the figurations in which people exist have in determining behaviour. Van Krieken (1998) explains that the behaviours and actions

of people are both enabled and constrained by the values of the figurations of which they are a part.

The organisation of our psychological make-up into our habitus is 'a continuous process' (Van Krieken, 1998, p. 59). It is something which starts at birth and continues throughout our lives as part of the social interdependencies which we exist in. However, Van Krieken (1998) does emphasise that a person's habitus develops rapidly and tends to have greatest impact 'during childhood and youth' (p. 59). Therefore it may take longer for people's habitus to change in adulthood, amongst the surrounding figuration and networks. This is an important consideration when trying to establish an inclusion agenda within a sports development team. Some people may struggle to shift their habitus towards inclusion, and may take longer or require further support in order to change their 'habitus' to that which is desired.

Power

A significant subject to understand in relation to figurations, habitus and chains of interdependency is power and the ratio of power. Mennell and Goudsblom (1998, p. 36) clearly explain the concept:

Throughout life, we depend on others for things we need, want or value; and others are dependent upon us for the things they need. This simple fact means that power-ratios are a feature of all human relationships.

Whilst it is evident that all people within a figuration or chain of interdependence have power, this may be to a greater or lesser degree. At times, one party may be 'more dependent than the other party' and as a result there may be an uneven balance of power (Mennell & Goudsblom, 1998, p. 22). This may be evident within a

workplace between a staff member and a manager. Murphy et al (2000, p 93) highlights the inevitability of balance as 'no one is ever absolutely powerful or powerless'. Therefore we must appreciate that power is never static or permanent, but multi-dimensional and constantly in flux (Murphy et al, 2000). Figurational sociologists claim that the greater the number of people in a group, the more equal the balances of power become. Therefore it becomes more likely that the outcome of the actions of a large group 'will be something that no single person or group has planned or anticipated' (Mennell & Goudsblom, 1998, p. 23). Considering sport policy, the outcomes and the way in which a policy is implemented may differ from what was originally intended or planned.

Unintended consequences/unplanned outcomes

Elias (1978) identified that the interweaving of networks of relationships or chains of interdependency can become complicated and uncontrollable. The outcomes of interactions can therefore be unintended or unplanned. Unplanned outcomes are considered to be 'the consequences of the complex interweaving of human beings with different beliefs, associated misconceptions and divergent objectives' (Murphy & Sheard, 2008, p. 51). Elias (1987) referred to these kinds of outcomes as 'blind social processes'. It is increasingly important to recognise that the outcomes of complex social processes involving the interweaving of a variety of individuals or figurations, (such as sport policy implementation), cannot be explained by the actions or intentions of any individual or group. Additionally, the outcomes of social processes involving a particular group of people can never be permanent as figurational sociologists would argue that relationships within a figuration are constantly in flux. That being said, people's experiences and perceptions of disability

sport and inclusion may change over a period of time, and therefore the implementation of a disability sport inclusion programme may have different planned and unplanned outcomes over time.

Game Models

In order to fully understand complex social processes, Elias developed the concept of 'game models'. Green (2003) provides explanation, highlighting how figurational sociologists conceptualise networks of interdependence in terms of 'a multi-level game'. The 'players' within a game may have varying levels of power, and our interdependencies may constrain us to a greater or lesser degree. Consequently, in a game, 'the dependency of a player on the intentions and actions of team-mates and opponents inevitably influences the player's own intentions and actions' (Green, 2003, p. 19). Games may vary in terms of the number of players involved, and the number of tiers on which the game is based. If two players were to enter a game, one player being more powerful than the other, over the course of the 'game' the more powerful individual's ability to control or determine the course of the game decreases. As the power imbalance diminishes 'there will result from the interweaving of the moves of the two players a game process that neither of them planned for' (Elias, 1978, p. 82). As the number of players increases, for example by increasing the number of local authority sports development officers tasked with delivering inclusive sport to disabled people, as does the complexity of the game. Therefore, regardless of how powerful some individual players are, such as the Sport Flintshire Manager or Disability Sport Wales Development Officer, they will be less likely to be able to control the moves of any other players or dictate the course or outcome of the game.

Involvement and detachment

A distinctive concept within figurational sociology for consideration is that linked to Elias' position on 'the relationship between human understanding and values' (Murphy et al, 2000 p. 94). This is also central to the understanding of research methods. Elias rejected the abstract and unhelpful dichotomous terms 'objectivity' and 'subjectivity' due to the terms being perceived as absolute, with no capacity for varied levels, or 'greater or lesser degrees of adequacy' (Bloyce, 2004). Elias instead opted for degrees of involvement and detachment (Bloyce & Smith, 2010, p. 5). It has been suggested that the process of understanding society should involve a combination of involvement and detachment from the researcher (Goudsblom & Mennell, 1998, p. 90). Elias explained that a balance between these two concepts existed in all human behaviour (Murphy et al, 2000, p. 94). Bloyce (2004) also discussed how figurational sociologists should strive for an appropriate blend between involvement and detachment; recognising that the researcher is part of the (research) process and it is impossible to be completely objective, although they should appreciate their level of involvement and strive to 'detach' oneself away from personal values within the research process. This is of increasing importance considering that the researcher is involved in the Sport Flintshire figuration as a Disability Sport Wales Development Officer. The concept of involvement and detachment, allows recognition that it is inevitable that there will be a degree of involvement on the researcher's behalf, although a greater degree of detachment has been sought at the data collection and analysis stage in order to gain 'greater reality congruence' (Elias, 1987; Murphy et al, 2000; Bloyce & Smith, 2010). Whilst

being heavily involved in the area which was under investigation, the researcher managed to maintain an appropriate level of detachment. For example, the researcher felt that an appropriate initial research question for this project was; 'to what extent does a disability sport inclusion programme have an impact on the working practices of sports development officers in Flintshire'. However, throughout the research process it emerged that this was not appropriate and was therefore reworked with support from the researcher's supervisor. The research process resulted in outcomes which were not anticipated, hence the repositioning of the research question.

Research Methods

The purpose of this section is to describe the processes through which the research was carried out and give a justification for the choices made regarding methodology.

Procedures

Prior to commencing the research process, an application was made to the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences Research Ethics Committee at the University of Chester to seek ethical approval. Permission was also sought from management within Disability Sport Wales and Sport Flintshire to allow interviews and focus groups to be undertaken with staff members. Once the necessary authorisation was gained to conduct the research project, all appropriate individuals were emailed inviting them to take part. Once a positive response was received, convenient dates and locations were organised. All potential interviewees were provided with a participant information sheet which gave a brief outline of the research project together with

information regarding what was required from their perspectives. Interviews and focus groups lasted between 30 to 50 minutes in a small private office location convenient to the participants. All interviews and focus groups were audio tape-recorder using two devices in order to prevent mechanical failure. DSW's Partnership Manager and Sport Flintshire's Sports Development Manager could not be given anonymity due to the role which they played within the team. By the nature of identifying the organisations involved in the research, it would be easy for readers to find those involved. Development officers were reassured that they would not be mentioned in name in any future write up. The interviews and focus groups were designed to encourage managers and development officer to share their views, experiences and thoughts relevant to disability sport and inclusion. Based on existing literature and policies regarding disability sport in Wales, interview and focus group schedules were designed to cover a range of pre-determined questions to ensure that key areas were covered.

Sampling method and participants

The sampling frame for this study was all sports development officers working in Sport Flintshire; Flintshire County Council's sports development unit, together with the Sport Flintshire manager and Disability Sport Wales' (DSW) Partnership Manager who has management responsibility for the community disability sport programme across Wales. A purposive sampling method was used. This is a non-probability method which samples participants who are relevant to the research question (Bryman, 2012). That being said, the target population were clearly identified at the outset of the research. This thesis was based on interviews with the Partnership Manager for DSW who had been in post for 12 years, and Sport

Flintshire's Sports Development Manager who has been employed by the local authority for 13 years. Two focus groups were carried out with ten development officers who work either on a part-time or full-time basis over a period of 11 months to 7 years. The following table shows the participants involved in the focus group and how they will be referred to within the text. Participants are grouped according to the roles which they play within the sports development unit in Flintshire. AYP refers to the Active Young People initiative, and SDO refers to sports development officers.

Generic Focus Group	SDO1
Generic Focus Group	SDO2
Generic Focus Group	SDO3
Generic Focus Group	SDO4
Generic Focus Group	SDO5
AYP Focus Group	AYP1
AYP Focus Group	AYP2
AYP Focus Group	AYP3
AYP Focus Group	AYP4
AYP Focus Group	AYP5

Semi-structured interviews

Qualitative interviews are appropriate to an interpretive inquiry as they allow for in-depth exploration of experiences (Charmaz, 2006). This method advocates the use of an interview schedule (allowing coverage of key themes), but also allows the researcher a level of flexibility which gives the ability to 'alter the sequence of questions or probe for more information with subsidiary questions' (Gratton & Jones, 2004, p. 141). Semi-structured interviews were particularly relevant to this study as they enabled participants to shape topics in their responses, within a framework created by the interviewer (Denscombe, 1998). This was achieved by asking opened ended questions and then probing for further information (Denscombe, 1998). In

qualitative interviews data is generated through the social interaction between participant and researcher (Bryman, 2008). The two-way nature of human conversation means that the researcher's probes and responses to the participant's speech will shape the data produced. In addition, the participant's responses may also shape the direction of questioning from the researcher.

Patton (2002) identified the purpose of an interview is to gain information from other people's perspectives. Figural approaches' theoretical framework has the capacity to structure our understanding of a research area and therefore constrains the questions we may ask in an interview schedule. Veal (1997, p. 198) outlines three main uses for interviews as a research method; a) when investigating low populations; b) where information is considered to be variable between participants, and complex in nature and; c) where research is exploratory and information sought is to be used for further investigation. Considering these elements, sport is a social phenomenon, which involves complex social situations; therefore, interviews may be an appropriate method to be adopted within figural research in order to adequately explore the complex nature of human figurations. Semi-structured interviews were undertaken with the Sport Flintshire Manager and DSW Partnership Manager in order to explore the concept of inclusion and the implementation of disability sport policy from the perspectives of managers working for two separate organisations within the sports development figuration.

Gratton and Jones (2004, p. 142) outline a number of advantages of the interview method. Considering Bloyce et al's (2008) study, interviewing enables participants to talk about their own experiences and feelings and allows unexpected data to

emerge. The interviewer also has the ability to establish trust and rapport (Gratton & Jones, 2004, p. 142). Green (2004, p. 382) also used semi-structured interviews to allow distinction between sport policy objectives and the reality for development officers' experiences in policy development in practice, and to appropriately assess the constraining and/or facilitating structural context within which the development officers exist and operate. This method was used for sports development managers in order to gain an in-depth insight in to the thoughts and feelings of individuals who have a management and leadership responsibility for teams of people appropriate to the research question. It was therefore deemed appropriate to interview these people separate to development officers, so that staff potentially felt more comfortable to share their experiences without their team manager being present.

Focus groups

Due to the number of development officers based in Sport Flintshire and the dynamic way in which officers interact as a team, focus groups were designed in order to gain information regarding disability sport and inclusion from Sport Flintshire's team perspective. Krueger (1994) described focus groups to be 'a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment'. Roulston (2010, p. 35) highlights how 'focus groups bring a group of people together to discuss a set of topics'. Focus groups are also an interesting methodology to utilise in order to learn about group dynamics and the ways in which particular groups of people talk about topics amongst their peers (Stewart et al, 2007). From a figurational perspective it was deemed appropriate and useful to discuss disability sport and inclusion within a methodological framework which involved the sports development 'figuration'.

Roulston (2010, p. 39) explained how within a focus group, individuals will often orient to others within the group based on their existing relationships. Therefore, for a number of sports development officers who know each other outside of the focus group environment, they would be likely to 'talk in ways that reflect their roles and relationships outside of the group'. From the researcher's involvement, the ways in which the development officers interacted within the focus group setting, was a reflection on how they interact within other contexts. Whilst all development officers shared their views and experiences regarding disability sport and inclusion, the length and amount of responses were a true representation of the development officer's general conduct.

Krueger (1994, p. 19) identified focus groups to be a more natural environment to collect data as participants are 'influencing and influenced by others- just as they are in real life'.

Data analysis

Interviews and focus groups were transcribed verbatim and then subjected to thematic analysis. This process involved the reading and rereading of transcripts in order to become familiar with the data. Howitt and Cramer (2010) highlight that alike with any form of qualitative analysis it is imperative for the researcher to be extremely familiar with the data, if the analysis is to be insightful.

The process of thematic analysis involved initial coding where the researcher grouped recurring statements and responses in to common 'codes' or raw data themes. At the end of this process, 33 initial codes emerged from the data. Through

a gradual process of refinement, similarities and commonalities were identified between the codes in order to develop five overarching themes. The main themes of the interviews and focus groups, and therefore analysis included; A journey towards becoming inclusive; The significance of a disability sport organisation and inclusion programme; Barriers to implementing disability sport policy/inclusion agenda; The implementation of disability sport policy in local authority sports development; and Striving towards inclusion 'utopia'. The continuous refinement of themes and categories helped 'identify relationships between the codes [and] categories of data' (Denscombe, 2007, p. 292). When discussing the outcomes of this research, an inductive approach has been utilised. Firstly by presenting the findings, and applying appropriate theory in order to gain a sociological understanding of the phenomena.

Whilst anonymity was not possible for the Managers who were interviewed, all data presented within the next chapter is not identified in relation to specific development officers. This was discussed prior to interview in order to reassure development officers that their individual viewpoints would not be individually traceable. This aimed to increase the level of comfort for those involved in focus groups, without concern that there would be any professional issues raised based on their individual responses. It is hoped that this has ensured that the research has gained a true reflection of development officer's experiences and thoughts concerning inclusion and sport for disabled people.

Bloyce (2004, p. 149) summarises that 'the aim for figurational sociologists is to recognise their involvement as far as possible and in so doing strive to distance oneself as far as is possible from one's values'. Considering this, the analysis of

qualitative interview data is considered difficult as a level of interpretation is required from the researcher (Gratton & Jones, 2008, p. 143). In acknowledgement of this, Green (2004, p. 382) recommends interweaving primary data with theoretical explanations in order to increase 'interpretive credibility' when discussing research findings. The core themes that emerged within the responses of the Managers and sports development officers, which are outlined above, will be discussed and analyzed throughout the next chapter.

Presentation of findings and discussion of results

The aim of this chapter is to present the data which emerged from two semi-structured interviews and two focus groups, in order to enhance our understanding of the implementation of a disability sport inclusion programme and inclusion agenda in a sports development unit in Flintshire. A number of themes emerged from the transcripts and each will be discussed in detail using excerpts from participants in order to give a reflection of the experiences of development officers and managers in the Sport Flintshire figuration. Previous literature and the key sensitizing concepts of figuration sociology will be considered in order to make sociological sense of the findings. The main themes of the interviews and focus groups, and therefore analysis, include: a journey towards becoming inclusive; the significance of a disability sport organisation and inclusion programme; barriers to implementing

disability sport policy/inclusion agenda; the implementation of disability sport policy in local authority sports development; and striving towards inclusion 'utopia'.

A journey towards becoming inclusive

This section outlines the contributory factors which have led towards Sport Flintshire development officers and team providing sport and physical activity provision for disabled people. This theme predominantly explains the development of a group habitus.

The managers interviewed both had previous experience working with disabled people. In turn, their experience and knowledge of disability sport has perhaps contributed towards the teams they manage shifting towards becoming more inclusive and considering disabled people as a specific population to try and engage in sport and physical activity. Many other staff had not had any prior experience regarding disability sport previous to their existing roles.

The Sport Flintshire Manager has a strong belief in shared leadership, and this is dispersed through the team, ensuring that everyone has a role to play in the leading of others, or the direction and focus of areas of work. She explained:

I think by distributing leadership and encouraging... an ideas culture people feel that they can, I suppose spread their wings and go with something... I think if they're allowed to do that... then they get better outcomes with projects, so it will absolutely have a positive impact on our business plan, because it's not my plan it's the team's plan.

Sport Flintshire's Manager discussed the dynamics of the sports development team in relation to the plurality of the team. She highlighted that each member is mutually dependent, and support each other in partnership on a regular and ongoing basis (Salumets, 2002). From a figurational perspective, this links to *homines aperti* in that the team could be considered to be 'bonded together in dynamic constellations' (Murphy et al, 2000, p. 92). She talks of the importance of inclusive delivery plans to enable that all Flintshire residents have sport provision which is appropriate to them, regardless of age, gender, disability or ability; 'so they fit the needs of the whole populous in relation to sport Flintshire and what *we're* trying to do'. Emphasis is placed on '*we're*' to reinforce the actions of the whole group, not one individual.

As a team 'Sport Flintshire' seem to explore tools to enable their continuous improvement. A recent Quest inspection had resulted in the team considering the whole of their population base within the local authority and surrounding areas. This in line with a focus shift from their main funding partner had a slight impact on the ways of working.

As an overarching organisation for the development of disability sport in Wales, Disability Sport Wales' (DSW) Partnership Manager explained the evolving nature of their community programme which is located within local authorities. The scheme has changed over a number of years since the organisation's inception. Whilst initially the focus was 'to try and get disabled people doing some sport', this shifted towards 'the second phase of impairment specific and sport specific opportunities

and then integration and inclusion, which is where we are now' (DSW Partnership Manager).

Sport Flintshire has a number of 'active young people' (AYP) development officers, whose role is to develop sport and physical activity provision on an extra-curricular basis within primary and secondary schools across Flintshire. Within the AYP cohort it was evident that there had been a shift towards directly consulting with young people in schools. AYP1 discussed the involvement of young people in schools to develop activity programmes; 'speak to them to see if they are able to attend, or what activities they actually would like to do.' Literature has discussed evidence based programming and this shows that it is currently being put in to practice in Flintshire (Kay & Dudfield, 2013).

The introduction of a disability sport inclusion programme has had an impact within Flintshire as a local authority. Previously, disability sport has predominantly been developed in a disability specific context, whereas Sport Flintshire's Manager explains:

We've had the development of insport which has been, again a different way of delivering because we've moved away from, you know, we're going to set up disability specific sport sessions to actually, they have their purpose and you know, are very valued but it's about making sure that organisations, national governing bodies and clubs have the understanding and knowledge and support to be inclusive in their delivery.

Thomas and Smith (2009) highlighted that inclusion has become a central characteristic of disability sport and of broader government policy. Whilst this research project is specifically considering inclusion from the context of disability, it is evident that inclusion and integration are considered in a broader sense within Flintshire when working with children and young people from pre-school ages:

If you look at integration and inclusion in its wider context it's not just about kids with disabilities, it's about maybe children with English as an additional language, and I think working with them at an earlier age, will break down some of those barriers moving into adulthood or young personhood (Sport Flintshire Manager).

This statement suggests that Sport Flintshire programmes give consideration to populations who may have previously been hard to engage in physical activity (Collins & Kay, 2004). The overarching ethos was seemingly that the sports development team strive to do this 'because it's important to us'. Wider sport policy is evident in Wales as explained in chapter two. Sport Wales' 'Vision for Sport' is implemented through the sports development officer networks across local authorities in Wales. The current policy priority is to get 'every child hooked on sport'. Such policy terminology is used by members of the Sport Flintshire management team when describing how disabled young people and others at risk of exclusion are targeted:

We've made it clear on our advertising that we're inclusive, any needs can be catered for, so I think it's really important because it's every child hooked on

sport, it's not the easy to reach, it's not just the affluent children, it's whether they're from low socio-economic backgrounds or what but children with disabilities have, since I've worked here, has always been a priority (Sport Flintshire Manager).

This shows an example of how National sport policy transcends to being implemented at a local level in Flintshire.

Sport Flintshire have a range of sports development officers, including a Disability Sport Wales Development Officer (DSWDO). Within the team, there appears to be a strong group habitus. Elias (1978) suggested that a person is not only a product of their own life history and experiences, but also of those that have gone before them. Therefore, whilst an individual may be born in to a network of figurations that existed before them, with values and beliefs, these values are passed on and can be modified over time. Elias (1978) also explained how individuals can be influenced by the current figurations and networks of which they are a part. Therefore, if an individual becomes part of a team who have a strong underlying belief and value system that considers the inclusion of disabled people in sport to be of great importance, it is more likely that this individual will engage in behaviour and actions associated with that 'habitus'. Sport Flintshire's Manager alludes; 'I mean to be honest, I think it's just a mindset and it's cultural within what we do.' This suggests that equality and inclusion is a fundamental 'philosophy' or 'habitus' of the team. This appears to have a positive impact on the provision of sport and physical activity by spreading the workload across the team; 'it's making a greater impact so, it's not been left to one person, but 5x60 (AYP) officers are developing opportunities and

leading on projects (Sport Flintshire Manager)'. In further statements, it is reaffirmed that 'it's just part of what we do' when asked about planning and developing inclusive sport provision for disabled young people. The culture and philosophy of inclusion was discussed by members of the management team, whilst also being reinforced by statements made by other team members. From the researcher's involvement and understanding of the dynamics of the team, comments made during interviews and focus groups were a true reflection on development officer's working practices. Some members of the team have more experience and confidence regarding adapting activities for disabled participants, although the 'habitus' evident was that disabled people should be included in the planning of all programmes. Team members confirmed 'It's something that we adopt as a team really (AYP2)' and it could be argued that this is the team's 'habitus':

I wouldn't say it's necessarily been something which we've thought about, I think it's just something that we adopt and move forward with it. It's just something we include as part of our work (SDO1).

This indicates how development officers see inclusion as a natural part of their job role. However, the Sport Flintshire Manager within an interview and focus group outlined that whilst inclusion is second nature, it is also a conscious decision that is made to provide sport for *all* people. A member of the AYP team, AYP3 highlighted 'it's integral really to what we do. Everything that we strive for is inclusive. That's the nature, the ethos of how we wanted to develop'. The group 'habitus' has become embedded in to the general ethos and 'philosophy' of the team. There are a number

of full time and part-time development officers, but also a wider network of coaches and volunteers who develop and deliver on Sport Flintshire programmes:

But we've recently grown the team and we're working a lot with our coaches and we've really tried to professionalize the coach and volunteer programme, giving them really good training and then mentoring as well, so training can be on the job coaching, it can be formal training like DIT training or you know a formal national governing body qualification, and we're really trying to professionalize that arm of what we're do and I think we've made massive strides in that, and recognising the work that they do, cos our team isn't just the full-time members of staff, it's the volunteers who work on our, 5x60 programmes or on our holiday programmes that make a real difference, so we try and make sure they feel part of our team, because they're helping us deliver our outcomes (Sport Flintshire Manager).

Sport Flintshire's development officers talked passionately about 'getting the kids involved with sport and physical activity' (SDO2), and Sport Flintshire's Manager summarised their viewpoint that 'I think the best way to deliver sport is to do it inclusively'.

It is clear from these data that 'inclusion' is a concept which all members of the team believe in, and over time this 'habitus' has become firmly embedded in to the actions and behaviour of the SF development officers.

The significance of a disability sport organisation and inclusion programme

This theme explores the role which the disability sport officer, organisation and policy play in the development of an inclusion agenda within the sports development figuration. In addition, the impact which these 'figurations' have on the chains of interdependency will also be outlined.

Thomas and Smith (2009, p. 71) concluded that there was limited research and data regarding local authority disability sport development, and that there was no clear coherent existing policy, 'or, indeed, anything approaching it' which was designed to improve the provision of sport for disabled people, in an inclusive or segregated environment. In Wales, it is evident that a disability sport inclusion programme entitled 'insport' has been developed in order to bridge this gap. Disability Sport Wales' partnership manager explains how the 'insport' model was derived from an Australian Sports Connect programme for National Governing Bodies of sport. The purpose and intended consequences of the insport programme according to DSW's Partnership Manager are:

insport is about changing the role of the disability sport offer and recognises that the disability sport development officer cannot physically, particularly on 21 hours per week, develop all sports, all impairments, disability specific, mainstream sports clubs, coach education, volunteer recruitment. So, what insport is about is engaging in this instance developing the whole of the local authority to look at how we can use that person differently as a kind of, almost a consultant in the very loosest of terms to support people to deliver inclusively, to challenge people

appropriately, to offer them real solutions to how they can make things more inclusive, and balancing that with a resource that will look at how we work through planning and policy development, education and training support for staff, right the way through to the monitoring and evaluation.

When asked during interviews and focus groups about whether development officers felt like the mainstreaming of disability sport had been achieved or was realistic in current times, there was an overwhelming response that they felt there was a need for specialist advice and support. This was not only from DSW's perspective, but from development officers within the Sport Flintshire team. This shows the importance of the disability sport organisation and officer within the sports development figuration. Over time the chains of interdependency have lengthened and disability sport is an integral part of the Sport Flintshire 'figuration'. Some development officers voiced concerns for if this role and organisations ceased to exist; 'I think aswell there's always a need for specialist advice. You know, it needs to be an attitude change, a policy change, but that needs to be driven by somebody, and without people driving it, it's probably fair to say that it wouldn't happen' (AYP3). This suggests that the DSWDO is a key part of the implementation of an inclusion agenda and disability sport policy within a local authority context. DSW's Partnership Manager explains the importance of the development officer role:

It is absolutely essential. The development officer is the most important part in all of this. We looked at different delivery models in the past, we had a review through Strategic Leisure...That review sort of challenged within the local authorities, whether this delivery framework was

appropriate or not, and the feedback from the local authority perspective was that the development officer was absolutely essential to ensuring that we can deliver inclusively.

The DSWDO may therefore be perceived and used as a support mechanism to enable the effective implementation of policy, and the development of an inclusion agenda. The way in which people interact within the figurations of which they are a part, is extremely significant when trying to implement policy. Thomas and Smith (2009) explored the role of local authorities in the development of disability sport. It was found that there was differential policy and practice occurring within local authorities in England with regards to disability sport and inclusive or segregated provision. In Wales there appears to be an attempt from Disability Sport Wales' perspective to implement a disability sport inclusion programme consistently across all local authorities. That being said, it is beyond the scope of this study to explore the differences between disability sport policy implementation and provision amongst Welsh local authorities. The figurations within each local authority would be considerably different, and consequently so may be their 'habitus'. SDO3 noted that the Sport Flintshire figuration is different from those in surrounding areas, 'I would just say that there will be authorities that probably aren't as far along or haven't got the same ethos that we do [with regards to inclusion]'. DSW's Partnership Manager highlights the importance of consistency in the implementation of policy:

It will be in their (sports development officers) work programmes and it will be consistently monitored and the data that comes out of that will be used then to inform future working practice so that everybody delivers an

inclusive programme which will engage a much bigger workforce with people that understand what disability and inclusive sport really looks like and can provide good quality opportunities in those fields. Rather than one of two people who get it at the moment. Essentially, being able to deliver good quality inclusive sport for disabled people, will improve the quality of provision for all people.

The level of support for clubs and other officers within the Sport Flintshire figuration is also noted: 'If you don't have that support from the disability sport officer it would be really hard to provide that support for the children and young people, I'd say' (SDO2).

When implementing disability sport policy, the DSWDO is considered to be a key part of the figuration. The role which they play can have a positive impact on others within the team and chain of interdependency:

I think having just some practical, helpful knowledge from disability sport Wales, about how to include some people has been really good because it's not scary to do. It's really hard to put something tangible on, cos nothing has happened other than, it's just a mind-set, and it's not really happened with, you know, like eastern European groups or, you know, other hard to reach groups, but it has with disability. And I think a lot of that is down to the Disability Sport Wales officer, challenging in the right way, understated, have you thought about this, you know, just posing

some nice questions and over a period of time have really helped stimulate what we do with this area of work (Sport Flintshire Manager).

Other officers clearly noted the lengthened chains of interdependency involved in sport development and the policy implementation process. Whilst recognising the importance of having a disability sport inclusion programme, the impact which this can have on figurations within the chain was also considered;

If they are going to go through it, and they're seeing other authorities achieving what they're achieving, and Sport Wales are also seeing it as well, then I would expect there might be a little bit of pressure on them, maybe not just from within the sports development team but from within the depths of whether it be leisure or lifelong learning, potentially even higher, from councillors to make sure that what they're delivering is inclusive (SDO3).

Other officers also discussed the importance of 'insport' to help lengthen the chains of interdependency for the benefit of inclusive provision; 'So it'll just highlight more partnership work and identify key areas to develop if we need to' (AYP2). Sport Flintshire's Manager embraces the 'insport' programme and how it can be used as a tool for development officer; 'So I think it helps them identify their role, the role that they can play in inclusion and working with people with disabilities, and it being more at the forefront.' The most important concept of 'insport' is seemingly that it is a process. This supports the application of figurational sociology for this particular study, as it recognises that the implementation of sport policy is indeed a process

(Thomas & Smith, 2009; Bloyce & Smith, 2010; Houlihan & Lindsey, 2013). In summary DSW's Partnership Manager explains that 'so, the insport journey, and it is very much that, a journey.' Therefore, due to the processual nature of policy implementation and the complex interweaving figurations involved in implementing disability sport policy in a local authority context, it may be the case that the journey taken may be very different from that intended, or from one local authority to another.

Barriers to implementing disability sport policy/inclusion agenda

As noted within existing literature, there are a number of barriers to disabled people participating in sport, and also for organisations who attempt to provide sport provision for disabled people (Thomas & Smith, 2009). This section outlines the difficulties experienced from a local authority perspective, regarding developing a disability sport inclusion agenda and considers the unplanned outcomes which arise when trying to implement disability sport policy. From existing literature, and adopting game models, it is evident that the sport policy process is extremely complex and there may result from the intended actions of a large number of people, outcomes that no one planned for.

Whilst 'insport' has been developed as a disability sport inclusion programme to support and enable local authorities to become more inclusive in the way in which they plan, implement and monitor sport provision for disabled people. It is evident that a number of unplanned outcomes arise from the intended actions of policy makers and implementers. DSW as an organisation have developed an initiative which aims to shift development officer's work programme and ethos towards an inclusion agenda. Whilst some outcomes will be unplanned, and some barriers will

be created as a result of the introduction of a disability sport inclusion programme, there is awareness that there may be a number of barriers preventing local authorities becoming truly inclusive for disabled people. DSW's Partnership Manager explained; 'I think there's going to be some different challenges in different local authorities. So, I think there will be hurdles that we meet as we go along, but I don't think they are insurmountable.' From a Sport Flintshire perspective, members of the team voiced their confidence that there were no perceived barriers currently to the team's inclusion agenda and therefore the implementation of 'insport' going forward:

There's nothing that would indicate to me that we would have a problem with any of our team and the way that we deliver. And if there was, we would challenge that in the right way (Sport Flintshire Manager).

No I don't see any barriers across the team, and speaking on behalf of the team and anyone is welcome to correct me if I'm wrong but I think that if anybody had an attitude or displayed any working practice which was contrary really to what we are trying to achieve, which is obviously insport. It will complement what we do (AYP3).

Whilst indicating a high level of confidence in development officers from a Sport Flintshire perspective, consideration was given to generic barriers which organisations may face when implementing an inclusion agenda. For example, it was highlighted in relation to providing inclusive sport provision for disabled people that 'It's not the easy option' (Sport Flintshire Manager). Staff also recognised that whilst Sport Flintshire's development officer's individual and group habitus held inclusive

working practices to be high on their agenda, this may not be the case for others working in different areas and authorities, 'if someone came along to one of our sessions we'd make sure we got them involved and do as much as they possibly could, but that doesn't necessarily mean that everyone works that way' (SDO1).

Considering the impact and implementation within figurations and networks outside of Sport Flintshire highlights the difficulties of monitoring whether policy has been effectively implemented. This raises an issue for DSW, as although it could be argued that as an organisation they hold higher degrees of power as they fund DSWDOs who are based in local authorities throughout Wales, they are unable to control or dictate the course of the sport policy implementation 'game'. The importance of communication within the chains of interdependency was highlighted:

Attitudinally it's whether or not [they] (local authority sports development officers) are willing to make the changes that they say they are going to make. Because it's easy to present on paper, but culturally changing what clubs and national governing bodies do in relation to this area of work is going to be key and I hope it's embraced and done in the right way, but alternatively I guess there are gonna be people that it's going to be way down there on their list of what they want to do. And it's how, you know, Sport Wales and Disability Sport Wales and FDSW all collectively work together to try and make sure that they challenge those attitudes in the right way, and ensure that people know what their role is (Sport Flintshire Manager).

This clearly identifies a number of 'players' within a 'game' of policy implementation. Whilst the actions and intentions of DSW and to a certain degree, the Sport Flintshire management team, are planned from the onset; when working within the complex figurations that consist of local authority sports development units, the actions and behaviours of individual 'players' cannot be controlled or predetermined. Elias (1978, p. 82) explained that 'there will result from the interweaving of the moves of the two players a game process that neither of them planned for'. When considering policy implementation, we must consider this in the context of a multi-level game, which in turn may result in a higher level of complexity due to the number of individuals within the figuration and therefore 'game'. It has been identified that 'insport' is a tiered programme, and as local authorities progress to bronze, silver and gold levels, a larger number of partners are involved. Ultimately 'insport' requires sports development units to influence partners within their figuration to become more inclusive. Therefore, the game becomes increasingly more complex as the tiers of 'insport' are progressed through.

Interestingly, only a small number of development officers identified potential barriers of implementing an inclusion agenda within Sport Flintshire, or the wider networks of delivery partners within the figuration. No barriers were identified by AYP officers working on the 5x60 scheme. Inclusion was firmly embedded in to their working practices, both from a sports development context, but also from the school's perspective which they were based in. Whilst some staff identified that they did not feel completely knowledgeable regarding disability, they were clearly aware where they could get information and appropriate support and guidance from.

Some development officers considered barriers from a local clubs perspective. Clubs are an important part of the sports development figuration. Recognising this, one officer explains potential barriers that may arise when trying to increase the number of clubs who provide inclusive provision for disabled people:

To be quite simple, I think clubs would look at it from the point of view, unless there was somebody within that club who particularly wanted to run with that, and it was their idea, then they might sort of say well actually it's not going to make any change to what we're doing now... Not saying it's the right way to do things, I'm just thinking of the conversations I've had with groups of volunteers who are involved in clubs, it's one thing after another and it's not a new role and a new person, it's a new role for an existing person that's already doing 10, 15, 20 jobs within that club (SDO3).

This is a significant unplanned consequence that may occur as a result of trying to implement an inclusion agenda within the wider sports development network. The Sport Flintshire development officers are paid either on a part-time or full-time basis. Their roles are to develop sport and physical activity provision throughout Flintshire. Mennell & Goudsblom (1998, p. 36) outline how 'power-ratios are a feature of all human relationships', as we depend on others for things that we need and vice versa. In this context, sports development officers work in the local communities with local clubs who provide sport and physical activity for young people and/or adults. Whilst inclusion is seemingly a priority for Sport Flintshire, this is not necessarily the case with some clubs. An unplanned consequence of implementing an inclusion

agenda is that local clubs feel like they are being asked to do additional work. Within focus groups, this was mentioned as a potential consequence rather than something which had been encountered on a regular basis with any clubs in the community.

One development officer identified coach education to be an area which potentially constrains the number of clubs, coaches and volunteers that can develop and deliver inclusive provision;

I also think the coach education structure doesn't massively help. By no means am I an expert in the disability coaching framework within national governing bodies, but I know that on mainstream courses disability is either glossed over and maybe if the tutor is particularly good they will throw scenarios in, but if the tutor isn't confident in that they won't and therefore disability is never mentioned (SDO3).

This highlights another figuration within the chains of interdependency. Whilst Disability Sport Wales are the overarching organisation for disability sport in Wales, there are a number of key partnerships that are imperative in order to implement disability sport policy on a local level. The sports development units in local authorities are a key part of the figuration, but also the National Governing Bodies (NGB) which qualify coaches and volunteers to deliver sport to young people and adults. The consequences of coach education courses being delivered without covering inclusion adequately:

Potentially, what people want to do and what they can do are two different things, based on the sort of the training that they have and their qualifications, and their ability to have inclusive sessions if you like, depending on the sport and the activity (SDO3).

This highlights an area for improvement within the sports development figuration. For coaches and volunteers to be given the skills and knowledge to deliver inclusively to disabled people, NGBs have a role to play, by making coach education courses inclusive.

One of the newer members of staff voiced concerns about achieving their performance targets. At this stage, disabled participation is not a target for every member of staff. Whilst the general group habitus is that inclusion is important and at the heart of planning and delivery, a concern was voiced regarding the continuity of funding based on meeting agreed targets:

Especially in this climate with the restructure. Everyone's so focussed on getting this this and this, cos we're externally funded, we need to get these targets and disability's not really in that target. Is that going to effect what people do? If there's a chance to get thirty kids with one session or a lot of work advertising for people that have got disabilities and I'm struggling to keep my job then, the easier option is to go for them. It's not something I'd do but it could be something that might influence someone else's decision to do something (SDO4).

This is an area which could potentially be addressed as local authorities progress through 'insport', as in order to achieve the next level (which in this situation is bronze) all development officers are required to collate performance targets regarding disabled participation (DSW, 2013a).

The implementation of disability sport policy in local authority sports development

This section explores the factors which enable the effective implementation of disability sport policy in a local authority context; including the importance of the wider sports development network and chains of interdependency on the implementation of policy. This theme also includes what the planned outcomes of sport policy implementation should look like from a Sport Flintshire and Disability Sport Wales perspective.

Le Clair (2012) highlighted that whilst disability rights and legislation are important, as are the implementation of them within sport. Considering this, there is currently a gap globally between legislation and policy and is an ongoing area for concern within disability sport. We have recently had the Equality Act (HMSO, 2010) enforced in the UK, which could potentially make local authority officers more receptive to providing sport for disabled people, as there is an increased emphasis on equality of rights for disabled people in wider society. This research aims to gain insight in to the extent to which disability sport policy is implemented within a local authority context in Flintshire. Within the interviews and focus groups, sports development officers and managers were asked how an inclusion agenda could be implemented effectively at a local authority level. From a Disability Sport Wales perspective, the Partnership

Manager discussed how the DSWDO could be utilised within the sports development team:

I think the challenge for us is that sports development teams don't rely on the disability sport officer to be the doer and instead use that person's skills and experience to support other officers to look at how they deliver inclusively. And hopefully, that is what insport does... It provides a two pronged approach of changing policy and planning and working with the line managers to ensure that inclusive thinking is embedded in the team and at the same time the development officer is kind of working within that team to be the support mechanism (DSW Partnership Manager).

This highlights a planned consequence of the 'insport' programme, and also the importance of the DSWDO within the local authority sports development figuration. DSW have consulted with local authorities to ensure that the 'insport' programme is suitable and appropriate to the local authority landscape. It may be suggested that this was to limit the number of unplanned consequences of the introduction of the 'insport' programme. However, as discussed in the previous chapter, when considering the multi-level and player game of sport policy implementation, it is impossible for any one organisation to dictate the outcome of the 'game' or process. To reinforce the importance of a disability sport development officer at this time, DSW's Partnership Manager added:

I think the disability sport development officer is absolutely key to getting this right. I think if we were to remove the disability sport development

officer at this stage from the insport offer, or from within the local authorities, I think we would struggle in most local authorities to drive forward an insport agenda.

It could be argued that this is an obvious response from the organisation which funds a DSWDO within each local authority in Wales on a 21 hour per week basis. However, the 'insport' programme is identified to be a tool which could result in an exit strategy for local authority disability sport development officers. It was mentioned in an interview that 'there is probably a five year journey to get all local authorities to gold and getting them there meaningfully and ensuring it is firmly embedded into everything' (DSW Partnership Manager). At the time of writing, two local authorities have progressed through to bronze level, however as explained, 'insport' is a process and a journey, which may differ from one local authority to another.

Sports development officers in Flintshire reflected on their experiences of implementing 'insport' ribbon. A number of officers noted the importance of the group habitus and the starting position at the time that a disability sport inclusion programme has been introduced:

I think we've started from a fairly good position, and probably other authorities, some will be in a better position. I wouldn't suggest there'd be that many of them, but there'll certainly be some that aren't. Yes there will be ones that it's a bit of a culture shock (SDO3).

I think as a staff team we all kind of sing from the same hymn sheet, kind of thing. We all have the same views about disability, we all have the same views about inclusion and it's good to have that support (SDO2).

In order to understand the impact of the implementation of the ribbon standard of 'insport' on the working practices of sports development officers in Flintshire, we must consider the starting point. Whilst it was not within the scope of this study, it would have been difficult to determine the absolute beginnings of the 'insport' process in Flintshire. Prior to Flintshire implementing 'insport', the team have been aware of the concept for a period of time. Elias explained how civilising processes and rationalization within any human group, have no absolute beginning (Mennell & Goudsblom, 1998), and the same could be argued for sport policy implementation. When a new policy or programme is introduced for sports development officers to plan, develop and deliver on; due to the group habitus, chains of interdependency and the figurations of which sports development officers are a part, all local authorities may have a different starting point.

The statements above suggest that Sport Flintshire have started from an inclusive habitus, and therefore there has been limited impact as a result of the implementation of 'insport' ribbon standard. When asked about the impact of 'insport', it was mentioned in interview that 'we haven't changed any of our working practice' (AYP3) and 'Interestingly I don't think it told us much that we didn't know because we have been considerate and focussed on inclusion as part of our delivery' (Sport Flintshire Manager). It would be interesting for future research to

explore the impact of implementing 'insport' gold standard on the working practices of sports development officers in Flintshire.

Whilst recognising that 'insport' ribbon has had a limited impact on the working practices of sports development officers in Flintshire, staff explained the current position in relation to the team's aims of developing and providing quality inclusive sport and physical activity:

But, I think if anybody was working contradictory towards those aims then that would be addressed from a management level or from a self management level in terms of that individual recognising that through their appraisals and one to ones or through their colleagues pointing it out, because I think it would stick out really (AYP3).

This indicates the strength of the group habitus, and explains how the development officers interact as a group. Whilst there is a management structure in place, the shared leadership and ownership of the team's objectives indicates that development officers challenge each other's actions and behaviours in order to maintain the group habitus.

Disability Sport Wales' perspective on inclusion is that:

It means that disabled children and adults are offered an opportunity to take part in meaningful sport and physical activity, and for a good percentage of those disabled people, meaningful, good quality

opportunities may be in a disability specific or a pan disability sport environment (DSW Partnership Manager).

Sport Flintshire's Manager highlighted that 'I think there's a difference between saying you're inclusive in what you're do, and being inclusive'. Considering this, the concept of 'meaningful sport and physical activity' was explored with managers and development officers in Flintshire. As 'insport' and disability sport policy has been developed by the National disability sport organisation or local authorities to implement, it was interesting to investigate if there were any differences between what DSW and SF officers deemed to be 'meaningful'. Generally, it was acknowledged that people take part in sport for a variety of reasons, and what is meaningful to one person may differ to that of another person. DSW's Partnership Manager explained how it is important to provide a variety of opportunities, from disability specific to mainstream provision with an inclusive delivery plan:

I don't think it's about us making a judgement on who should be in what environment; it's about providing that menu and ensuring that people can make a real genuine choice about what they want to be involved in.

This perspective seems to be mirrored within Flintshire. Sport Flintshire's Manager highlighted what 'meaningful' meant from her viewpoint:

And it's purposeful, and it's meaningful to them, and that might be meaningful in terms of making friends, or it might be meaningful in terms of doing something that they've never done before. But it's definitely

ensuring that they're, clubs, organisations, sports development teams are walking the walk and not talking the talk. That's meaningful to me.

Other development officers reiterated the importance of 'walking the walk and not talking the talk' by stating:

It's kind of not saying it's a token gesture, it's not just a tick box effort is it it's something that should be considered the same as the mainstream side of the club or whoever it may be...So if they do want to just stay at participation level and it's going to be very informal, then that's absolutely fine. But if they do want to look to develop and eventually they might aspire to be international athletes, then that pathway is there for them (SDO3).

The latter statement recognises some of the core principles of the sports development continuum, that disabled people, like non-disabled people, may wish to participate at recreational level, but some may wish to progress through to performance level. It could be therefore argued, that when talking about 'meaningful' activity, the factors remain the same when considering disabled and non-disabled populations. Another development officer stated very simply that in order for sport to be meaningful, young people or adults need to feel 'that they're enjoying it' (AYP4). DSW's Partnership Manager discussed the similarities of coaching disabled versus non disabled people:

In terms of, you know, coaching disabled persons is no different to coaching any other person, it maybe just widens the spectrum of people they are engaging with. A disabled person is not necessarily going to be the worst person or the best person in that group. So, for those children that have got a lower ability level, not a disability, they should therefore be getting a better quality experience because the sport can be differentiated to all those people.

This is an important message for development officers, coaches and volunteers who may feel apprehensive about developing provision for disabled people.

Partnership working was clearly identified to be of significance when implementing disability sport policy, and more specifically, the 'insport' development programme. DSW's Partnership Manager explained how partnership working and lengthening the chains of interdependence is a significant part of the effective implementation process at a local authority level:

'insport' development is linked into a similar programme for NGBs and for clubs, to try and close the loop and ensure that people are driving in the same direction... So, the things that have historically been barriers, you know, identifying children in mainstream schools, relationships with different partners in health, having to face with social services. 'insport' should be able to unpick some of those, and ensure that it's firmly embedded in operational plans, the core documents that link partners together... As you move through the tiers of insport. So, ribbon will

predominantly focus around the sports development unit. Bronze, goes in to leisure as a whole. Then we look at youth services, play, young offenders' teams, the traditional network of partners that a sports development team would engage with at silver. Then gold is education, health and social services. So those big players are going to be essential to getting it right. Those bits will take longer, those are the big partners and players that we need to work with (DSW Partnership Manager).

This highlights how integral the chains of interdependence are within the implementation of 'insport'. The 'insport' programme is designed to bring a range of partners together to improve sport provision for disabled people. Lindsey (2011, p. 517) explained how partnership working is no longer just a way of working, but has become an established and 'important structure in the design and delivery of sports development policies and programmes'. Sport Flintshire development officers discuss the importance of partnerships when trying to develop an inclusion agenda:

Partnership working is key, cos there are so many organisations and departments that work with people with disabilities and access them, I suppose it's joining up the dots really... So, partnerships are, and they're really hard, everyone's got their agenda... I think that it is important and I think moving forward we can probably identify a few more things that we could do and working with partners in particular to understand the role that they can play in having some shared responsibilities and outcomes for specific projects or goals I guess (Sport Flintshire Manager).

It is clear from interview and focus group responses that partnership working is key to the implementation of sport policy within a local authority context.

Striving towards inclusion 'utopia'

This section considers what sports development officers in Flintshire perceive inclusion to involve in 'utopia'. This terminology was utilised by three out of the ten development officers. Collins dictionary defines 'utopia' to be 'any real or imaginary society, place or state considered to be perfect or ideal. Whilst there was a statement made in England in 1996 that disability sport should be mainstreamed by the year 2000, the research explores whether development officers feel this has been achieved in Wales in 2000 or to date.

Within interviews and focus groups it was asked whether managers and officers felt that inclusion and more specifically, the mainstreaming of disability sport had been achieved, based on recommendations made by a disability sport task force in 1996. Sport Flintshire's Manager did not feel that this was achieved in the year 2000 or even to date, explaining how they felt DSW and their local authority development officers had a role to play in order to work towards achieving an inclusion agenda in Flintshire:

I think that, I think we're really proactive, but I think we need that still, and I know that there are other authorities in England and Wales who probably don't place as much emphasis on working with people with disabilities, because it's hard. I, you know, in an ideal world it's where you'd want to be but you've gotta be realistic with some things and it is such a specialist

area and I think maybe it could become regionalised, sub-regionalised at some point... But, not at this moment, not for me anyway. I think it would be, just, it would take away some of the expert knowledge that we would require (Sport Flintshire Manager).

This is in line with DSW Partnership Manager's perspective, that inclusion has not yet been achieved in Wales, 'I don't think we are there yet, I think we are a long way off'. A projection of whether inclusion is a realistic goal is discussed, whilst recognising that each local authority across Wales has a different journey to reach inclusion 'utopia':

There is a potential to achieve it in Wales, because of the nature of the geography of Wales, the fact that we have an officer in each local authority gives us a real handle on engaging with those local authorities in a meaningful way, and the governing bodies are really buying into it. There's a real long way to go on that journey yet though... I don't think you can put a timeframe on it. I think that if all local authorities are starting at different points (DSW Partnership Manager).

This indicates the importance of the DSWDO as a key part of the sports development figuration, in addition to partnership working and the lengthened chains of interdependency. It is evident that the implementation of policy and an inclusion agenda is an increasingly complex process involving multi-levels and players. From a local authority perspective, Flintshire development officers discuss how inclusion could be achieved:

in terms of achieving that kind of utopia, I don't think we'll ever get to that kind of level without some kind of input or specialist knowledge, and I think that's what we're actually looking for rather than, for me rather than, a disability sports development unit actually delivering that kind of work (AYP3).

Some felt that a realistic timeframe to achieve inclusion in an 'ideal world' would involve, 'maybe ten years down the line, that's where they're looking at' (SDO5). Others outlined concern for a shift towards inclusion occurring too quickly without adequate and specialist knowledge and support for clubs or organisations:

It probably is a long way off because in terms of knowledge and the initial getting involved in that sport, there's a big kind of leap of faith almost and if people who are like yourselves, as a disability sport officer can play that role of feeding people in to clubs and building up trust and building up knowledge and being that go to person, I think there's a lot to be said for that role, and if that kind of wasn't around and it was just access straight into an NGB national programme, I don't know. I don't know whether, maybe for the individuals who are confident and want to get involved (SDO4).

I think it's quite a specialist role isn't it so I think if you're expecting the clubs to develop themselves and to work with kids with disabilities without much guidance, whether they have now. It's impossible to have all that

knowledge unless you've worked with them already or had that experience. So, and that's the case with most clubs, they don't have that experience, because they go in and they're delivering a sport which they're passionate about, but when you go in to deliver a sport it is the mainstream kids that come, you don't, unless obviously they're disability specific (SDO2).

Whilst Sport Flintshire's officers are seemingly confident to deliver inclusively and inclusivity is the group habitus within the team, there is still recognition that support and guidance is required from a disability specialist or organisation.

The interviews and focus groups explored what managers and development officers felt inclusion looked like in an ideal world. This enabled the research participants to consider what they were working towards and attempting to achieve with regards to the inclusion of disabled young people and adults in sport. The perspective from Disability Sport Wales was simply that, 'In an ideal world, all programmes would be developed inclusively from the outset. Not reactively' (DSW Partnership Manager). This indicates that generically, this is not currently happening, and that there are inconsistencies with regards to sport provision for disabled people. As a programme, 'insport' aims to bridge the gap in terms of inconsistent planning and development of sport opportunities in Wales. From a Sport Flintshire perspective their manager discusses 'utopia' and what they are striving towards in the local authority in order to achieve success from an inclusion standpoint. They noted that in an ideal world:

There were lots of opportunities for lots of different activities in sport and provision... it would be innate, it wouldn't be something separate, it would be something that was absolutely part of what they did I guess in utopia, that would be what it looked like. We wouldn't have to be thinking specifically about it, it would just be happening (Sport Flintshire Manager).

Other staff discussed their views with regards to inclusion in an ideal world. It was noted that when considering inclusion, development officers considered this in its widest sense, rather than just the inclusion of disabled children. Development officers referred to children who have different levels of ability for example. Considering this, comments were made such as:

So, it's regardless of your ability, there should be sessions available for you to be able to compete so that you can play at a competitive level, enjoyable level, whatever that is, against your peers really, against people who will give you a level of competition at that stage (AYP3).

So whilst this is in consideration to disabled people, it could also be applied to non-disabled populations. Other comments suggested that ideally 'all sessions were made inclusive to everyone' (AYP1), together with 'so if you are going to play that sport you just mix with any other children or young person that enjoys that sport and feel that they are part of that club. That's in an ideal world' (SDO2). Some development officers outlined that in an ideal world, people would be able to take part in the sport and activity of their choice, in their chosen environment, at an appropriate level. Whilst on the surface it appears that development officers are

striving towards something which seems fairly simplistic, such as enabling disabled people 'to do what they want (SDO4)' in relation to sport, disability sport policy implementation is evidently an extremely complex process. One development officer shared:

If you could get rid of the labels on sessions and merge them as one and everybody could do it together then that's absolutely brilliant, but for me the important thing is having the opportunity to be able to do something (SDO3).

Ideally, there would be no need for sport to be identified as inclusive or as disability sport provision, as any person could access sport regardless of impairment. However, it is evident that in Wales, and perhaps other areas, local authority sports development teams, clubs in the community, and National Governing Bodies are not in a position for all provision to be fully inclusive for all at this moment in time. It is important at this stage to reflect on what 'meaningful' activity entails, as explored in the previous section. We must also consider the inclusion spectrum in order to gain an insight into the different ways in which 'inclusion' can potentially be achieved, and the different ways in which disabled people can engage in sport and physical activity (Stevenson & Black, 2006).

DSW's Partnership Manager continues to talk about inclusion in an ideal world, linked to 'insport' being the vehicle to take local authorities on a journey towards becoming inclusive. Although contentious, if 'insport' is implemented effectively, this

could result in an exit strategy for the DSW community programme. So in essence, if DSW's development officers implement 'insport' successfully, they will be reducing the need for their job role to exist. However, development officers are funded on a short-term basis (two to four years), and DSW are keen to ensure that there will be a strong legacy at the point that funding ceases to exist:

I think we all recognise that the community programme, the officers in the local authorities funded through the national lottery as you well know, and that we want to ensure that, at the point where there isn't funding from the national lottery, that we know that we have made a real difference and that difference would be sports development and teams being able to operate without a specialist officer in place, opportunities are still developed... I think that is the end game. I think the vision is that everybody does that. It's a real journey (DSW Partnership Manager).

Furthermore, it is outlined how key the policy implementation process is, in order to ensure an inclusion agenda and habitus is firmly embedded in to the disability sport figuration, and in wider relationships along to chains of interdependence:

I think as we move forward disability sport in Wales will look very different in terms of the services and support that we give to different organisations. I think the key thing is getting this right and ensuring that it [inclusion] is firmly embedded and that we evaluate at every step that it's actually making a difference, like what we want it to. Then if we achieve

that, we can withdraw the officers and hopefully we can stand back and say we did actually make a big difference (DSW Partnership Manager).

Summary

The central purpose of this chapter has been to present and discuss the findings from the interviews and focus groups which were undertaken with sports development officer and managers involved in the Sport Flintshire and Disability Sport Wales figuration. This attempted to enhance our sociological understanding of disability sport policy implementation and the development of an inclusion agenda in Flintshire. Whilst Elias explains that 'nothing is more fruitless, when dealing with long-term social processes, than to attempt to locate an absolute beginning (Elias, 1983, p. 232), this study has explored the contribution and significance of implementing 'insport' within a local authority sports development unit in Flintshire, Wales. The main findings are considered in further detail within the following conclusion.

Conclusion

Drawing upon aspects of Elias' figurational approach to sociology, the central objective of this thesis has been to examine the extent to which implementing a disability sport inclusion programme and policy contributed towards an inclusion agenda within a sports development unit in Flintshire. Whilst attempting to address this question, the views and experiences of sports development managers and officers within Flintshire were explored, to try and gain a sociological understanding of inclusion and the sport policy implementation process. The views of a senior manager within Disability Sport Wales were also investigated, as this organisation plays a significant role within the disability sport figuration.

In the early stages of this thesis, the research question was identified to be 'to what extent does a disability sport inclusion programme have an impact on the working practices of sports development officers in Flintshire'. This was later changed by the researcher when little evidence emerged from the interviews and focus groups relating to the impact on working practices. Sport Flintshire have recently been awarded with the ribbon standard of the 'insport' development programme. This is

the entry level of the programme; the first stage. With regards to the working practices of sports development officers in Flintshire, there was found to be little or no impact, due to reasons which will unfold. Whilst the researcher is involved in the Sport Flintshire and Disability Sport Wales figurations, it was difficult to project the outcome of the implementation of 'insport' ribbon. Hopefully, this level of honesty will indicate to readers that the researcher has strived to achieve an appropriate level of detachment throughout the data collection and analysis stages.

The findings indicated that there has been a shift over a period of time towards an inclusion agenda within the Sport Flintshire figuration. Whilst this study was specifically interested in sport and physical activity provision for disabled people, it was evident that 'inclusion' was considered in a wider sense. There was strong evidence of a group 'habitus' which prioritised inclusion and a 'sport for all' culture within the team. This could partly be explained by an inclusive habitus being strongly embedded in to the way in which the sports development team were managed and led. Leadership was a significant factor in the development and maintenance of the group habitus, and it must be noted that management were not the only individuals to 'lead' other members of the team, or the direction of work. Leadership was seemingly distributed throughout the team, and this contributed towards a focus on inclusion throughout the sports development team and wider networks such as clubs, coaches and local volunteers. It may be useful at this stage to integrate Sport Flintshire's official 'insport' development ribbon feedback from the DSW panel, in order to a) support the findings and b) give an alternative, and perceived neutral perspective regarding Sport Flintshire. In support of the group habitus, it was noted

that 'the entire Sport Flintshire team were committed to the principles of inclusion and the delivery of sport to disabled people' (DSW, 2013b).

DSW highlighted the importance of the DSWDO as an essential part of the disability sport figuration. This was also outlined by development officers from Sport Flintshire. It was identified that the DSWDO could be used as a tool and support mechanism to enable the effective development and delivery of inclusion and disability specific sport provision for disabled young people and adults and the implementation of an inclusion agenda. By the very nature of the existence of a disability sport organisation or DSWDO, sports development officers felt that disability sport and inclusion remained on the agenda within local authorities and wider partners. There were concerns whether development officers would be able to seek specialist knowledge and support if required, if there was no specific officer or organisation to liaise with. There was a positive reception to the introduction of a disability sport inclusion programme, with all staff embracing 'insport' as a tool to gain recognition for current levels of working practice. Development officers were also keen to utilise 'insport' as a continuous improvement tool, and to identify key partnerships along the chains of interdependence.

In the majority, Sport Flintshire development officers did not perceive there to be any barriers to implementing an inclusion agenda or 'insport' at ribbon level. It was noted however that there may be extremely different situations within other local authority sports development units across Wales. Therefore, due to the processual nature of policy implementation and the complex interweaving figurations involved in implementing disability sport policy in a local authority context, it may be the case

that the journey taken may be very different from that intended, or from one local authority to another. Elias (1978) explained that 'there will result from the interweaving of the moves of the two players a game process that neither of them planned for'. When considering policy implementation, we must consider this to be a multi-level game, which in turn may result in higher levels of complexity due to the number of individuals within the figuration and therefore 'game'. In order for us to fully appreciate and understand sports development teams and the policy implementation process, we must try to increase our understanding of Elias' game models as this clearly depicts the complexities involved (Elias, 1978). Whilst game models are of increasing importance in order to gain insight in to sports development and policy, as are the figurations of which sports development officers are a part. As a programme the purpose of 'insport' is to lengthen the chains of interdependency and ensure that an inclusive habitus is firmly embedded at each stage of the 'chain'. This would constitute success from an 'insport' and policy implementation perspective.

Disability Sport Wales and Sport Flintshire managers and development officers discussed 'meaningful' sport and physical activity provision in the context of disabled people. Perceptions involved individual's ability to participate in activities of people's choice, in an appropriate environment and at a suitable level, whether it is for recreational or performance purposes. These factors could be true for non-disabled populations, but it was recognised that 'meaningful' provision was not currently available for all disabled people in Flintshire at this time. It is hoped that 'insport' can be utilised as a vehicle to take local authority sports development officers, but also clubs and NGBs on a journey towards becoming more inclusive, which in turn will

hopefully have a positive and enhancing effect on sport and physical activity provision for disabled people. This in turn could lead towards achieving an inclusive 'utopia', and a potential exit strategy and long lasting legacy of the DSW community programme which is implemented through the local authority sports development network.

The conclusions from this thesis have implications for future research. Disability Sport is an under explored area and this research aimed to address a gap in the literature. This research aimed to explore the extent to which a disability sport inclusion programme contributed towards an inclusion agenda within a sports development unit in Flintshire. In response to this it is evident that 'insport' has contributed towards an inclusion agenda within Flintshire, and may continue to do so over the course of the bronze, silver and gold standards of 'insport' development. However, it must be recognised that the implementation of sport policy is multifaceted, involving lengthy chains of interdependence.

It would be extremely valuable for future researchers to explore the initial research question once Flintshire or any other local authority sports development unit progress through to Gold standard of 'insport'. This would inevitably involve a lengthened chain of interdependence as 'insport' is designed to involve increased levels of partnership working as local authorities progress from ribbon, bronze, silver and gold. Therefore it is recommended that a figurational perspective is adopted in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved in the policy implementation process within disability sport and local authorities in Wales. Further research into other aspects of disability sport and policy in Wales would also

be recommended as there is an evident lack of academic research available in this area.

References

Barnes, C. (1997). *A Legacy of Oppression: a history of disability in western culture*. In L. Barton and M. Oliver (eds.) *Disability Studies: Past, Present and Future*. Leeds: The Disability Press.

Barnes, C., and Mercer, G. (1995). *Disability: emancipation, community participation and disabled people*. In G. Craig and M. Mayo (eds.) *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development*. London: Zed Books.

Barnes, C., Mercer, G. and Shakespeare, T. (1999). *Exploring Disability. A Sociological Introduction*, Cambridge: Policy Press.

Barnes, C., and Mercer, G. (2003). *Disability*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Bergsgand, N. A., Houlihan, B., Mangset, P., Nedland, S. I., and Rommetvedt, H. (2007). *Sport Policy: A Comparative Analysis of Stability and Change*. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.

Bloyce, D. (2004). 'Research is a messy process. A case study of a figurational sociology approach to conventional issues in social science research methods', *Graduate Journal of Social Science*, 1: 1.

Bloyce, D. and Smith, A. (2010). *Sport Policy and Development: An Introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.

Bloyce, D., Smith, A., Mead, R., and Morris, J. (2008). 'Playing the Game (Plan)': A Figurational Analysis of Organisational Change in Sports Development in England, *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 8 (4): 359-378.

Bramham, P. (2008). *Sports Development: Policy, Process and Practice*. Oxon: Routledge.

Brems, E. (2008). *Conflicts Between Fundamental Rights*. Antwerp: Intersentia.

Brittain, I. (2010). *The Paralympic Games Explained*. Oxon: Routledge.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods*. 3rd Edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. 4th Edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Camic, C. (1986). The Matter of Habit. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91: 1039-1087.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. London: Sage.

Coakley, J. and Dunning, E. (2000). (Ed.). *Handbook of Sports Studies*. London: Sage.

Craig, G. and Mayo, M. (Eds). (1995). *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development*. London: Zed Books.

Culture Committee (2003). *Policy Review of Participation in Sport and Physical Exercise*. Cardiff Bay: National Assembly for Wales.

Denscombe, M. (1998). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. 1st Edn. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Denscombe, M. (2007). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. 3rd Edn. Buckingham: Open University Press.

DePauw, K. and Doll-Tepper, G. (2000). *Towards progressive inclusion and acceptance: Myth or reality? The inclusion debate and bandwagon discourse*. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 17: 135-143.

DePauw, K. P. and Gavron, S. J. (2005). *Disability Sport*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Disability Sport Wales. (2013a). *Case Officer's Resource: Insport Club*. Cardiff: DSW.

Disability Sport Wales. (2013b). *Feedback from insport Development Panel: Summary of Feedback- Flintshire*. Cardiff: DSW.

Doyle, B. (1999). *Welfare to Rights? Disability and Legal change in late 1990s*. In M. Jones and L. Basser Marks. (1999). *Disability, diverse-ability and legal change*. Kluwer Law International: Netherlands.

Dunning, E. (1996). 'On problems of the emotions in sport and leisure: critical and counter-critical comments on the conventional and figurational sociologies of sport and leisure'. *Leisure Studies*, 15 (3): 185-207.

Dunning, E. (1999). *Sport Matters: Sociological Studies of Sport, Violence and Civilisation*. London: Routledge.

Dunning, E. (2002). 'Figurational Contributions to the Sociological Study of Sport', In J. Maguire and K. Young (Eds). *Theory, Sport and Society*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Dunning, E. and Hughes, J. (2012). *Norbert Elias and Modern Sociology: Knowledge, Interdependence, Power, Process*. London: Bloomsbury.

Elias, N. (1978). *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Elias, N. (1987). *Involvement and Detachment*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Elias, N. (1991). *The Society of Individuals*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Elias, N. (2000). *The Civilising Process: Sociogenetic and psychogenetic investigations*. London: Wiley Blackwell.

Federation of Disability Sport Wales. (FDSW) (2005). *Strategy Overview FDSW 2005-2009*. Cardiff: DSW

Federation of Disability Sport Wales. (FDSW) (2008). *Corporate Plan 2009-2013*. Cardiff: DSW.

Fitzgerald, H. (2009). (Edn). *Disability and Youth Sport*. Oxon: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Penguin: Harmondsworth.

Goudsblom, J. and Mennell, S. (ed.) (1998). *The Norbert Elias Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Gratton, C. and Jones, I. (2008). *Research Methods for Sports Studies*. Oxon: Routledge.

Green, K. (2002). 'Physical education teachers in their figurations: a sociological analysis of everyday "philosophies"', *Sport, Education and Society*, 7, 65-83.

Green, K. (2003). *Physical Education Teachers on Physical Education: A Sociological Study of Philosophies and Ideologies*. Chester: Chester Academic Press.

Green, K. and Hardman, K. (Eds). (2005). *Physical Education: Essential Issues*. London: Sage.

Hargreaves, J. (2000). *Heroines of Sport: The Politics of Difference and Identity*. London: Routledge.

Haywood, L., Kew, F., Bramham, P., Spink, J., Capenerhurst, J., and Henry, I. (1995). *Understanding Leisure*. 2nd Edn. Cheltenham: Stanley Thomas Publishers Ltd.

Her Majesty's Stationery Office. (1944). *Disabled Persons (Employment) Act, 1944*. England: Swift (Printing and duplicating) Ltd.

Her Majesty's Stationery Office. (HMSO). (1995). *Disability Discrimination Act 1995*. London: HMSO.

Her Majesty's Stationery Office. (HMSO). (2010). *The Equality Act 2010*. London: HMSO.

Houlihan, B. (1991). *The Government and Politics of Sport*. Oxon: Routledge.

Houlihan, B. (1997). *Sport, policy and Politics: a comparative analysis*. London: Routledge.

Houlihan, B. (Eds). (2003). *Sport and Society. A Student Introduction*. London: Sage.

Houlihan, B. (2005). Public sector sport policy: developing a framework for analysis. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 40 (2), 163-185.

Houlihan, B. (2012). 'Sport Policy Convergence: A Framework for Analysis', *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 12 (2): 111-135.

Houlihan, B. and Green, M. (2006). 'The changing status of school sport and physical education: explaining policy change'. *Sport, Education and Society*, 11: 73-92.

Houlihan, B. and Green, M. (2011). (Eds) *Handbook of Sport Development*. London: Routledge.

Houlihan, B., and Lindsey, I. (2013). *Sport Policy in Britain*, Oxon: Routledge.

Houlihan, B. and White, A. (2002). *The Politics of Sports Development: Development of Sport or Development through Sport?* London: Routledge.

House of Commons (HoC) (2009) *Potential Benefits of the 2012 Olympics and Paralympics for Wales: Eighth Report of Session 2008-2009*, London: Stationary Office.

Howitt, D. and Cramer, D. (2010). *Introduction to research methods in psychology*. London: Prentice Hall.

Hylton, K. and Bramham, P. (2008). *Sports Development: Policy, Process and Practice*. Oxon: Routledge.

Jones, M., and Basser Marks, L. (1999). *Disability, diverse-ability and legal change* (pp. 209-226). Kluwer Law International: Netherlands.

Kay, T. and Dudfield, (2013). *The Commonwealth Guide to Advancing Development Through Sport*. Commonwealth Secretariat.

King, N. (2009). *Sport Policy and Governance: Local Perspectives*. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.

Krueger, R. A. (1994). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. London: Sage.

Le Clair, J. M. (2012). *Disability in the Global Sport Arena: A Sporting Chance*. Oxon: Routledge.

Lindsey, I. (2011). Partnership Working and Sport Development. In B. Houlihan and M. Green. *Handbook of Sport Development*. London: Routledge.

MaGuire, J. (1988). Doing Figurational Sociology: Some Preliminary Observations on Methodological Issues and Sensitizing Concepts. *Journal of Leisure Studies*, 7, 187-193.

Maguire, J. and Young, K. (Eds). *Theory, Sport and Society*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Malcolm, D. (2008). A Response to Vamplew and Some Comments on the Relationship between Sports Historians and Sociologists of Sport. *Sport in History*, 28, 259-279.

Mennell, S. and Goudsblom, J. (1998). *Norbert Elias: On Civilisation, Power and Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Minister for Sport's Review Group. (1989). *Building on Ability*. Leeds, Department of Education: The Minister's Review Group.

Murphy, P., Sheard, K., and Waddington, I. (2000). Figurational Sociology and its Application to Sport. In Coakley, J. and Dunning, E. (Ed.) *Handbook of Sports Studies*. (pp. 92-105). London: Sage.

Oliver, M. and Barnes, C. (1998). *Disabled people and Social Policy: From Inclusion to Exclusion*. London: Longman.

Oliver, M. and Barnes, C. (2008). 'Talking about us without us?' A response to Neil Crowther. *Disability and Society*, 23 (4) 397–400.

O'Connell, C. (2007). 'The Commission For Equality And Human Rights: A New Institution For New And Uncertain Times'. *Industrial Law Journal*, 36 (2), 141-162.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. London: Sage.

Polley, M. (1998). *Moving the Goalposts: A History of Sport and Society since 1945*. London: Routledge.

Roulston, K. (2010). *Reflective Interviewing: A Guide to Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Salumets, T. (2001). *Norbert Elias and Human Interdependencies*. Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Sayce, L. and O'Brien, N. 'The future of equality and human rights in Britain-opportunities and risks for disabled people', *Disability and Society*, 19, No. 6: 663-668.

Smith, A. (2004). 'The Inclusion of Pupils with Special Educational Needs in Secondary School Physical Education', *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 9 (1): 37-54.

Smith, A. and Green, K. (2004). 'Including Pupils with Special Educational Needs in Secondary School Physical Education: A Sociological Analysis of Teachers' Views', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25 (5): 593-607.

Smith, A. and Haycock, D. (2011). Sport development and disability. In B. Houlihan and M. Green (eds.) *Handbook of Sport Development*. London: Routledge.

Smith, A. and Thomas, N. (2005). 'Inclusion, Special Educational Needs, Disability and Physical Education'. In K. Green and K. Hardman (Eds). *Physical Education: Essential Issues*. London: Sage.

Smith, A. and Thomas, N. (2006). 'Including Pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities in National Curriculum Physical Education: A Brief Review', *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 21 (1): 69-83.

Sports Council Disability Task Force. (1997). *Recommendations of the Future Structure and Integration of Disability Sport in England*. London: Sports Council. In N. Thomas and A. Smith. (2009). *Disability, Sport and Society: An introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.

Sports Council for Wales (no date). *Basic Information Pack*. Cardiff: SCW.

Sports Council for Wales. (1994). *Able to play: A review of policy and provision of PE and Sport for children with disabilities*. Cardiff: SCW.

Sports Council for Wales (SCW) (1995). *Willing and Able: The provision of sports opportunities for children with disabilities*. Cardiff: SCW.

Sports Council for Wales (SCW) (1998). *Young people first*. Cardiff: SCW

Sports Council for Wales (SCW) (2004). *Sports Update*. Cardiff: SCW.

Stevenson, P. and Black, K. (2006). *The Inclusion Spectrum*. Australia: The Inclusion Club.

Stewart, D. W., Shamdasani, P. N., and Rook, D. W. (2007). *Focus Groups: Theory and Practice* (Vol. 20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thomas, N (2003) *Sport and Disability*. In B.Houlihan (Eds.) *Sport and Society*. A Student Introduction. London: Sage.

Thomas, N. and Smith, A. (2009). *Disability, Sport and Society: An introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.

Van Bottenburg, M. and De Bosscher, V. (2011). *An assessment of the impact of sport development on sport participation*. In B. Houlihan and M. Green (Eds). Routledge handbook of sport development. London: Routledge.

Veal, A. J. (1997). *Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism: A Practical Guide*. London: Pearson Education.

Waddington, I. & Malcolm, D. (2008). Eric Dunning: This Sporting Life. In D. Malcolm & I. Waddington. (Eds.). *Matters of Sport: Essays in Honour of Eric Dunning*. London: Routledge.

Wadham, J., Ruebain, D., Robinson, A., and Uppal, S. (2011). *Blackstone's Guide to The Equality Act 2010*. London: Oxford University Press.

Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) (2003). *Healthy and active lifestyles in Wales: A framework for action*. Cardiff: Health promotion Division.

Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) (2005). *Climbing Higher / Dringo'n Uwch*. Cardiff: Sport Policy Unit.

Appendices

Appendix 1- Interview Guide Schedule

Appendix 2- Focus Group Schedule

Appendix 1

Sports Development Manager Interview schedule

Background information

1. Do you mind telling me what your role is?
2. Do you mind telling me how long you have worked in this organisation?
3. What is your background from a work perspective?

Sport Policy & Areas of work

1. What are the priorities for your area of work?
 - a. What informs these priorities?
2. Have there been any changes to the direction, which your work has been focussed?
 - a. **If yes:** how has the focus/areas of work changed?
 - b. What impact has this had on your role?
 - c. Why have these changes emerged at this time?
 - d. **If no:** do you envisage any changes in the near future?
3. Are there any specific areas you would like your work to cover?
 - a. **If yes:** why is this?
 - b. What power do you have to make this an area of focus?

Staff Members

4. Can you tell me about the team which you manage?
 - a. How many staff?
 - b. What does the structure look like?
 - c. How effective is this in delivering and implementing priority areas of work?
 - d. How important is the provision of sport for disabled children and adults to your organisation?

Disability Sport Development

5. Over time there has been discussion and recommendations that disability sport should be mainstreamed. What are your feelings on this?
 - a. More specifically, in 1997, a Sports Council Disability Task Force recommended that disability sport should be mainstreamed by the year 2000. What are your thoughts regarding this?
 - b. Do you think there will ever be a point where disability sport is entirely planned, developed and delivered by mainstream sports organisations?

Involvement with insport

6. What do you understand the purpose of 'insport' to be?
 - a. Why was/do you think this initiative developed?
 - b. Is there any significance to the timing of this being developed?
 - c. What do you hope the consequences of 'insport' will be?
 - d. What constitutes success?
7. Do you perceive there to be any barriers implementing insport?
 - a. **If yes:** What are the barriers?
 - b. **If no:** Is this from a local perspective? Do you envisage there being any general barriers to this initiative (outside of your local authority)?
8. How do you think 'insport' will affect the working practices of sports development officer?
 - a. Will this have a positive impact on sport provision? If so, how?
 - b. How important are relationships between staff to make this initiative a success?
 - c. What other relationships and partnerships are significant in order to increase the likelihood of 'insport' being successful?
 - d. Has anything similar been delivered locally or nationally before?
9. Can you say how any other initiatives or projects have been similar?

Inclusion in sport

10. In an ideal world, what does inclusion look like in Sport?

- a. Disability Sport Wales have identified that 'inclusion relates to the *meaningful* provision of activity, opportunity and competition to disabled people within an appropriate sport, physical activity, and/or physical education environment. What is *meaningful*?
 - b. What would you consider a realistic timeframe for mainstream organisations to be in a position to plan, develop and deliver *meaningful* provision to disabled people?
11. Will there always be a need for disability sport organisations?

Anything else

12. Is there anything else you want to say about 'insport' and/or sport provision for disabled people?

Thank you

Appendix 2

Sports Development Officer Focus Group

Background information

1. Do you mind telling me what your roles are?
2. Do you mind telling me how long you have worked in this organisation?
3. What is your background from a work perspective?

Sport Policy & Areas of work

4. What are the priorities for your area of work?
 - a. What informs these priorities?
5. Have there been any changes to the direction, which your work has been focussed?
 - a. **If yes:** how has the focus/areas of work changed?
 - b. What impact has this had on your role?
 - c. Why have these changes emerged at this time?
 - d. **If no:** do you envisage any changes in the near future?
6. Are there any specific areas you would like your work to cover?
 - a. **If yes:** why is this?
 - b. What power do you have to make this an area of focus?
7. How important is the provision of sport for disabled children and adults to your organisation?

Disability Sport Development

8. Over time there has been discussion and recommendations that disability sport should be mainstreamed. What are your feelings on this?
 - a. More specifically, in 1997, a Sports Council Disability Task Force recommended that disability sport should be mainstreamed by the year 2000. What are your thoughts regarding this?
 - b. Do you think there will ever be a point where disability sport is entirely planned, developed and delivered by mainstream sports organisations?

Involvement with Insport

9. What do you understand the purpose of 'insport' to be?
 - a. Why was/do you think this initiative developed?
 - b. Is there any significance to the timing of this being developed?
 - c. What do you hope the consequences of 'insport' will be?
 - d. What constitutes success?
10. Do you perceive there to be any barriers implementing insport?

- a. **If yes:** What are the barriers?
 - b. **If no:** Is this from a local perspective? Do you envisage there being any general barriers to this initiative (outside of your local authority)?
11. How do you think 'insport' will affect the working practices of your roles as sports development officers?
- a. Will this have a positive impact on sport provision? If so, how?
 - b. How important are relationships between staff to make this initiative a success?
 - c. What other relationships and partnerships are significant in order to increase the likelihood of 'insport' being successful?
 - d. Has anything similar been delivered locally or nationally before?
12. Can you say how any other initiatives or projects have been similar?

Inclusion in sport

13. In an ideal world, what does inclusion look like in Sport?
- a. Disability Sport Wales have identified that 'inclusion relates to the *meaningful* provision of activity, opportunity and competition to disabled people within an appropriate sport, physical activity, and/or physical education environment. What is *meaningful*?
 - b. What would you consider a realistic timeframe for mainstream organisations to be in a position to plan, develop and deliver *meaningful* provision to disabled people?
14. Will there always be a need for disability sport organisations?

Anything else

15. Is there anything else you want to say about 'insport' and/or sport provision for disabled people?

Thank you