

Survey on strategies to promote social inclusion through sports

Introduction

The regular practice of physical activities and sports is known as a determinant of physical and mental health (Gouvernement du Canada, 2018; Gouvernement du Québec, 2012). Several studies focussing specifically on people with intellectual disability have indicated that participating in physical activities and sports has positive effects on the physical health and well-being of this population (Carmeli, Zinger-Vaknin, Mohammed, & Merrick, 2005; Guidetti, Franciosi, Gallotta, Emerenziani, & Baldari, 2010; van de Vliet & al., 2006). In addition, the participation of people with intellectual disability in these activities can foster their participation in community activities, the development of positive relationships and the development of a sense of belonging (Blick, Saad, Goreczny, Roman, & Sorensen, 2015; Darcy & Dowse, 2013; Grandisson, Tétreault, & Freeman, 2012), all components of social inclusion (Simplican, Leader, Kosciulek, & Leahy, 2015). Therefore, physical activities and sports seem to be powerful tools contributing to the development of more inclusive communities for people with intellectual disability (Special Olympics Canada, 2019).

It is possible for people with intellectual disability to participate in physical and sports activities in specialized, unified or mainstream settings. In specialized sports settings, they participate in activities dedicated to them, tailored to their needs. Special Olympics, for example, offers activities where athletes with intellectual disability train and compete together. The benefits of these activities have been documented, notably relating to the self-esteem of people with intellectual disability, to attitudinal changes in the general population and to the development of significant interpersonal relationships (Darcy & Dowse, 2013; Inoue & Forneris,

2015). Nevertheless, the athletic activities practiced in specialized settings, although beneficial, are sometimes criticized because they offer few opportunities to interact with people without intellectual disability (Inoue & Forneris, 2015) compared to inclusive activities (Patterson, 2007). In order to address this, Special Olympics has also developed Unified Sports in which an equal number of athletes with and without intellectual disability practice and compete together (Special Olympics, 2016). These initiatives have benefits associated with social inclusion, as they promote positive interactions and friendship development between athletes with and without intellectual disability (Baran, Top, Aktop, Özer, & Nalbant, 2009; Harada, Siperstein, Parker, & Lenox, 2011; McConkey, Dowling, Hassan, & Menke, 2013). In addition, participation in these activities allows people with intellectual disability to improve their social skills and their self-esteem, while encouraging individuals without disabilities to develop more positive attitudes towards this population (Harada & al., 2011; McConkey & al., 2013; Özer & al., 2012; Wilski, Nadolska, Dowling, McConkey, & Hassan, 2012). Finally, it is also possible to promote the inclusion of people with intellectual disability in physical activities in mainstream settings (or inclusive settings), in the same activities as the non-disabled population. Yet, several factors can play an important role in the success or failure of this inclusion in mainstream settings. These factors include the training of the coaches, the awareness of the different stakeholders, and the support offered to the included athlete (Braga, Taliaferro, & Blaggrave, 2018; Grandisson, Tétreault, & Freeman, 2010).

Prior to the current study, a scoping review of the peer-reviewed literature identified different strategies that promoted social inclusion of people with intellectual disability in sports and physical activities (Grandisson, Marcotte, Niquette, & Milot, *sous presse*). This study highlighted the importance of promoting the sport participation of the person with intellectual disability in meaningful roles (e.g. coach assistant) and in a context that is as inclusive as possible

to foster positive interactions with other participants and the development of a sense of belonging to the group. In addition, it is recommended that support adapted to the need of the person and the context be offered so that the participation is positive for everyone involved. Thereafter, seven distinct strategies to foster social inclusion of individuals with intellectual disability through sports and physical activities were documented in a qualitative study (Grandisson, Marcotte, Milot, Allaire, & Lamontagne, 2019). These strategies are: 1) developing Unified Sports, 2) conducting activities to raise awareness, 3) providing training to coaches, 4) using shadows, 5) developing a peer-support structure, 6) having a resource person available when needed, and 7) facilitating engagement in nonplaying roles. The advantages, disadvantages and considerations for implementation of these seven strategies were also explored. Findings indicate that no strategy should be prioritised in all cases and that a combination of strategies adapted to the person and her context would often be desirable (Grandisson & al., 2019). It was also suggested that Unified Sports would be more difficult to implement in a rural context. While Unified Sports are increasingly popular on the international scene with more than 1.4 million participants (Special Olympics, 2018), the authors questioned whether most efforts should continue to be geared to implementing these initiatives or whether other strategies should be favored to foster social inclusion of individuals with intellectual disability through sports and physical activities.

Objectives

The goal of this study is to document the perspective of the people engaged in sports and physical activities (sports stakeholders) regarding seven strategies to foster social inclusion through sports and physical activities. More specifically, this study aimed to document: a) their openness to each strategy, b) their interest to be involved in their implementation, c) the contexts favorable to their

implementation, d) the considerations for their implementation, and e) their preferences regarding the strategies to prioritize. This study also aimed to explore whether associations exist among sociodemographic characteristics (e.g. being involved in a specialized or mainstream sport setting) and preferences regarding the strategies to prioritize.

Method

Study Design

This study is mainly quantitative in nature (Andres, 2012). To address the first objective, a cross-sectional descriptive design was used (Carter & Lubinsky, 2016; Fortin & Gagnon, 2016). More specifically, an online survey was done to describe the participants' openness to the strategies, their interest to engage in their implementation and the contexts favorable to their implementation. This design allowed the researchers to verify if the efforts to ensure the implementation of the strategies were worth doing. Qualitative data were obtained using a comment section in the survey to clarify the quantitative data and understand the participants' perspectives more in depth. To address the second objective, a descriptive correlational design was used to explore if relationships exist among certain sociodemographic characteristics and participants' preferences regarding the strategies to prioritize (Carter & Lubinsky, 2016; Fortin & Gagnon, 2016).

Participants

Participants were people involved in mainstream or specialized sports settings living in the province of Quebec (Canada). This included athletes, coaches, athletes' parents, volunteers, coordinators, and referees. The participants had to be 18 years or older. Individuals with insufficient understanding of English or French to complete the survey independently or on the phone with a research assistant were excluded from the study. Although the support received by

phone could increase the risk of bias associated with social desirability, it was deemed essential to capture the perspective of the individuals most concerned with study findings, namely individuals with intellectual disability (Butori & Parguel, 2010). The survey was sent by email and shared on social networks by several organisations and athletic federations in Quebec (Canada) offering specialized and mainstream sports. Participants were recruited over a period of one month, from April 20 to May 18th 2018. Ethical approval was obtained at Laval University (#2017-077).

Data Collection

The online survey was self-administered, available in French and in English on the survey platform *LimeSurvey*, and could be completed in approximately 15 minutes. It was developed to be as accessible as possible. For example, short statements or questions composed of simple words were prioritized and the descriptions of the strategies were presented in point forms instead of sentences (Agence de la santé et des services sociaux de Montréal, 2013). In addition, the scales contained few levels in order to allow ease of selection (Krosnick & Presser, 2009). Pictograms were used to illustrate the described strategies and the scale levels in order to facilitate the comprehension and the completion of the survey (Agence de la santé et des services sociaux de Montréal, 2013). The description of the strategies included in the survey and the pictograms used to illustrate them are available in Appendix A. Professionals with training in survey development and social inclusion validated the survey. It was pretested with people involved in sports at different levels, including a representative of Special Olympics Quebec, a representative of mainstream sports activities offered by Quebec City, two individuals involved in sports (one with intellectual disability, one without), and a parent.

The survey was divided into three sections: 1) sociodemographic characteristics of the participant; 2) opinions on the seven strategies; 3) prioritization of the strategies. Scales with three levels, with one representing a neutral choice, were used in the second section. The neutral choice avoided forcing the ambivalent participants to choose a response (Andres, 2012). They could have been ambivalent for reasons such as the lack of information on a strategy or the difficulty to imagine its implementation (Andres, 2012). For each of the strategies, a comment section allowed the participants to explain their choices and to propose ideas regarding the implementation of the strategies. The variables studied were the openness to the strategies, the interest to be involved in their implementation and the contexts favorable to their implementation. Only participants who were open to a strategy (i.e. answered yes or maybe) were asked to indicate their interest to be involved in its implementation and the favorable contexts. Among the sociodemographic variables that could be associated with the prioritization of the strategies, sport setting (i.e. specialized or mainstream), roles (e.g.: athlete, coach), gender, geographic region and age were considered.

Analysis

The electronic data collected through the online survey were exported in SPSS Statistics 25 and NVivo 11 to be analysed. For the first objective, descriptive statistics were done to measure the frequencies and percentages of participants opened and interested to be involved in the implementation of each strategy. To illustrate the results, visual analysis were done using bar graphs. The comments were examined qualitatively using through a mixed content-analysis process. More specifically, a combination of deductive (based on the research objectives and the survey categories) and inductive (allowing other categories to emerge from the data) analyses were done (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Skillman & al., 2019). A research assistant realised the first coding

process, which was then validated by a second research assistant, which contributes to increasing the validity of the findings (Balard, Kivits, Schrecker, & Volery, 2016). For the second objective, chi-square tests were done to verify the existence of relationships among sociodemographic characteristics and preferences regarding the strategies to prioritize in Quebec. Those tests quantified the probability that a participants' profile predict a specific attitude (Strobl, Malley, & Tutz, 2009).

Results

Participants

A total of 229 people completed the online survey. Only one person requested and obtained support by phone to complete the survey with a research assistant. More than half of the participants were 39 years old or younger (61.6%) and were women (n=168, 73.4%). The respondents came from urban (52%) and rural (48%) regions according to the classification of the Government of Quebec (2018). This classification does not allow to determine with certainty whether participants live in a city or in the countryside since it offers a general classification into regions that include city and small towns. Most of the participants came from mainstream sports settings (n=157, 68,6%), but 21,8% came from specialized settings and 9,6% were active in these two settings. The roles of the participants in their sports settings are described in Table 1. The majority of the participants from mainstream sports settings were athletes. The coaches were well represented in the two groups.

- Insert Table 1 here -

Perspectives on the Strategies

The participants gave their opinion on each of the seven strategies. First of all, they quantified their openness and their interest to be involved in the implementation of the strategy.

Next, they indicated which contexts would facilitate the implementation of each strategy. They also had the possibility to leave comments or suggestions regarding each strategy.

Openness to each strategy. Table 2 presents the degree of openness of the participants to the implementation of each strategy. There was a large sense of openness among sports stakeholders in Quebec, as at least 70% of the participants were in favor of the implementation of each strategy.

- Insert Table 2 here -

Interest to be involved in each strategy. Table 3 presents the participants' answers regarding their interest to be involved in the implementation of each strategy. Regarding the provision of training to coaches, only the coaches from mainstream sports settings were asked about their interest to be involved in this initiative. Among the individuals who were open to each strategy, their interest to be involved in its implementation varied from 48 to 71.1% depending on the strategy. For the strategy of developing a peer support structure, an additional question was asked to athletes from mainstream sports settings who were in favour of this strategy. They had to indicate if they were interested to become a supportive teammate to an athlete with intellectual disability. Their responses were: yes (72.9%, n=62), maybe (24.7%, n=21) and no (2.4%, n=2) (n=2).

- Insert Table 3 here -

Favorable contexts. The participants shared their opinion regarding the contexts that would be favorable to the implementation of the strategies in Quebec. These results are presented in Table 4. For all the strategies, more than 80% of the participants identified schools and recreational community sports facilities as favorable contexts in which these strategies could

be implemented. Mainstream competitive sports settings were perceived as a favorable context by more than 70% of the participants for three of the strategies, namely providing training to coaches, having a resource-person available and facilitating engagement in a nonplaying role. Approximately half of the participants (n=110, 48.46%) perceived that training to coaching could be offered online.

- Insert Table 4 here -

Considerations for the implementation of the strategies. Participants shared different ideas on key elements to consider when implementing strategies aimed at fostering inclusion through sports. Two critical elements that emerge are the use of combination of strategies and the need for opportunities of real contact between people with and without intellectual disability,

First, many participants recommended that a variety of strategies should be used in combination, as this participant expressed: “The strategies appear to me complementary and all relevant to reach the goal of a better inclusion for people with intellectual disability in our community”. For example, the analysis of the participants’ comments revealed that many believed that conducting awareness activities is an important strategy to use in conjunction with other strategies. Several participants underlined the importance of selecting one or more strategy according to the abilities and needs of the person with intellectual disability. For example, some participants proposed that Unified Sports and peer support would be more appropriate for people with a mild intellectual disability. The following comment sums up well the recommendations expressed by many: “Different models of support could be offered. I believe you need to choose the model according to the needs of the individual.” The support by a resource person seems to be a strategy that complements all the others, according to the participants. They specified that the resource person should ideally be available in-person or at a distance when needs arise. Yet,

they mentioned that support offered by a peer remained relevant even when a resource person could be available.

Some participants suggested that awareness raising activities should provide opportunities for real contact between athletes with and without intellectual disability. For example, a participant shared: “And then, you have to live it. Spending time with athletes with a difference helps individuals in the regular [setting] understand!” This was also suggested as an important aspect of training to coaches. On this regard, a participant mentioned: “That the coaches are in direct contact with these young people during the training to experience possible situations and see how to do the right interventions on the field.” This comment echoes another idea that was raised several times, which is the fact that the training itself is a way to raise awareness and develop coaches’ acceptance. On the topic of training to coaches, many participants perceived that Internet would be sound platform to host the training.

Many participants perceived that it is favorable to implement Unified Sports in individual sports because they think that it is unrealistic to have teams in which participants had similar abilities. This comment illustrates this idea: “A special structure should be in place to allow youth with and without ID [intellectual disability] to feel good. In team sports, I have the impression this would be difficult.” Nevertheless, the risk of stigmatisation was also mentioned several times, particularly in reference to the use of shadows and to the engagement in a nonplaying role. For this last strategy, participants underlined the importance of respecting the desires and abilities of the people when assigning them roles and responsibilities.

Prioritisation of the strategies. Participants had to identify which three strategies among the seven should be implemented in priority in Quebec (Canada). Conducting awareness raising activities and providing training to coaches were the most prioritized strategies, with 58,1% and

64,2% of the participants who selected them. Approximately 40% of the participants prioritized the development of Unified Sports or the development of a peer support structure. Table 4 presents the number of participants who prioritized each strategy.

Association with Sociodemographic Variables

Table 5 illustrates the strategies prioritized by the participants in relation to the principal sociodemographic characteristics. No relationships were statistically significant ($p \leq 0,05$) although the proportion of participants who prioritize the different strategies varied slightly according their profiles. For example, people who were involved in specialized sports settings prioritized Unified Sports more often and engagement in another role less often than those who were involved in mainstream settings. In addition, those from urban settings prioritized activities to raise awareness more often, whereas those from rural settings prioritized Unified Sports more often. Finally, the participants under 30 years of age prioritized the development of a peer support structure more frequently, whereas those over 30 years of age tended to prioritize the availability of a resource person when needed more often.

- Insert Table 5 here -

Discussion

The main objective of this study was to document the perspectives of sports stakeholders on seven strategies that foster social inclusion through sports and physical activities. The results show that the population involved in sports in Quebec (Canada) is, in general, favorable to all the strategies. Nonetheless, the percentage of participants interested to be involved in their implementation is a bit lower. Two of the proposed strategies appear to have drawn a large consensus among the survey participants, namely conducting awareness raising activities and

providing training to coaches. First, the openness of the participants is very high for these two strategies (>85%). Second, they were the two most often prioritized strategies in the survey among all groups of participants. Our findings are coherent with those from another study in which focus group participants from Quebec (Canada) had also placed the emphasis on the necessity of offering awareness raising activities and training for coaches as well as on the need to use a combination of strategies for greater impact (Grandisson et al., 2019). Our findings provide guidelines to help decision-makers of different sports organisations who share the objective of promoting social inclusion through sports and physical activities. It calls for actions beyond the development of Unified Sports in favor instead of a combination of strategies aimed at promoting inclusion through sports (ex.: training, awareness raising, peer-support). In addition, to foster the development of inclusive sports settings, our findings indicate the high relevance of conducting activities to raise awareness and providing training to coaches who welcome athletes with intellectual disability in their teams. Then, as suggested in the conclusion of a scoping review on this topic (Grandisson et al., sous presse), appropriate supports may be provided by a peer, a shadow or a resource-person to ensure that the opportunity to be involved in sports or physical activities becomes a positive experience for all and truly contributes to fostering social inclusion of people with intellectual disability.

The second objective of this study was to explore the personal characteristics that could be associated with the prioritization of the strategies. Although certain trends were noted, when comparing the proportions of participants favouring each strategy, no association reached statistical significance. The small sample size certainly contributes to explaining the difficulty to obtain significant relationships. It is therefore impossible to conclude which strategy should be used and what adaptations should be made depending of the region, the sport setting, the age and

the gender of the participants. Nonetheless, since the commitment of the most concerned individuals in the adaptation and implementation of interventions plays a critical role in their success (Damschroder & al., 2009), the selection and the implementation of the strategies to favor social inclusion through sports should be done in collaboration with the partners involved in the activities concerned. In addition, because the intention to be involved is a more predictive variable of people's behaviors than their openness, (Ajzen, 1991; Fishbein, 2008), it seems appropriate to identify in which strategies the individuals of a given community want to be involved. The descriptions and illustrations of the strategies presented in Appendix A can be used to facilitate discussions with practitioners involved in sports in a given community before making decisions and taking action to implement Unified Sports or provide training to coaches of this community for example.

One of the primary strengths of the study is that it has created a global portrait of the perspective of the Quebec sports population on strategies that promote inclusion of individuals with intellectual disability through sports and physical activities. This was made possible via data collection with participants who are engaged in different roles in sports and physical activities, who come from different contexts and who live in different regions. The efforts to make the survey as accessible as possible have certainly assisted to reach the different participants. In addition, this study enabled the expression of the perspectives of individuals with intellectual disability who share valuable knowledge regarding the barriers to their inclusion (Hall, 2017). Nevertheless, because of the small sample size, the study power is insufficient to demonstrate significant differences among the subgroups. Therefore, the generalization of the results to a population with specific characteristics, such as age or geographic region, is impossible. The survey was auto-administered and completed online, thus reducing the social desirability bias

(Kreuter, Presser, & Tourangeau, 2008; Krosnick & Presser, 2009). In addition, it was validated by experts and pre-tested by the individuals it targeted. Yet, the authors recognized that it is generally more preferable to use Likert scales with a minimum of four categories since participants may be tempted to choose the middle option (i.e. maybe) (Lozano, García-Cueto, & Muñiz, 2008). Yet, in this survey, the middle option was never the most frequently selected. This decision was taken to allow uncertain participants not to give a false answer (Andres, 2012). The three-point scale was also perceived as easier to understand for people with intellectual disability or lower literacy levels.

Conclusion

This study reveals that the population of the Quebec province is highly open to the implementation of the seven strategy that promote social inclusion through sports and physical activities. It also demonstrates that a large proportion of the population is interested to be involved in their implementation. It appears that no single strategy should be prioritized in all the cases. Although Unified Sports are increasingly popular throughout the world, it seems that the sports stakeholders from Quebec (Canada) would rather if more efforts were geared towards the provision of training to coaches from mainstream sports settings and on conducting awareness raising activities. The comments also highlight the relevance of combining different strategies depending of the needs and the context. Therefore, it would be relevant to develop tools that support the adoption of the strategies by the key people engaged in the physical and sports activities that include individuals with ID. This would allow them to make informed decisions regarding which strategy to use. In addition, the impact of the different strategies on the social inclusion of people with intellectual disability could be documented. Finally, further studies

could explore the relevance of using the different strategies to foster inclusion of other populations, such as people with other developmental or physical disabilities.

Acknowledgements

Financial support for this work was obtained from Fonds de recherche du Québec – Société Culture and Special Olympics Canada.

References

- Agence de la santé et des services sociaux de Montréal. (2013). Pour qu'on se comprenne! Précautions et littératie en santé : Guide pour les professionnels et communicateurs en santé. Retrieved from <http://www.santecom.qc.ca/bibliothequevirtuelle/Montreal/9782896733231.pdf>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- Andres, L. (2012). *Designing and doing survey research*. London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Balard, F., Kivits, J., Schrecker, C., & Volery, I. (2016). L'analyse qualitative en santé. In J. Kivits, F. Balard, C. Fournier, & M. Winance (Dir.), *Les recherches qualitatives en santé (3e ed.)*. Malakoff, France: Armand Colin.
- Baran, F., Top, E., Aktop, A., Özer, D., & Nalbant, S. (2009). Evaluation of a unified football program by special olympics athletes, partners, parents, and coach. *European Journal of Adapted Physical Activity*, 2, 34-45.
- Blick, R. N., Saad, A. E., Goreczny, A. J., Roman, K., & Sorensen, C. H. (2015). Effects of declared levels of physical activity on quality of life of individuals with intellectual disabilities. *Research In Developmental Disabilities*, 37, 223-229. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2014.11.021
- Braga, L., Taliaferro, A., & Blagrove, J. (2018). Inclusion in the 21st century: Insights and considerations for teacher and coach preparation. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance (JOPERD)*, 9(6), 42-49. doi:10.1080/07303084.2018.1476938
- Butori, R., & Parguel, B. (2010). Les biais de réponse - impact du mode de collecte des données et de l'attractivité de l'enquêteur. Retrieved from <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00636228>
- Carmeli, E., Zinger-Vaknin, T., Mohammed, M., & Merrick, J. (2005). Can physical training have an effect on well-being in adults with mild intellectual disability? *Mechanisms of Ageing and Development*, 126, 299-304. doi:10.1016/j.mad.2004.08.021
- Carter, R. E., & Lubinsky, J. (Dir.). (2016). *Rehabilitation Research : Principles and applications (5th ed.)*. St Louis, United States: Elsevier.
- Damschroder, L., Aron, D., Keith, R., Kirsh, S., Alexander, J., & Lowery, J. (2009). Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: A consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation Science*, 4, 50. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-50

- Darcy, S., & Dowse, L. (2013). In search of a level playing field – the constraints and benefits of sport participation for people with intellectual disability. *Disability & Society*, 28, 393-407. doi:10.1080/09687599.2012.714258
- Fishbein, M. (2008). A reasoned action approach to health promotion. *Med Decis Making*, 28, 834-844. doi:10.1177/0272989X08326092
- Fortin, M.-F. & Gagnon, J. (2016). *Fondements et étapes du processus de recherche (3^e ed.)*. Montréal, Canada : Chenelière-Éducation.
- Gouvernement du Canada. (2018). Votre santé et l'activité physique. Retrieved from <https://www.canada.ca/fr/sante-publique/services/etre-actif/votre-sante-activite-physique.html>
- Gouvernement du Québec. (2012). La santé et ses déterminants : Mieux comprendre pour mieux agir. Retrieved from <http://publications.msss.gouv.qc.ca/msss/fichiers/2011/11-202-06.pdf>
- Gouvernement du Québec. (2018). Portrait économique des régions du Québec - Édition 2018. Retrieved from https://www.economie.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/contenu/documents_soutien/regions/portraits_regionaux/portrait_socio_econo.pdf
- Grandisson, M., Marcotte, J., Milot, E., Allaire, A. S., & Lamontagne, M. E. (2019). Perspectives on strategies to foster inclusion through sports: advantages, disadvantages and considerations for implementation. *Inclusion*, 7, 140-153. doi:10.1352/2326-6988-7.2.140
- Grandisson, M., Marcotte, J., Niquette, B., & Milot, É. (sous presse). Strategies to foster inclusion through sports: A scoping review. *Inclusion*.
- Grandisson, M., Tétreault, S., & Freeman, A. R. (2010). Le sport: Promoteur de la santé et de la participation sociale en déficience intellectuelle. *Revue francophone de la déficience intellectuelle*, 21, 54-65.
- Grandisson, M., Tétreault, S., & Freeman, A. R. (2012). Enabling integration in sports for adolescents with intellectual disabilities. *Journal Of Applied Research In Intellectual Disabilities: JARID*, 25, 217-230. doi:10.1111/j.1468-3148.2011.00658.x
- Guidetti, L., Franciosi, E., Emerenziani, G. P., Gallotta, M. C., & Baldari, C. (2009). Assessing basketball ability in players with mental retardation. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 43, 208-212. doi:10.1136/bjism.2006.034918
- Guidetti, L., Franciosi, E., Gallotta, M. C., Emerenziani, G. P., & Baldari, C. (2010). Could sport specialization influence fitness and health of adults with mental retardation? *Research In Developmental Disabilities*, 31, 1070-1075. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2010.04.002
- Hall, S. A. (2017). Community Involvement of Young Adults with Intellectual Disabilities: Their Experiences and Perspectives on Inclusion. *J Appl Res Intellect Disabil*, 30, 859-871. doi:10.1111/jar.12276
- Harada, C. M., Siperstein, G. N., Parker, R. C., & Lenox, D. (2011). Promoting social inclusion for people with intellectual disabilities through sport: Special Olympics International, global sport initiatives and strategies. *Sport in Society*, 14(9), 1131-1148. doi:10.1080/17430437.2011.614770
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qual Health Res*, 15. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687
- Inoue, C., et Forneris, T. (2015). The role of Special Olympics in promoting social inclusion: An examination of stakeholder perceptions. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 3(5), 23-34.

- Kreuter, F., Presser, S., & Tourangeau, R. (2008). Social desirability bias in CATI, IVR, and web surveys: The effects of mode and question sensitivity. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72, 847-865. doi:10.1093/poq/nfn063
- Krosnick, J., & Presser, S. (2009). Question and questionnaire design. Retrieved from https://web.stanford.edu/dept/communication/faculty/krosnick/docs/2009/2009_handbook_krosnick.pdf
- Lozano, L. M., García-Cueto, E., & Muñiz, J. (2008). Effect of the Number of Response Categories on the Reliability and Validity of Rating Scales. *Methodology*, 4, 73-79. doi:10.1027/1614-2241.4.2.73
- McConkey, R., Dowling, S., Hassan, D., & Menke, S. (2013). Promoting social inclusion through Unified Sports for youth with intellectual disabilities: a five-nation study. *Journal Of Intellectual Disability Research: JIDR*, 57, 923-935. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2012.01587.x
- Özer, D., Baran, F., Aktop, A., Nalbant, S., Ağlamış, E., & Hutzler, Y. (2012). Effects of a Special Olympics Unified Sports soccer program on psycho-social attributes of youth with and without intellectual disability. *Research In Developmental Disabilities*, 33, 229-239. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2011.09.011
- Patterson, I. (2007). Changes in the provision of leisure services for people with disabilities in Australia. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 41, 108-118.
- Simplican, S. C., Leader, G., Kosciulek, J., & Leahy, M. (2015). Defining social inclusion of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities: an ecological model of social networks and community participation. *Research In Developmental Disabilities*, 38, 18-29. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2014.10.008
- Skillman, M., Cross-Barnet, C., Friedman Singer, R., Rotondo, C., Ruiz, S., & Moiduddin, A. (2019). A Framework for Rigorous Qualitative Research as a Component of Mixed Method Rapid-Cycle Evaluation. *Qualitative Health Research*, 29, 279-289. doi:10.1177/1049732318795675
- Special Olympics. (2016). Project UNIFY. Retrieved from <http://www.specialolympics.org/RegionsPages/content.aspx?id=24443&LangType=1036>
- Special Olympics. (2018). Sports & Games - Unified Sports. Retrieved from <https://www.specialolympics.org/our-work/sports-and-games/unified-sports>
- Special Olympics Canada. (2019). Our mission. Retrieved from <https://www.specialolympics.ca/learn/about-special-olympics-canada/our-mission>
- Strobl, C., Malley, J., & Tutz, G. (2009). An introduction to recursive partitioning: rationale, application, and characteristics of classification and regression trees, bagging, and random forests. *Psychol Methods*, 14, 323-348. doi:10.1037/a0016973
- van de Vliet, P., Rintala, P., Fröjd, K., Verellen, J., Van Houtte, S., Daly, D. J., & Vanlandewijck, Y. C. (2006). Physical fitness profile of elite athletes with intellectual disability. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 16, 417-425. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2006.00539.x
- Wilski, M., Nadolska, A., Dowling, S., McConkey, R., & Hassan, D. (2012). Personal development of participants in special Olympics unified sports teams. *Human Movement*, 13, 271-279.

Table 1

Roles of the participants in their sport setting

Role	Mainstream sport setting (n= 179) n (%)	Specialized sport setting (n= 72) n (%)
Athlete	129 (72,1%)	14 (19,7%)
Parent	43 (24,0%)	19 (26,8%)
Coach	60 (33,5%)	27 (38,0%)
Volunteer	51 (28,5%)	28 (39,4%)
Coordinator	22 (12,3%)	10 (14,1%)
Referee or Judge	10 (5,6%)	3 (4,6%)
Other	20 (11,1%)	13 (18,3%)

Table 2

Participants' openness to the proposed strategies that foster social inclusion (n=229)

Strategies	Openness	n	%	CI 95%
Developing Unified Sports	Yes	162	70,7%	64,2%-76,4%
	Maybe	61	26,6%	21,0%-32,8%
	No	6	2,6%	0,9%-4,8%
Conducting activities to raise awareness	Yes	207	90,4%	86,5%-94,3%
	Maybe	20	8,7%	5,2%-12,7%
	No	2	0,9%	0,0%-2,2%
Providing training to coaches	Yes	202	88,2%	84,3%-92,1%
	Maybe	25	10,9%	7,0%-14,8%
	No	2	0,9%	0,0%-2,2%
Using shadows	Yes	163	71,2%	65,5%-77,3%
	Maybe	57	24,9%	19,2%-30,6%
	No	9	3,9%	1,7%-6,6%
Developing a peer-support structure	Yes	172	75,1%	69,0%-80,8%
	Maybe	49	21,4%	15,7%-27,1%
	No	8	3,5%	1,3%-6,1%
Having a resource structure available when needed	Yes	171	74,7%	69,4%-80,3%
	Maybe	49	21,4%	15,7%-26,2%
	No	9	3,9%	1,7%-7,0%
Facilitating engagement in nonplaying roles	Yes	176	76,9%	71,6%-82,1%
	Maybe	43	18,8%	14,0%-23,6%
	No	10	4,4%	1,7%-7,4%

Table 3

Interest of the participants to be involved in the strategies

Strategies (n= open or maybe open)	Interest to be involved	n	%	CI 95%
Developing Unified Sports (n= 223)	Yes	128	57,4%	50,8%-63,8%
	Maybe	87	39,0%	32,8%-45,5%
	No	8	3,6%	1,7%-6,7%
Conducting activities to raise awareness (n= 227)	Yes	111	48,5%	42,4%-55,4%
	Maybe	85	37,4%	31,3%-43,9%
	No	31	13,7%	9,7%-18,6%
Providing training to coaches (n= 60, coaches from mainstream sports settings)	Yes	43	71,7%	59,4%-81,9%
	Maybe	15	25,0%	15,4%-37,0%
	No	2	3,3%	0,7%-10,3%
Using shadows (n= 220)	Yes	137	62,3%	55,7%-68,5%
	Maybe	66	30,0%	24,2%-36,3%
	No	17	7,7%	4,7%-11,8%
Developing a peer-support structure (n= 221)	Yes	140	63,3%	56,9%-69,5%
	Maybe	69	31,2%	25,4%-37,5%
	No	12	5,4%	3,0%-9,0%
Having a resource structure available when needed (n= 220)	Yes	120	54,5%	47,9%-61,0%
	Maybe	79	35,9%	29,8%-42,4%
	No	21	9,5%	6,2%-14,0%
Facilitating engagement in nonplaying roles (n= 219)	Yes	135	61,6%	55,1%-67,9%
	Maybe	70	32,0%	26,1%-38,3%

No	14	6,4%	3,7%-10,2%
----	----	------	------------

Table 4

Contexts perceived as favorable to the implementation of the strategies

Strategies	Competitive mainstream sports settings n (%)	Specialized sports settings n (%)	Mainstream recreational community sports centres n (%)	Schools n (%)	Work place or private companies n (%)	Other n (%)
Developing Unified Sports	99 (44,39%)	111 (49,78%)	186 (83,41%)	174 (78,03%)	76 (34,08%)	3 (1,35%)
Conducting activities to raise awareness	125 (54,59%)	107 (46,72%)	191 (83,41%)	195 (85,15%)	108 (47,16%)	4 (1,75%)
Providing training to coaches	163 (71,81%)	139 (61,23%)	191 (84,14%)	185 (81,50%)	96 (42,29%)	5 (2,20%)
Using shadows	145 (65,91%)	Not asked	184 (83,64%)	184 (83,64%)	89 (40,45%)	6 (2,73%)
Developing a peer-support structure	146 (66,06%)	Not asked	188 (85,07%)	191 (86,43%)	111 (50,23%)	3 (1,36%)
Having a resource structure available when needed	156 (70,91%)	Not asked	187 (85,00%)	188 (85,45%)	103 (46,82%)	6 (2,73%)
Facilitating engagement in nonplaying roles	165 (75,34%)	Not asked	190 (86,76%)	188 (85,84%)	116 (52,97%)	1 (0,46%)

Table 5

Priorization of the strategies and associations with sociodemographic variables

Strategies	n total who prioritized (%)	Proportion who prioritized the strategy								
		Gender		Age		Region		Settings		
		M	F	≤ 29	≥ 30	Urb.	Rur.	M	S	MS
Developing Unified Sports	90 (39,3%)	37,7%	39,9%	39,6%	39,1%	33,6%	45,5%	35,0%	46,0%	54,5%
		<i>p</i> = 0,879		<i>p</i> = 1,00		<i>p</i> = 0,079		<i>p</i> =0,119		
Conducting activities to raise awareness	133 (58,1%)	52,5%	60,1%	58,2%	58,0%	63,0%	52,7%	55,4%	66,0%	59,1%
		<i>p</i> = 0,364		<i>p</i> = 1,00		<i>p</i> = 0,140		<i>p</i> = 0,419		
Providing training to coaches	147 (64,2%)	59,0%	66,1%	69,2%	60,9%	64,7%	63,6%	63,7%	62,0%	72,7%
		<i>p</i> = 0,352		<i>p</i> = 0,208		<i>p</i> = 0,891		<i>p</i> = 0,688		
Using shadows	82 (35,8%)	34,4%	36,3%	29,7%	39,9%	36,4%	35,8%	35,0%	36,0%	40,9%
		<i>p</i> = 0,877		<i>p</i> = 0,124		<i>p</i> = 0,891		<i>p</i> = 0,884		
Developing a peer-support structure	93 (40,6%)	44,3%	39,3%	47,3%	36,2%	42,0%	39,1%	43,9%	32,0%	36,4%
		<i>p</i> = 0,544		<i>p</i> = 0,101		<i>p</i> = 0,688		<i>p</i> = 0,289		
Having a resource structure available when needed	68 (29,7%)	32,8%	28,6%	24,2%	33,3%	31,9%	27,3%	33,1%	26,0%	13,6%
		<i>p</i> = 0,472		<i>p</i> = 0,143		<i>p</i> = 0,472		<i>p</i> = 0,147		
Facilitating engagement in nonplaying roles	60 (26,2%)	29,5%	25,0%	25,3%	26,8%	25,2%	27,3%	30,6%	18,0%	13,6%
		<i>p</i> = 0,500		<i>p</i> = 0,878		<i>p</i> = 0,765		<i>p</i> = 0,075		

Abbreviation. M : male, F : Female, ≤ 29 : 29 years or younger, ≥ 30 : 30 years or older, Urb. : urban, Rur. : rural, M : involved in mainstream sport settings, S : involved in specialized sport settings, MS involved in mainstream and specialized sport settings.