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Abstract

Despite recent developments, related to adapted physical activity programmes, much is still needed to enhance the contributions these programmes make toward rearticulating conceptions of disability (Fitzgerald, 2005). Research often suggests that negative attitudes concerning individuals living with a disability have been prevalent from early Egyptian, Greek and Roman civilizations to the modern day (Arokiasamy et al., 2008). Miller et al., (2004, p.9) found that ‘abusive and oppressive behavior arose from the belief that disabled individuals are inferior to others’. Considering this, merely the term ‘disability’ has the prefix of ‘dis’ suggesting a perceived inferior and negative relationship between disability and ability (Fitzgerald, 2005).

The key aim of this study was to investigate if perceptual changes in secondary school pupils’ of disability sport could be altered during a Lincolnshire County Sports Partnership intervention entitled ‘The LSP Wheelchair Basketball Project.’ The intervention utilised a reverse-integration method of delivery, incorporating wheelchair basketball into pupils PE lessons for a 12-week period. Bourdieu’s theoretical standpoint was used to provide theoretical foundation for the study while Chris Shilling’s work (2003) provided context specific, theoretical foundation to explain potential perceptions of participants prior to the intervention. 97 pupils aged between 10 and 12 took part in this research. All pupils, regardless of physical status, took part in the intervention. Non-Participant observations were made over the 12-week intervention period at one school in the city of Lincoln. This highlighted key behaviour themes among pupils, which were then discussed in guided group interviews. Results indicated an evolution of three key perceptions participants possessed prior to the intervention. Participant perceptions of disabled individuals changed from sympathy, limiting and contrived respect (pre-intervention) to perceptions of empathy, commonality and genuine respect. Furthermore, a comparison group provided evidence that these changes had occurred solely due to the lived experiences of participants who encountered the intervention.
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1: Introduction

Throughout cultures across the planet, individuals with physical disabilities have been subject to negative stereotypes and stigmatisation. Early Grecian and Spartan history provides numerous accounts and examples of a culture in which physical imperfection resulted in abortion/destruction of newborn babies (Kennell, 2010, p.47). Whilst the severity of these perceptions has altered over time, researchers frequently still highlight a discrepancy in how individuals view their ‘normal’ body compared to that of a physically disabled individual (Fitzgerald, 2005; Howe, 2006). Bryan (2006, p.104) asserts that ‘it is of no surprise that we still see negative perceptions of disability. Societies refusal to change its perception of disability has seen an acceptance of “the way things are”’. Researchers suggest that a perception of the disabled body being limited and/or imperfect is a root cause to negative perceptions. Indeed Bryan (2006, p.105) claims that ‘Too often the negatives of the limitation(s) imposed by a disability are the aspect on which we focus’ (Bryan, 2006, 105). Due to this perception of an inferior form, physically disabled individuals are often seen as being incapable of participating in activities a non-disabled individual can i.e. physical education.

Researchers suggest that physical education has become one area of education that has seen these perceptions arise (Brown, 2004; Fitzgerald, 2005; Howe; 2009). Haycock and Smith (2011, p.159) noted a teacher, when asked what sports are open to disabled individuals, as saying:

‘If we're doing basketball, it's not just (for) anyone to come along to because we're playing, like, national level...There are certain activities we open up like the athletics...but the main focus is on the elite kids. That's what's seen as more important here so we focus on that.’

Fitzgerald (2005) stated that, frequently, disabled individuals are perceived as being incapable of playing sport and feel discouraged from attempting to
participate. Fitzgerald (2005, p.53), in her analysis of disabled pupils’ experiences of sport noted a participant who had said:

‘It’s like I feel like he’s looking down on me and he doesn’t care and he sees my chair and all things I can’t do.’

Fitzgerald (2005, p.55) highlighted how a student perceived her teacher to view her as being incapable of participating within sport and therefore felt discouraged to involve herself. Brown (2005) asserted that this perception of limitation was also relevant to disabled pupils’ peers within the PE field. Brown claimed that often pupils participating with disabled also demonstrated similar negative perceptions toward physically disabled individuals. Fitzgerald (2005) later asserts that it would be a mistake to assume that traditional methods of integrating disabled individuals into traditional PE lessons affect, in anyway, the ‘deep-seated, normalised physical education habitus’ that is currently evident in schools, i.e. a negative perception of disability.

Considering this, it is important to understand the physical education context in which these perceptions arise and are reinforced. Following this, the intervention analysed in this study will be identified and discussed and the need for research will be justified. Finally, an outline of the study highlighting the research aims, principal findings and a general structure of the thesis will be provided.

1.1: The ‘Normalised’ PE Setting

In 2001, the Labour Government released the ‘Special Educational Needs and Disability Act’, which proposed that a period of change in special education was required. This document asserted that integration between special and mainstream schools should be encouraged. It was the government’s belief (REF) that the then current educational system could accommodate the needs of
disabled individuals through Special Education Needs (SEN) departments. Research in the PE field however suggested that this perception is inaccurate, and that the PE setting does not cater for disabled individuals.

Researchers suggested that the PE environment has become dominated by ‘successful’ students who possess a high level of physical competence (Hay and MacDonald, 2010), display high levels of technical skill (Hunter, 2004) and demonstrate a competence in a number of games predominantly practiced in schools (Brown, 2005). Consequently, this had led to physically disabled individuals being discouraged from participating in school sport (Hunter, 2004; Shapiro and Martin, 2010). While numerous studies have been conducted that have investigated the Physical Education environment (Brown, 2005, Fitzgerald, 2005) there is still limited understanding concerning young, disabled individuals’ experiences of physical education and school sport (Smith, 2004). Indeed researchers suggest this limited understanding of disability and disabled individuals, within the PE field, is due to the success-based character of the PE environment (Brown, 2005; Hunter, 2004; Morgan and Hansen, 2008; Tok and Morali, 2009).

For Sherrill (2004), one of the most prevalent barriers to including students with disabilities is related to teacher attitudes and perceptions. Hay and MacDonald (2010), interviewed teachers to investigate how they discern “good” pupils from “bad” pupils and noted that their analysis was based upon student’s ability to perform within traditional team games i.e. Football/Rugby, games perceived to be inaccessible to physically and mentally disabled individuals. For example, Hay and MacDonald (2010, p.9) noted a teacher saying:
‘We ask them to get out there and play a game, football or something, and we video them. That gives us a pretty good indication, early on, about who can do the sorts of things that are required.’

As a result the PE setting has become one in which successful, athletic and skillful students benefit, while those who are perceived as being unable to participate in school sports, such as disabled individuals, remain in the shadows and on the touchlines (Morgan and Hansen, 2008). Bourdieu (1984) and Shilling (1993) both suggested theoretical concepts that may, in some way, explain this stigmatisation of disabled individuals.

1.2: Bourdieu and Shilling: Using ‘capital’ to explain the social construction of disability amongst secondary school children

This study used Pierre Bourdieu’s (1984) concept of Capital and Chris Shilling’s (2003) expansion of this theory relating to Physical Capital, to gain insight into why many of the negative perceptions of disability in schools have been created and reproduced within mainstream PE.

Bourdieu (1984) believed that society consists of social actors (individuals) who possess varying levels of diverse social capital. Bourdieu believed that each individual within society has a societal value that is based on three forms of capital: Economic, Cultural and Symbolic (Jarvie and Maguire, 1994). Bourdieu believed that an individual would accumulate these forms of capital and, based on their accrual, begin to interact within a specific social group (Bourdieu, 1992). This social group would then influence an individual forming what he termed their ‘habitus’. Habitus refers to a set of acquired schemes or dispositions, perceptions and appreciations, including tastes, which orient practices and give them meaning (Bourdieu, 1992). For example, for the purpose of this study, non-
disabled individuals’ negative perceptions of disabled individuals are often reproduced and instilled within an individual’s habitus thus causing the cycle to begin again (Thorpe, 2009).

Chris Shilling (2003) critiqued Bourdieu’s concept with the introduction of his concept of Physical Capital. Shilling’s theory stemmed from the apparent lack of Bourdieu’s view of the physical, biological body as being a bearer of value, as well as those elements of the body that are culturally produced (Shilling and Mellor, 2001). Bourdieu only placed value in an individual’s deportment, clothing, hairstyle etc; all of which are constructed by an individual’s habitus. Shilling (2003) however claims that mesomorphic form, health, fitness and physical capability, also possessed value. With regards to this study, disabled individuals are often viewed as possessing low levels of physical capital and are therefore perceived as being unable to participate within traditional school sport and are subject to poor provision of PE (Hay and MacDonald, 2010).

Considering this, researchers have attempted to target this perception by challenging traditional methods of session delivery (Haycock and Smith, 2011; Sparkes, Partington and Brown, 2007; Tinning, 2006). It is therefore necessary to outline in brief, the previous approaches taken to address this issue.

1.3: A Chance for Change: Reverse integration and its potential to change perceptions

Adapted physical activity has, in recent times, been considered a primary way to challenge negative perceptions of disabled individuals whilst also increasing disabled individuals’ participation levels in PE (Brasile, 1990; Nixon, 2007; Spencer-Cavaliere and Watson, 2010). Brasile (1990) introduced the concept of ‘reverse integration’ as a means to challenge traditional methods of integration
and affect change in negative perception. This concept calls for a new perspective in education through which non-disabled individuals are required to adapt to a disabled environment, instead of expecting disabled individuals to adapt to a non-disabled environment, (Thiboutot, 1992). This approach has since been considered a central component in the proposed inclusion spectrum and centralises the importance of disability sport. The inclusion spectrum provides teachers with various different forms of integration available to them with an aim to challenging perceptions of disability and improving integration (Stephenson, 2007).

Figure 1.1 The Inclusion Spectrum (Stephenson, 2007)

Brasile (1990) claimed that reverse integration has caused a deeper commitment to, and insight into, the needs of disabled individuals with regard to social barriers
that exist today. It was Brasile’s belief that by allowing non-disabled individuals to experience disability sport, perceptions toward disability and disability sport could be altered. This in turn could then potentially alter the social stigma often attached to disabled individuals. Considering this new form of integration however, Spencer-Calaviere and Peers (2011) asserted this field would be significantly enriched by empirical studies into the actual experiences of athletes participating within reverse integration contexts. Reverse-integration potentially reverses Bourdieu’s concept of capital by placing physical capital value in disability sport, which according to numerous researchers, usually possesses little capital value (Fitzgerald, 2005, Howe, 2009).

While this method of delivery has been researched (Brasile, 1990), the sociological impact of such a programme has not. With this in mind, this study was conducted alongside an evaluation of a reverse-integration intervention implemented in Lincolnshire. Over a 12-week period, pupils aged 11-12 were exposed to wheelchair basketball sessions during their timetabled PE lesson. While an evaluation of the aims of the intervention was also conducted, this study focussed exclusively on the social and perceptual experiences/changes pupils encountered during a 12-week wheelchair basketball intervention.

1.4: Analysing the intervention

This thesis investigates the sociological impact of a reverse integration disability sport intervention on the perceptions of young people in a school in Lincolnshire. At no point was the researcher involved in the conception or creation of the intervention goals and therefore it is vital to understand that this piece of research did not evaluate the ‘success’ of the intervention in meeting its aims but instead, solely focussed on sociologically examining if participants perceptions of disability were, in any way, influenced by their experiences of the intervention. Therefore,
the primary research goal of this study, based on the predisposed structure and delivery of the intervention, was to:

- Ascertain whether pupils’ perceptions of wheelchair basketball altered following participation in the ‘Wheelchair Sports’ intervention.

To achieve this the sociological concepts of Bourdieu (1984) and Shilling (2003) are used to explain participants’ pre-conceptions about physical disability and disability sport, as well as to investigate whether or not the intervention had an impact on participants’ perceptions after their involvement in the scheme. Following on from this a discussion into the key concepts relating to the construction of societal perceptions toward disability and disability sport is carried out.

The review of literature identified a lack in research into non-disabled children’s perceptions and lived experiences of disability sport. The aim of this study was to identify perceptions participants possessed regarding wheelchair basketball players and observe whether, through a reverse-integration intervention, those perceptions would change. Therefore four main areas of investigation were identified as being key to the completion of the study:

- Attitudes individuals held prior to participation in the intervention regarding disabled individuals and disability sport.

- Actual physical sensations of participating in the intervention.

- The emotive and social lived experiences participants encountered during the intervention.
Based on participants' experiences, the attitudes individuals held following the intervention regarding disabled individuals and disability sport.

These goals were investigated using two principal methods of data collection; non-participant observations and guided group interviews. The use of non-participant observations during the intervention followed Krane and Baird's (2005) method for collecting data. During non-participant observations, the researcher noted frequently displayed behaviours, coded these behaviours and later discussed them with participants during guided group interviews. The use of both methods of data collection was key to extracting information about participant's experiences during the intervention. It also enabled the researcher to gain insight into participants' perceptions of physically disabled individuals and disability sport both pre and post intervention. Furthermore, a comparison group, not exposed to the intervention, was used to provide comparable evidence to examine whether any changes in participants' opinions about disability sport and physical disability in general were due to the lived experiences of participating in the intervention, or due to a wider culture change in the school. This comparison would provide key evidence as to whether the intervention and not a separate external source had in any way changed perceptions.

Thematic data analysis, followed Gratton and Jones' (2004) four-stage model and identified three key higher order themes that related to participants' perceptions. Results are presented using raw-data examples of each higher order theme, and discussion focuses upon each theme's change based on the lived experiences of participants. Potential connections between prior research and results obtained during this study will be completed. Finally, limitations of the study will be
identified and, based on these limitations, recommendations for areas of future research will be provided.
2: Literature Review

This section will provide contextual evidence of the environment in which the intervention was conducted. Key societal perceptions toward disability will be highlighted and discussed. Furthermore, key sociological concepts, primarily Pierre Bourdieu’s (1992) concepts of Field, Capital and Habitus, together with Chris Shilling’s (1993) theory of Physical Capital, will be used to provide understanding of, and explanation for, the potential causes of these societal perceptions. Throughout, a critique of each theory will be undertaken. In addition, the key concept of reverse integration will be introduced to provide better understanding of the intervention.

2.1: Disability

This section will identify the multiple boundaries, obstructions and perceptions disabled individuals frequently face, expose why these perceptions have been formed and discuss who formed them and why they continue to exist.

During the initial stages of the literature review, it became apparently that there is a distinct lack of research relating to perceptions of wheelchair basketball players. Whilst numerous studies exist regarding the psychological and physiological demands of the game (DeGroot et al., 2012; Kolayis, 2012; Uzun et al., 2012), little is known in the form of how individuals within society form their perceptions of wheelchair basketball players. What has been researched however is how society forms its opinions toward disabled individuals as a ‘societal group’ (Fitzgerald, 2005; Howe, 2009). Due to this lack of research it is therefore necessary to utilise literature regarding disability sport as a whole and provide examples as to how this relates to wheelchair basketball.
Before discussion turns to common perceptions of disability, it is important to outline what disability refers to as a term. Three basic terms can relate to the same issue; disability, impairment and handicapped. Nixon (2000, p.422) defines impairment as a biomedical condition that pre-supposes something is missing; organic or functional limitation. Disability, as defined by Thomas and Smith (2009, p.7), refers to any physical, psychological or mental restriction/lack of ability (resulting from impairment) to perform an activity in the manner or within the range considered ‘normal’ for a human being. Nixon (2000, p.422) further defines a handicap as a social condition that occurs when an impairment or disability is not accommodated for in an environment or social setting. It is vital, for this section, to consider these definitions and understand how the term ‘disabled individual’ refers to an individual with physical, mental or psychological restrictions.

Whilst there are varying definitions of disability, there are also two separate forms of defining the body; The Medical Model and the Social Model. The medical model defines disability in biological/medical terms and as a problem (Bailey, 2008; Hargreaves, 2000; Jespersen & McNamee, 2008; Thomas & Smith, 2009). Disability is viewed as an unchanging medical condition that predisposes a disabled individual as a deviation from a supposed 'normal' body (Hargreaves, 2000). Corrigan et al., (2010) assert that what deviates from the medical 'norm' then becomes undesirable.

The social model of disability considers the role of social relations and environmental limitation in the experiences of disability (Bailey, 2008; Jespersen & McNamee, 2008; Tremain, 2005). The social model suggests that impairment must be distinguished from disability (as defined above). Bailey (2008) asserts that it is society that has caused the stigmatisation of disabled individuals.
Although the impairment/disability is not discounted, the social model draws attention to the socially constructed ideas about bodily norms and ideals that are the real source of discomfort in a disabled individuals’ stigmatisation (Corrigan et al., 2010).

Negative attitudes concerning individuals living with a disability have been prevalent from early Egyptian, Greek and Roman civilizations to the modern day (Arokiasamy et al., 2008). Indeed the term disability has the prefix of ‘dis’ suggesting a perceived inferior and negative relationship between disability and ability (Fitzgerald, 2005). Howe (2009) suggests that for both the impaired individual as well as society there is a need to deal with the ‘problem’ created by the abnormal or disabled body. Miller et al., (2004, p.9) found that ‘abusive and oppressive behavior arose from the belief that disabled individuals are inferior to others’. Hay and MacDonald (2010) claim that the difficulties in managing impaired bodies puts a strain on social interaction, which for some, can be seen as problematic. Disabled individuals are classed by others within society as a deviation from a proposed idealistic form. As claimed by Brodwin and Frederick (2010), physically disabled individuals are not associated with the typical image of youth and physical attractiveness. Because of this, disabled individuals have been stigmatised as a group that is viewed either sympathetically or ostracised for their disability.

While researchers such as Berger (1980), Elder-Vass (2007) and Lewis (2010) question the ability of disabled individuals to oppose this perception, Howe (2009) claims that once attention has been drawn to the body, either through illness or impairment, it can become a focal point for the personal analysis of social interaction. Howe suggests that even highly trained disabled sportsmen/women or individuals, who participate in disability sport (such as wheelchair basketball
players), will always been ‘tagged’ with similar perceptions or viewed differently and, most likely subconsciously, as different to non-disabled individuals. Negative stereotypes, separation from nondisabled activities and a lack of provision for disabled individuals have become common practice and have therefore led to a reproduction of common negative perceptions toward disabled individuals (Saebu, 2010).

It is now vital, based on these broad societal perceptions, to identify the social environment this study was to be conducted in: The School.

2.1.1: Disability and Physical Education

Within the school environment, there is still limited understanding concerning young, disabled individuals’ experience of physical education and school sport (Smith, 2004). Smith’s (2004) assertion above highlights the need for researchers to investigate the lived experiences of disabled individuals during schooling. What is possible to discuss however is the school setting and the environment that disabled and nondisabled individuals encounter during physical education (PE) lessons. For Sherrill (2004), one of the most prevalent barriers to including students with disabilities is related to teacher attitudes. Hay and MacDonald (2010, p.9), interviewed teachers to investigate how they discern “good” pupils from “bad” pupils. In their study they noted a teacher as saying:

‘We ask them (pupils) to get out there on court and play a game and video them. That gives us a pretty good indication, early on, about who has got past experience and who can do the sorts of things that are required, you know.’

The statement above notes the immediate need for a pupil, within PE lessons, to possess a high level of physical competence to be perceived as fulfilling the requirements of the PE National Curriculum. Similarly Hunter (2004) found that
teachers placed value in their students’ ability at sport, levels of technical skill, fitness and corporeal appearance. Brown (2005) found that successful students were often categorised as demonstrating a competence in a number of games predominantly practiced in schools. Researchers frequently refer to the school sport setting as a success based field (Morgan and Hansen, 2008; Tok and Morali, 2009; Spray et al., 1999) in which successful, athletic and skillful students benefit, while those who do not possess high levels of technical skill and fitness remain in the shadows and on the touchlines (Morgan and Hansen, 2008). Fitzgerald (2005, p.50) noted a similar situation when questioning a pupil regarding playing basketball from a wheelchair;

‘Most of the boys are bigger than me and I’m not going to get that tall and they’re getting bigger and in basketball I haven’t got a chance. I can’t get the ball and they don’t pass to me and they’re bigger and faster and I’ll run and try, I’m trying but, that’s it, it’s hard they’re bigger than me.’

Physically or mentally disabled pupils may not be able to perform the motoric or autonomous skills PE fields might require. Consequently, PE can become an environment that stigmatises disabled individuals as being inferior solely due to their disability (Fitzgerald, 2005).

Pierre Bourdieu’s concepts provide explanation of how the sports environment has become dominated by non-disabled individuals (Brown, 2005; Fitzgerald, 2005; Hay and MacDonald, 2010; Wright and Burrows, 2006). ‘Successful’ individuals appear to possess valuable qualities (discussed in section 2.2.2), apply these said qualities over individuals with lesser amounts and therefore dominate the social environment. Both students and teachers have reproduced this process; teachers, reward ‘successful’ students with high grades, while the lesser able students receive low grades and can be criticised or receive little attention (Rubie-Davies, 2010). ‘Successful’ students have also been shown to
criticise, ridicule and/or patronise disabled students due their inability to perform within the PE field (Sparkes et al., 2007). In recent studies however researchers have attempted to target this imbalance of provision and accessibility (Haycock and Smith, 2011; Sparkes, Partington and Brown, 2007; Tinning, 2006).

Despite the apparent marginalisation and stigmatisation of disabled students presented above, it has also been demonstrated that teachers and students can appear to take a similar, sympathetic attitude towards disabled students. Shapiro and Martin (2010) claim that children with physical disabilities are discouraged from playing sport due to their disability. This, researchers suggest, occurs due to the debate between innate skill and learned skill. In relation to sport, the belief that genetics are central to ability has prevailed (Hay and MacDonald, 2010). Similarly Evans (2004) suggested that a key element of the definition of ability is its assumed nature; whether a person’s ability is innate, the product of their environment or an interrelationship between genetics and environment. This issue provides a good explanation as to why disabled individuals face participation and perceptual boundaries in sport and physical education. It is this “scientific” perception of the body as a measurable entity, able to be fine-tuned, and measurable by success that has perpetuated the idea of the body as a ‘machine’ (Hay and MacDonald, 2010). If the body is viewed as a machine, disabled individuals are viewed as ‘broken’ or ‘faulty’ versions of the ideal. Due to this perception, as Shapiro and Martin (2010) claimed, disabled students are frequently discouraged from playing sport, or in some cases, given little to no access or provision.

It is now possible to see the complex nature of PE and the difficulties PE teachers, non-disabled pupils and disabled pupils have in interacting within it. It is
at this point important however to highlight the debate regarding an individual’s ability to act against such perceptions and social barriers.

2.1.2: Structure vs. Agency: The Case of Oscar Pistorius

The structure vs. agency dilemma provides an example and wider social insight regarding disabled individuals’ participation in sport. Researchers use social concepts as truth and do not question the ability of individuals to act against these social concepts. To support this investigation and discussion, Lewis (2010, p.207) claims that the

‘Structure vs. agency debate concerns some of the most fundamental issues addressed by social scientists, namely how we conceptualize, explain and thereby gain knowledge of the social world.’

This study, concerned with perceptions of wheelchair basketball players, considers the ability of disabled individuals to contest social structures and participate in sport.

The relationship between social structure and human agency is one of the central problems of social science. At the heart of the problem lies a key question concerning the nature of the social world; does society amount to nothing more than a collection of individuals, or does the interaction of those individuals give rise to unique properties (Lewis, 2010). It is this key debate that has caused social theorists to attempt to measure the interaction of individuals on a micro-level and the constraining social structures affecting them on a macroscopic (Berger, 1980; Elder-Vass 2007; Lewis, 2010). Social structures within society, i.e. education, have produced and enforced images, perceptions and beliefs upon society regarding disabled individuals and sport (section 2.1.1). Contrary to these structures however, particularly in recent years, society has seen the emergence of sporting icons who possess some form of disability. Within the athletics field,
there are numerous examples of individuals rejecting these social structures. For example, Oscar Pistorius, a South African sprinter has become known as the ‘blade runner’ (Liew, 2012). Pistorius, a double leg-amputee, uses carbon-fiber artificial limbs to run and participate in athletics. While Pistorius has received wide-acclaim for his sporting accomplishments (world record holder in 100m, 200m and 400m), the International Association of Athletics Federation (IAAF) felt it necessary to ban Pistorius from participating with nondisabled athletes (Cole, 2009). Upon Pistorius’ emergence, studies were conducted and asserted that Pistorius’ ‘blades’ provided an unfair advantage over non-disabled athletes (Jones and Wilson, 2009; Camporesi, 2008) and recommended that Pistorius be removed from Olympic participation. It is however in recent years that studies have concluded that Pistorius’ blades provide no such advantage.

The case of Oscar Pistorius provides a useful example of the conflict between agency and structure explanations. Pistorius’ opposition to social perceptions created a media reaction to which said social structures (IAAF) responded to by producing ‘scientific reports’ that claimed he possesses an unfair advantage over other athletes. It is suggestible that the image of Pistorius running (with artificial limbs/blades) challenged boundaries amongst social structures (IAAF), which resulted in the immediate need to restore equilibrium, i.e. banning Pistorius from competing.

Using Pistorius’ example, it is now important to identify social theories that attempt to explain how negative perceptions toward disability have been created, consented to and reproduced and then discuss why disabled individuals face social barriers to sports participation within the PE field.
2.2: Pierre Bourdieu

Karl Marx stressed that class divided society and that individuals with high economic capital possessed higher levels of power within said society. Marx (1867) claimed that powerful individuals within society created social structures, such as Governments, to control and enforce perceptions thus forming the social classes (Giddens, 2006). Marxist theory however has received negative attention from theorists claiming that class cannot be the sole contributor to social formations (McRobbie, 2009; Reay, 1995; Thorpe, 2009).

Pierre Bourdieu’s conceptual work expanded on Marxist theory and has attracted considerable interest among scholars of the sociology of sport, physical culture and physical education (Brown, 2005; Clement, 1995; Gorely, Holroyd & Kirk, 2003; Jarvie & Maguire, 1994; Kay & Laberge, 2002; Light & Kirk, 2000; Tomlinson, 2004). This section will, in detail, discuss Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of field, capital, habitus and doxa. It is important also to discuss the links between Bourdieu’s concepts in order to overcome the false dichotomy between agency and structure that Bourdieu sought to challenge.

2.2.1: Field

Bourdieu’s theory of the social field is a key metaphor of his sociology (Swartz, 1997) and provides the ‘setting’ in which society interacts. Bourdieu (1984, p.30) defines the social field as a ‘configuration of positions’, objectively defined, that ‘impose upon their occupants based on their situation within society’. These positions lead to the distribution of power (capital) that in turn ‘command access to specific points that are at stake within that field’ (Bourdieu and Waquant, 1992, p.97). Bourdieu uses ‘Field’ as the arena in which we interact with one another and struggle for position (Hay and Hunter, 2006). Within this field a circulation of
capital transpires in which social actors (individuals) labour to accumulate as high amount of capital as possible (see section 2.2.2).

Bourdieu and Waquant state that the interaction within these fields is a relational exchange (Bourdieu and Waquant 1992) in which relations shape actions and beliefs rather than palpable structures such as government (already a divergence from Marxist theory). Swartz (1997, p.119) claims, based on Bourdieu’s belief, researchers should be encouraged to look for the ‘underlying and invisible relations that shape action rather than properties given in commonsense categories’. Bourdieu’s theory of field thus relates to the arena in which we interact and live. Within these fields Bourdieu claimed that individuals accumulate levels of capital, through symbolic conflict, that affect the social groups and activities one can interact within (Siisiäinen, 2000). For the purposes of this study, the field being analysed is ‘The School Field’, an area in which various groups of individuals (pupils) interact and construct friendship groups and activities during their PE lessons.

Now that the social field has been identified and discussed, focus will turn to the interaction between the actors within this field. As discussed above, Bourdieu believed that within a field, a circulation of capital transpires and based on the accrual of this capital, society is formed. It is key then to introduce and discuss the numerous forms of capital and their perceived value.

2.2.2: Capital

Bourdieu’s concept of capital provided the foundation upon which this study is based. This section will identify the numerous forms of capital Bourdieu proposed and discuss how an individual may attain them. Following this, discussion will continue concerning how varying types of capital can affect an individual’s action
and how this capital relates to Bourdieu’s theory of social construction and imbalance. Capital is ascertained through social struggle and it is this struggle that Bourdieu (1977), and later Shilling (2003), centralise in their respective theories.

As stated above, Karl Marx (1867) defined capital in economic terms. Bourdieu however explores this theory of capital and asserted that economic capital was merely one form of capital an individual can possess (Jarvie and Maguire, 1994). Bourdieu identified three main forms of capital; Economic capital related to the material goods, income and property an individual possesses (Bourdieu, 1986), Cultural capital (exists in three forms) - the embodied state; an individual’s dispositions of the mind i.e. their likes/dislikes, the objectified state; the ownership of pictures, books, instruments one possessed and the institutionalised state; the educational background and scholastic qualifications and individual possessed (Bourdieu, 1986). Finally Bourdieu suggested Social/Symbolic capital that relates to an individual’s heritage, prestige and acquaintances. Briefly, each form will be discussed to better understand how each capital type is defined and how each can be utilised within society.

2.2.3: Economic Capital

Similarly to Marx, Bourdieu highlighted economic capital as a large contributor to the construction of social groups. Economic capital, relating to an individual’s material wealth, income and ownership of property is attributed to the formation of the class system (Whannel, 2008). For Marx it was this imbalanced distribution of economic capital that caused social strata to be formed (Giddens, 2006). However Bourdieu, while agreeing with Marx, expanded on this theory and suggested that economic capital was too simplistic a method to divide society. Bourdieu believed numerous types of capital exist that can be ascertained by
society’s members and not all of these are as easily defined as economic capital (see sections 2.2.4 and 2.2.5). Bourdieu’s theory does attribute high levels of economic wealth as responsible for an increased leisure time and ability to participate in a wider variety of activities (La Torre et al., 2006; Macintyre et al., 1993; Powell et al., 2006). With higher income, researchers (Armstrong et al. 1999; Cauley et al., 1991; Giles-Corti, 2002;) believed, comes the ability to purchase equipment, pay membership fees etc. Burchardt (2000) noted the proportion of non-disabled participation (once per month) was over twice the proportion of disabled individuals and stated the primary reason for this was the low income of disabled individuals. Burchardt (2000) asserted that the two primary barriers to participation are travel and membership fees. Economic income plays a key role in determining the possibility of individuals to participate in sporting activities.

Economic capital is considered an influential factor regarding participation. However Bourdieu attached lower value to it than did Marx.

2.2.4: Cultural Capital

The recognition of cultural capital began to see Bourdieu expand on Marxist capitalist theory. During his research, Bourdieu (1986) found that children from the same ‘class’ group achieve differently academically and begin to interact with individuals from other social groups who had similar scholastic achievements. It became apparent to Bourdieu that dividing society according to economic means is insufficient. Cultural capital, as stated earlier, according to Bourdieu is divided into 3 main forms, embodied, objectified and institutionalised. It was the culmination of these 3 forms that indicated an individual’s level of cultural capital. Bourdieu (1986, p.48) did clearly state however that;
'The accumulation of cultural capital implies a labour of inclination and assimilation, cost time, which must be invested personally by the investor.'

It is this final point that proposes that economic capital, while aiding an individual, is not infinite; instead attaining other forms of capital takes dedication and investment. Applying Bourdieu’s example of school children, a pupil from the highest economic group possesses very little cultural capital if he/she receives poor grades while an individual from a low economic group possesses high cultural capital based on their academic achievement. Hurtado (2009) provides an interesting example by considering cultural capital (in its numerous forms) as linguistic ability, i.e. using a varied vocabulary to support persuasive communication. This provides a prime example of the varying forms of cultural capital and the manner in which this capital is exploited to gain power within society. Similarly as stated in 2.1.1, Hunter (2004) found that teachers place value on their students’ ability at sport, levels of technical skill, fitness and corporeal appearance. Disabled individuals, perceived as not possessing such qualities, commonly receive lower scholastic grades and are therefore perceived as possessing low levels of cultural capital.

It is apparent that while Bourdieu identifies the three forms of cultural capital, his imprecise definitions of each form produces an infinite number of possible ways cultural capital can be manifested. It is important that research that attempts to identify a specific form of cultural capital within Bourdieu’s boundaries, should be aware of the varying and numerous forms that are potentially produced.
2.2.5: Social/Symbolic Capital

Bourdieu (1986, p.51) defines social/symbolic capital as:

‘The aggregate of the actual or potential resources, which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition--or in other words, to membership in a group.’

Like cultural capital, symbolic capital for Bourdieu represented a mechanism for discussing the legitimisation of power relations through symbolic forms (Swartz, 1997). Symbolic capital relates to a perception of prestige or acquaintance with certain groups. Symbolic capital however is converted from the other forms of capital and, according to Everett (2002, p.63), is ‘the most valuable form of capital’ due to its visual, apparent and transferable nature. Symbolic capital is exchanged for material capital (i.e. membership fee to social groups) and links closely with cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977). As the title suggests, symbolic capital is almost a persona or image an individual presents through their deportment. The accumulation of social and symbolic capital is a difficult process as the accrual of each form can depend on the possession of other capitals (Bourdieu, 1990). For example, to join certain social clubs/groups an individual may possess the appearance required for such a group (tie and suit) but lack the economic capital to pay a membership fee. Similarly, an individual possessing the economic capital to join a scholarly club may lack the academic and cultural capital required to interact with such a group. It is clear that the boundaries of Bourdieu’s classification of capital are vague and indeterminate. Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic capital is indeed so intricate that Bourdieu (1986, p.257) claims himself that capitals overlap so extensively that it becomes virtually impossible to distinguish them. It is because of this admission from Bourdieu that researchers must be vigilant in remaining independent from relying solely on
such a concept and clearly defines the capital form being focussed upon.

Bourdieu believed that with the accrual of capital, an individual then possesses particular value in society and, based on this value, begin to form groups within the social field. Having analysed and discussed Bourdieu’s theory of capital, it is now important to understand how these forms of capital are then exploited and utilised within society. Bourdieu’s theory of field will be revisited and the concepts of ‘Habitus’ and ‘Practice’ will be introduced.

2.2.6: Applying Capital to the Social Field

Below is a visual illustration of Bourdieu’s concept of field and the varying degrees and types of capital an individual can possess. The figure below represents the Field (discussed in 2.2.1) and the varying types of capital an individual can possess. The dark green circular object on figure 2.1 represents a disabled individual on disability allowance.

![Figure 2.1 Bourdieu’s concepts of Field and Capital (adapted from La Distinction (1984, p.37))](image)
According to Bourdieu, individuals interact within a Field (in its various contexts). Swartz (1997, p.123) asserts that fields are structured spaces of dominant and subordinate position that are based on types and amounts of capital. Dependent on an individual’s level of economic and cultural capital, they would be placed at a particular point on the continuum. To give a contextual example, a disabled individual would be situated around the circular area highlighted on figure 2.1. Bourdieu’s concept would place the disabled individual is such a location due to their lack of economic capital and also due to their perceived lack of cultural capital. This process of examining an individual’s level of capital, Bourdieu would argue, has thus led to the formation of social strata and class legitimisation (Swartz, 1997).

To simply claim that Bourdieu’s continuum is accurate does not consider the multiple variants of individuals and fields within society. Bourdieu’s theory however develops through the concept of practice.

Bourdieu (1984) claimed that individuals within society, possessing higher levels of capital (in any form), might dominate individuals who lack similar levels of specific capital. In a very basic sense, the rich in capital dominate and exploit the poor (Whannel, 2008). For example, an individual studying at Oxford University would, in Bourdieu’s conceptualisation, possess higher levels of cultural capital and therefore academically dominate an individual working on a factory floor with few scholastic qualifications. Consequently an individual possessing low levels of economic and cultural capital would not be able to join a golf club that had imposed high membership fees for example (Wilson, 2002). It would be accurate to suggest as this point however that Bourdieu’s theory, is one-dimensional. While there are more forms of capital for Bourdieu, in essence it is still the domination of the powerful over the weak that has formed society. Bourdieu
argues however that this reproduction of domination and submission, in essence conflict, is due to consent and practice. It is therefore necessary at this point to discuss Bourdieu’s theory of practice to better understand the reproduction of this conflict.

2.3: Practice

Bourdieu’s theory of practice is one of reproduction and consent. Bourdieu argued that the imbalance of capital and position within society had occurred through a process of symbolic violence and the partial consent of society. Bourdieu claimed symbolic violence was:

‘A gentle violence, imperceptible and invisible even to its victims, exerted for the most part through the purely symbolic channels of communication, recognition and feeling. This extraordinary social relation thus offers an opportunity to grasp the logic of the domination exerted in the name of a symbolic principle known and recognised by the dominant and the dominated.’


Symbolic violence relates to an individual or habitus enforcing habitual or individual capital on a subordinate other (Brown, 2006). Note however that the term ‘symbolic’ violence does not denote actual physical violence. Marx’s (1867) concept of ‘valorisation’ provides a simple example of Bourdieu’s theory of symbolic violence and practice in relation to economic capital. The CEO of a company earning a high economic wage exploits the factory floor worker for his/her labour (symbolic violence) and in return pays them a wage. Without the consent of the factory floor worker to be exploited for their labour, the CEO would not possess a productive company and therefore fail to possess increased levels of economic capital. It is this interaction between our factory worker and CEO that
explains practice in its basic form. The CEO is happy to pay his/her workers for their labour while the factory worker is happy to work for their wages. It is this concept of consent that has led to the reproduction of social imbalances throughout society.

Bourdieu (1990) argues that the reproduction of these practices has led to the forming of social groups i.e. factory workers and CEO’s. Due to the reproduction of these imbalances on a daily basis, individuals within society produce social groups that have formed based on the perceived levels of capital one possesses. Bourdieu suggests that these social groups lead to the present and aid internalisation of these norms or an individual’s habitus. Bourdieu (1992) refers to a process of symbolic violence that reinforces practices.

2.4: Chips or Caviar? Taste and the Construction of Habitus

Habitus refers to a set of acquired schemes or dispositions, perceptions and appreciations, including tastes, which orient our practices and give them meaning (Bourdieu, 1992). As defined by Noble and Watkins (2003) and Laberge (1995), habitus is both the ‘embodiment of our social location’ (Noble & Watkins, 2003, p. 522) i.e. class, ethnicity, gender etc and ‘the structure of social relations that generate and give significance to individual likes and dislikes with regard to practice and action’ (Laberge, 1995, p. 136), in essence, taste. To take the example from above, our factory floor worker’s social group would contain members who have similar tastes (habitus) and potentially comparable levels of economic, cultural and symbolic capital i.e. other factory floor workers. It is this division within society, Bourdieu would argue, that has caused the formation of society as we see it. Pickel (2005) cements this point, stating that the more powerful and socially significant a social system, the more important its habitus is for its members (functionally and/or symbolically). In essence an individual’s
habitus relates taste, which leads to the joining of a habitual group (individuals possessing similar habitus). As Bourdieu (1992, p.53) asserted, habitus is a ‘structured structure’, the effect of actions and interactions with others and ‘structuring structures’. Simply, habitus suggests and constrains our actions (Thorpe, 2009) but does not necessarily pre-determine them. Researchers commonly suggest that habitus is the most influential and fundamental guide to an individual’s actions. Wynne (1998) defined an individual’s habitus as their social ‘backbone’. An individual’s habitual group, whether joined or forced upon them, can define the activities and perceptions they encounter during their social life (Bourdieu, 2000). An example of field, capital and habitus can be seen in Fitzgerald and Kirk’s (2009) work on family influence and sport. Fitzgerald and Kirk (2009, p.477) noted a participant commenting:

Tom: ‘I don’t know what it is, I’ve always liked football, I watch [on the TV] with me dad and brother. (I) watch me brother and we all play. We’ve always done it. We watch England.’

Interviewer: ‘Sounds like you’re all into football. Why do you think it’s football you all like?’

Tom: ‘Well, my dad’s into it so me and my brother are, it’s always been like that. I guess it comes from dad. We’re all into football. There’s nothing else, it’s just football.’

Tom’s first statement notes a subconscious liking for a sport then attributes this to positive experiences with his father and brother. Tom then proceeds to explain that he and his brother play football and that this love for football extends from their father’s. Using Tom as an example it is possible to suggest that at home (field) Tom’s father decides what is watched (on TV) due to his age and standing
(capital) within the family unit. Due to this, Tom and his brother are therefore influenced by their father, consent to his authority and begin watching sport. As this process is reproduced (practice), football becomes ingrained within their mentality (habitus) and they begin to participate. Bourdieu’s concept of habitus has the potential to help understand the ways in which embodied practices produce identity, difference and a given social order (Thorpe, 2009).

While habitus is a complex and multilayered concept, an issue highlighted by Thorpe (2009) with the utilization of this theory, Bourdieu does not provide distinct and clear concepts/explanations regarding the social or spatial boundaries toward the formation of a habitus. Reay (1995) claims that Bourdieu’s unwillingness to specify the objective structures that produce habitus can lead to problems in the theory’s implementation. To further support this argument, McRobbie (2009, p.142) admits finding the analysis of the ‘intersections and flows between and across so many fields and so many habitus’ as methodologically overwhelming. McRobbie (2009) focused on Bourdieu’s lack of clarity regarding multiple fields, habitus and capital forms as a serious issue when attempting to implement his theories. McNay (2000) suggests the habitus is too under theorized by Bourdieu, and other researchers claim that habitus is too inadequately precise (Giroux, 1983; Nash, 1990; Jenkins, 1992). It is at this point then that the PE field being analysed, the circulation of capitals within this field and potential habitual influences a pupil encounters must be discussed to ensure that Bourdieu’s concepts are applied to a specific context.

2.5: Bullies and the Bullied: Social Order in the School Field

This section will revisit the school field (discussed in section 2.2.1). The participants interacting within the school field (more specifically PE lessons), i.e. School Pupils (disabled and non-disabled), will be further discussed and, using
past research, the contributing factors to the accrual of capital and formation of a
disabled or non-disabled individuals habitus will be outlined.

2.5.1: The Quest for Playground Dominance: How Bourdieu Relates to School

Sport

‘Everyone knows who’s the football and rugby captain. You get to know...But most people don’t know the boccia captain.’

Fitzgerald (2005, p.48)

Through this statement, noted by Fitzgerald (2005), it can be observed how the school field is dominated by ‘traditional’ school sports and by the individuals who participate within them. Studies analysing this formation are common (Clément, 1995; Hay and Hunter, 2006; Hunter, 2004). However few focus upon the multi-dimensional accrual of capital proposed by Bourdieu. Studies predominately focus on socio-economic status and the effect economic capital has on a child’s schooling and experiences of Physical Education (PE) (Armstrong et al., 1999; Cauley et al., 1991; Giles-Corti & Donovan, 2002; La Torre et al., 2006; Powell et al., 2006). This study however is concerned with understanding the field of PE, how that field is divided in terms of habitus and capital and finally the varying perceptions PE pupils have toward disabled individuals and disability sport.

Prior research (Azzarito and Sterling, 2010; Brown, 2006; Datta, 2008; Kirk, 1999) has linked Bourdieu’s theory of field, capital and habitus to the school field through symbolic violence (discussed in section 2.3) and concepts of youth embodiment (Clément, 1995; Hunter, 2004; Hay and Hunter, 2006). Embodiment simply refers to the experiences and changes an individual encounters and applies in their life. Sparkes et al’s., (2007, p.3) study provided an example of this when a participant stated;
‘It is intimidating for other students if you’re not PE. It is the very athletic, the very loud, sometimes a bit laddish. The big lads, the ones that are quite loud, quite outgoing, the ones with a lot of personality, and a lot of oomph. They’re the, PE lads’.

This statement provides an example of how PE, through symbolic violence has become dominated by athletic, typically male, individuals. Symbolic violence is discussed in the topic of masculine domination and sport (Brown, 2006). While this study is concerned with disability, symbolic masculine domination of the PE environment, acts as a key to understanding the creation, shaping and management of the school sport field.

2.5.2: Football or Fencing? How Habitus Affects PE

Within PE, individuals and certain habitus dominate the PE lesson, gym or playing field. Clément (1995), Sparks et al. (2007), Lipsyte (2006) and Miller (2009) all suggest that the mere selection of a particular sport, has attached to it, the very practices and identities that affirm an individual to a particular social group. To better understand how such a simple choice can have such a large impact on an individual’s habitus, it is important to discuss why this occurs. Kirk and Tinning (1994), Hunter (2004) and Vertinsky (1992) all suggest that historically PE has been driven through control, discipline, gendering and the shaping of an objectified body. Following the previous assumption, Reay (2004) suggests that through historical and educational structures, a specific and legitimised form of capital has been socially created for the PE field; ‘the ideal’ culturally defined body or ‘the look’ as defined by Featherstone (1982). Wright and Burrows (2006) argue that physical education has always been concerned with the body and its capacities and that this ideal culturally defined body has been given higher
importance (capital value) than other scholastic subjects. For example, within modern society a youthful, slim, toned and sensual body is held in the highest regard (Oliver, 2001; Shilling, 1996; Wright, 2000). This formation of this culturally defined body is a widely researched area and provides understanding to how particular habitus/individuals dominate the school field. It is important however to understand where this objectified form originates.

Through structural forms such as the media, medical industry or health and beauty industry an image of the ideal body has been formed in which society has consented to, legitimised and transferred to issues such as obesity, femininity, homosexuality and disability. For women a small, petite, toned, frail body is often viewed as the idealistic form whilst for men, muscular, strong, big and robust is the suggested ‘ideal’ image (Polley, 1998). Frew and McGillivray (2005, p.169) conducted a study of gym attendees’ motivation:

Participant 8: ‘Everyone has the idea looking for the Madonna arms or Jennifer Lopez butt and thighs.’

Participant 19: ‘The Brad Pitt abs that’s what I’m looking for and so do a lot of guys if they’re honest.’

These idealistic forms are attributed to health, fitness and success and any kind of divergence from said images can have a negative impact upon individual’s capital values (Fitzgerald, 2005). It is this culturally defined body that has come to dominate the school and sporting field. Hunter’s (2004) study analysed a school PE lesson and found that teachers termed ‘good students’ as having among other things, deportment with high physical capital. Fitzgerald (2005) claimed that PE serves to affirm ‘normative’ values such as, the ‘ideal’ mesomorphic form and high levels of autonomous motoric competence. Within the sporting field an idealistic image has been formed to which capital has been attached. Individuals,
within PE, who possess this form, are dominant (see Sparkes et al., reference in 2.5.1). Individuals who do not possess this culturally defined body, many of whom could be disabled, are stigmatised into a subordinate group (Miller, Parker and Gillinson, 2004). Here we can see Bourdieus’s theory of practice in action; an idealistic form (capital), created and imprinted by the media, has been reproduced (practice) and imposed upon subjective social groups (habitus). These groups have consented to and thus reproduced this image as an ideal. It is through this process that society has begun to attribute the physical form with varying levels of capital (Shilling, 2003).

It is apparent at this point that Bourdieus’s work fails to account for corporeal appearance. While Bourdieus’s work would suggest the physical appearance of an individual to be symbolic (see section 2.2.5), he does not provide any support or explanation for an individual’s capital level with regard their physicality. It is therefore relevant and essential to introduce Chris Shillings (2003) theory of physical capital and the value of the physical form.

2.6: Introducing the Corporeal Body: Physical Capital

Frew and McGillivray (2005, p.166) noted a frequent perception individuals possess when considering their corporeal appearance.

‘Everybody looks at everybody...you compare – it’s nothing unusual...you’re always looking. As soon as you’ve got a flat stomach you see someone else and say they are better than me. Then you think I want to look like that.’

It is at this juncture that an extension of Bourdieuan theory occurs. Shilling’s (2003) work on the socially constructed body and physical capital has led to a rethinking of Bourdieus’s concepts and approaches toward physical disability and social research. Shilling (2003) states that at the very centre of Bourdieus’s theory
of social reproduction is the body as a bearer of value. The body, for Bourdieu, was viewed as an unfinished entity that develops in tandem with social forces. However Bourdieu rarely discussed the actual physical self; skins, bones, muscle mass etc as a bearer of value; an individual’s ‘corporeal’ appearance. Bourdieu allocated little capital value to the physical self and instead suggested that the external appearance of the body was one created by the habitus that the body exists within, i.e. dress code and stature. Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic capital incorporated taste and issues such as dress, hairstyle, posture etc (Bourdieu, 1977). However, Bourdieu allocated no value to the physical morphology of the body. A weakness of this approach however is that if the body is socially constructed, the physical self becomes an ideologically invisible entity. Shilling (2003, p.111) however, re-conceptualised Bourdieu’s theory to incorporate physical capital, or ‘The development of bodies in ways which are recognised as possession value in society.’ Shilling asserts that the body as a physical entity possesses a capital value. Shilling and Mellor (2001) claim that sociology divorces the body from the mind and claim the mind to be the bearer of value and receptor for social imagery. For this study however viewing the body as a bearer of value is key to identifying perceptions and experiences toward disabled individuals and must therefore be considered as key to understanding the formation of the social fields and the potential perceptions of the individuals being analysed.

In addition, Shilling’s concept states habitus is extremely influential on how an individual views their body. Shilling (2003, p.13) noted that different habitus develop ‘distinct orientations’ to their bodies, which result in various bodily forms. An example given earlier suggested that the economic capital of a factory floor worker and a CEO of a company are vastly different and because of this so is their cultural and subsequently their symbolic value. Similarly physical capital or
physical form is also assigned differing capital volume dependent on the individual’s habitus.

2.6.1: Aggressive or Athletic? Physical Capital and Habitus

As stated by Wynne (2008) habitus can act as a key component of an individual’s social interaction. Bourdieu (1992) continually refers to the numerous habitus’ that an individual interacts with in society. To say that the ideal culturally defined body is uniform throughout all social groups would be inaccurate. Bourdieu (1984, p.479) suggested that dominated classes (lower) attribute to themselves strength in the sense of labour power, fighting strength, physical and strength of character, courage and manliness. For the dominating classes (upper), Bourdieu believed they attributed a spiritual and intellectual strength, self-control that predisposes them to control others, sensibility and culture. Bourdieu identified two vastly different approaches to physical form. Stempel (2006) further alludes to this point and noted, over time, the varying importance different social classes place on sport and the physical body. Stempel (2006, p.278) identified the ‘athletic body’ created through ‘sporting prowess, knowledge and sensibility’ as an upper-middle class concept. Stempel’s research suggested that upper-middle class groups place higher value on an athletic body (slim, toned) and that value is found in prowess, knowledge and sensibility when participating in sport. Lamont (2000) and Stempel (2006) claimed, contrary to the upper-middle classes that lower classes placed value in ball sports, often attributed with ‘masculine’ qualities like competitiveness, strength, and physical domination. Lamont and Stempel imply a much more muscular and aggressive image for the lower class sporting form. Lamont and Stempel identify two different ‘ideal’ culturally defined bodies for two separate habitus within the same field (sport). Coakley and Whannel (2008) both assert that this separation had occurred based on historical factors of separation
between the bourgeoisie and proletariat. Historically working class sports such as rugby league and football have involved aggression and domination while upper class sports such as golf and tennis have involved prowess and technique. This allocation of sports and ‘ideal forms’ again highlights the complex concept of physical capital. Despite the varying images, research suggests that the ideal form was one that, despite being different, possessed high capital value with each habitus.

At this point then, it is possible to again expand on Bourdieu’s theory. As shown in figure 2.1 Bourdieu believed there to be two forms of capital (symbolic included in cultural) and devised a continuum on which an individual could be placed on their capital value. Due to the addition of Shilling’s work however, it is now also possible to add a third axis; physical capital.

Figure 2.2 Adaption of Bourdieu’s Continuum

Figure 2.2 includes a third axis that represents physical capital. Again, it is important to understand the multiple fields within society this could be applied to
and, as discussed above, the culturally defined body (+ physical capital) will vary dependant on the field being analysed. For the purpose of this study then it is important to recognise value in an individual’s corporeal appearance. Similarly as in figure 2.1, the circular shape in figure 2.2 would suggest where society could locate a physically disabled individual. The placement, incorporating Bourdieu and Shillings concepts of capital, provides an example to where society may locate a physically disabled individual possessing low levels of cultural and economic capital and perceived to possess low physical capital. It is this placement that has led to the perception of physically disabled individuals as possessing low societal value. With Bourdieu’s concept of field, capital, practice and habitus and Shilling’s conception of physical capital as a guide, it is now possible to understand how negative perceptions of disability have be established and reproduced through habitus.

This placement on Bourdieu’s continuum does not however account for, similarly to that discussed in section 2.2.1, the ability of an individual to resist their placement in a field. For example, a wheelchair basketball player could challenge their position in a field through their practice. Bourdieu however introduces the final ‘cog’ to his concept: Doxa. Once an individual had accrued various forms of capital, developed a habitus and then began to engage in particular activities, Bourdieu introduced his concept of Doxa.

2.7: That Isn’t Appropriate for Us: Bourdieu and Doxa

This section will detail Bourdieu’s concept of Doxa and consider Shillings concept of physical capital. Bourdieu’s theory of capital is explicitly used to explain ‘doxa’. (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992), Doxa, to Bourdieu, refers to the belief or perception an individual has regarding his/her ability or ‘right’ to be in a social situation. Bourdieu (1977) believed there to be a process by which individuals
validate their association with society. Bourdieu developed his ‘generative formula’ (Jarvie and Maguire, 1994, p.192) that expressed his belief regarding individuals’ motivation to participate in certain sports; capital (many forms) + field = practice which in turn equalled Doxa.

Doxa plays the vital role in the determining an individual’s ‘illusio’ or investment into the game (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.98). Bourdieu believed Doxa (perception) was the foundation to understanding why individuals either participate or chose to refrain from activity. Bourdieu believed that the culmination of an individual’s capital (physical included) and habitus led to a perception of value. This value was then transferred, in turn, into Doxa; a feeling of ‘that’s for me’ or ‘that’s not for the likes of me’ (Bourdieu, 2000, p.185). Referring back to figure 2.1, it is possible, using Bourdieu and Shilling’s concepts, to visualise the concept of Doxa.

![Figure 2.3 Bourdieu's concept of Doxa](image)

The individual (the green dot) in figure 2.3 is encompassed by a perceptive
barrier, which represents an individual’s perception (doxa) toward activities he/she may or may not participate in. This perceptual boundary thus provides the individual with a selection of habitually ‘appropriate’ sports/activities to participate in. It is then an individual’s choice to invest themselves (capital) into an activity within their Doxic area. While Bourdieu again claims this to be theoretical and multi-dimensional (Bourdieu and Waquant, 1992), it does provide an understanding to why individuals engage in particular activities over others.

Based on the culmination of an individual’s embodied perceptions of capital and their habitual location and standing within the social field, an individual then perceives whether they possess appropriate attributes to ‘illusio’ (invest). As throughout this section, it is important to now apply Doxa, as a theory, to the research topic.

2.7.1: Doxa and School Sport

“Well we’re not the best and we aren’t in the important school teams. If you’re in one then... You know it’s like Mr Evans does the football team and he spends the lesson with the good players and he’s not bothered about us.”

(Fitzgerald, 2005, p.47).

A disabled participant in Fitzgerald’s (2005) study provides an example of doxa. The emotive words used such as ‘not the best’, ‘aren’t in the important school team’ and ‘good players’ provides an example of the perceived barrier a disabled individual had when thinking about sport. As discussed above, disabled individuals are continually associated with low-levels of capital within the school field by teachers and pupils. Due to this perceived lack of capital, disabled individuals are stigmatised into a subordinate group or ‘not the important school team’ (Fitzgerald, 2005). Within sport, symbolic violence has caused the formation of the sports field, in which disabled individuals are attributed with very
low levels of capital and therefore success. This continually reproduced imbalance has therefore caused perceptions toward disabled individuals to be formed. The impact of this behavior, research suggests however, is not one-directional. Prior research, as discussed in 2.1 and 2.1.1, states that disabled individuals face considerable social barriers.

Recent studies (Blinde and McClung, 1997; Leder, 1990) suggest that these social barriers have a direct effect on the perceptions (doxa) of disabled individuals towards sport. Howe (2009, p.40), a disabled researcher, personally claimed that;

'Every time I move in the pub the eyes of other customers and bar staff are upon me. Perhaps not surprisingly this makes me self-conscious'.

Similarly, Leder (1990) asserted that the majority of participants claimed that their body was ever present and never absent/inconcealable, because of their impairments. While an individual’s body is debatably always ever present, research suggests that disabled individuals, because of their impairment, are socially more visible than non-disabled individuals. Blinde and McClung (1997) found that disabled individuals felt that sport was an impregnable thing that only fit able people could get involved in (doxa). While it is impossible to gauge the perceptions of every individual, many of the statements made throughout this section are based on prior research. What prior research does surmise however is that those perceptions regarding disability, in both disabled and non-disabled individuals, are common and negative. Within the field of PE, disabled individuals are looked upon in a negative light and are commonly rejected from the social field due to their perceived lack of ability (physical capital). Similarly non-disabled individuals view disabled individuals negatively and stigmatise them into low-capital groups prematurely.
Throughout this section it is possible to note the numerous perceptions, causes and theories that influence disabled individuals concerning sport. It is possible to see that regardless of the specific disabilities individuals possess, or a disabled individuals participation in sport, whether a wheelchair basketball player or a partially sighted football player, society often classifies disabled individuals as a homogenous social group. Because of this misrepresentation of disabled individuals, numerous initiatives, similar to the intervention discussed in section 1, have been devised. The following section will detail the theory behind such an intervention and provide links to the issues and theories discussed above.

2.8: Challenging the Norm: Reverse Integration

Based on all that has been discussed above, it is valuable to note that previous studies have suggested a potential method to changing the perceptions discussed above. Through section 2.1 and 2.5 it is evident that the school system and imbalance of non-disabled to disabled individuals in the school setting has caused the physical education world to sculpt the curriculum toward non-disabled individuals (Hunter, 2004; Sherrill, 2004). Particularly within PE, sport integration typically focuses on either the inclusion of disabled individual within traditionally able-bodied sports, or the inclusion of disability sports as separate events within mainstream sport (Nixon, 2007). So often integration is based on how well a disabled participant adjusts to the expectations and rules of the non-disabled world. Despite this however a concept of reverse integration has been conceptualised that aims to alter this imbalanced provision. Reverse integration aims to integrate non-disabled individuals into what has traditionally been considered to be disability-specific programmes (Brasile, 1990; Spencer-Cavaliere and Watson, 2010; Thiboutot et al., 1992). It is this reverse integration
that has led to a call for reshaping of disability intervention programs. Brasile (1990), a key theorist behind reverse integration suggested that instead of merely identifying barriers to participation and removing them, a new perspective to integration should be taken (Thiboutot, 1992). Brasile suggests that reverse integration promotes a better comprehension of the true abilities of the disabled through active participation and that:

‘More importantly, such integration will lead to a deeper commitment to, as well as a keener insight into, the needs of the disabled individual in regard to the attitudinal and architectural barriers that are still so prevalent in our society today.’

(Brasile, 1990, p.4)

It is with this belief that numerous programmes, similar to the one being analysed in this study, have been implemented in which non-disabled individuals participate in disability sport, e.g. wheelchair basketball. Despite this growing access to reverse integration programs, Spencer-Calaviere and Peers (2011) suggest that there is a distinct lack of supporting research on the experiences of athletes who play in such settings. It is the belief of the researchers stated above that reverse integration interventions can aid disabled individuals reintegrate into an activity, as debated above, deemed unsuitable for them. It is the secondary benefit of reverse integration highlighted by Brasile (1990) however that makes the theory applicable to this study - reverse integration promotes a better comprehension of the true abilities of disabled individuals. It is this suggestion that promotes the use of reverse integration interventions to change non-disabled individuals’ perceptions of disabled individuals and disability. Prior research appears to support Brasile’s theory however Spencer-Calaviere and Peers (2011) state that the PE field could be significantly enriched by empirical studies into the actual experiences of athletes who are already participating within reverse
integration contexts. With this suggestion comes support for researchers to explore the perceptual changes and experiences of individuals participating in reverse integration interventions. Considering this, this study will ascertain whether a reverse-integration style intervention can potentially affect non-disabled individuals perceptions of disabled and therefore alter their allocation of physical capital toward disabled individuals.

Throughout this section the issue of disability has been identified and, through Pierre Bourdieu and Chris Shilling’s work, has discussed the societal structures disabled individuals experience when attempting to participate in sport. It appears that research has highlighted four main areas that require analysis to assess the effectiveness of the proposed reverse integration intervention. These are the attitudes individuals hold prior to participation (both disabled and disabled), the actual physical sensation of participating (transfer of physical capital), the emotive and social aspect of participating (habitus) and finally the experiences of participants during the intervention.
3: Methodology

McRobbie (2009, p.142) admits finding analysis of the ‘intersections and flows between and across so many fields and so many habitus’ as methodologically overwhelming. As discussed in section 2, Bourdieu and Shilling’s theories, although used throughout previously published research, can create methodological concerns due to their ‘under-theorized’ and ‘confusing’ nature (McNay, 2000; Reay, 1995). It is therefore necessary to produce a robust, pragmatic and well-considered methodology to ensure that potential weaknesses, often attributed to theory based research, are reduced.

As discussed in section 1.4, this piece of research was solely focussed on determining if pupil perceptions of disabled wheelchair basketball players were altered during the intervention. In addition to this research however, an evaluation of the intervention was also conducted. To ensure that a clear distinction between the two separate pieces of work remained, two research methodologies were constructed in order to fulfil the requirements of each piece of work. This section of the thesis details the research strategy and theoretical standpoint adopted to answer the research question of this study. In addition the implemented research design for this study will be identified and discussed. Furthermore, the research methods used to obtain and analyse data will also be discussed.

3.1: Defining the relationship between the Researcher and the Research

This brief section will highlight and discuss the process by which, I the researcher, distinguished between the evaluation of the intervention and this piece of research. Furthermore a brief account of how I remained reflexive in my practice during data collection and analysis will be provided.
In conjunction with this piece of research, I was recruited by the Lincolnshire Sports Partnership to evaluate the success of their intervention on a countywide scale to ascertain if theirs goals for the intervention had succeeded. While this evaluation report was considered totally separate from this piece of research I felt it important to clarify the measures taken to ensure no overlap of data or bias influence this piece of research at the expense of the evaluation report.

During the preparation phases of this research, I ensured focus remained firmly on whether pupils’ perceptions of wheelchair basketball performers were altered following the completion of the intervention period. In order to do so, the principal investigator did not participate in the programme at any level, and remained divorced from activities that were delivered. This ensured that the study had a singular focus that would not be influenced by personal feelings about participation or programme delivery. Furthermore, analysis of research logs and field notes at a later date enabled the researcher to be consistently reflective about the programme (appendix N). This log was kept throughout the data collection process to ensure my own personal thoughts were identified and discussed but, more importantly, to ensure that any personal interpretation on my part was directed back to the research question and validated by asking participants to agree or disprove my own feelings (see section, 3.5.3).

3.2: Research Strategy

De Vaus (2001) suggests that sociological studies based upon weak and poorly defined ontological and epistemological positions often provide inaccurate and invalid sets of data/results. It was therefore considered important that the ontological and epistemological approaches to research be well defined and critically considered prior to data collection.
3.2.1: Employing a Constructivist Ideology

Rodwell (1998) suggests that a study that aims to analyse social perceptions, should adopt a research approach based upon a constructivist ontological ideology. Constructivist approaches to research consider social phenomena and meaning to be socially constructed and that knowledge is based on social experience, human perception and social conventions (Smith, 2010, Gratton and Jones, 2010). This study intended to identify any perceptual changes in participants regarding disabled individuals and disability sport as a result of documenting their experiences during a wheelchair basketball intervention. Therefore this research project required a constructivist approach. Once this ontological approach had been chosen, it was key to select an epistemological standpoint that would ensure a robust approach to the study.

3.2.2: Seeking A Middle Ground: Applying Bourdieu’s Concept of Reflexivity

A key debate throughout research, often referred to as the ‘Paradigm Dialogue’, focuses on differing approaches to epistemological positions in research. Ellis (2006) claims that researchers naively assert that the paradigms underpinning quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches rest on supposedly conflicting assumptions about how we understand reality. What was considered key, in the context of this study, however, was that the selected epistemological standpoint be as relevant to Bourdieu and Shilling’s concepts as possible. Bourdieu himself proposed a concept of Reflexivity when approaching social research (Bourdieu, 1990; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Indeed Bourdieu (1990/1993) believed scientists should accept that research can never be bias free and that individuals always have a tendency to attribute themselves to some form of belief/concept etc. Similarly Hertz (1997) and Gilbert (2008) asserted that reflexivity can be described as a style of research that makes clear the
researcher’s own beliefs and objectives and acknowledges that his/her personal opinions will control to some extent how he/she perceives the social world. Bourdieu (1990) argued however that when considering approaches to research, it is important to minimise personal prejudices that frequently arise from the classification of research positions. In essence Bourdieu (1990) urged researchers to remove themselves, regardless of personal preference, from such debates as the Paradigm Dialog, and find a middle ground that provides robust rigorous research into the social field.

Bourdieu, himself a reflexive sociologist, suggested that trends within society are produced and reproduced by the social actors within it. While these trends are constantly reproduced and continually altering, a good researcher can identify such tendencies, analyse trends and thereby produce factually accurate results. This study, intended to identify tendencies (perceptions) participants possessed prior to the intervention relating to physically disabled individuals. Following this argument, the study identified trends and behaviours participants displayed during the intervention. These behaviours would then provide the basis upon which to engage in discourse relating to post intervention perceptions of disability. The aim of this study, and Bourdieu’s suggested approach, broadly concur. Therefore a reflexive sociological standpoint was considered an appropriate epistemological position to take. Furthermore, the following sections detail how data collection methods and data analysis were selected to enable corroboration of data with participants, who were encouraged to ‘tell their own story’ in order to aid the reduction of researcher bias.

3.2.3: Utilising Bourdieu and Shilling’s Theories and Operating Deductively

Section 2 detailed numerous reasons behind how and why perceptions toward disability exist and are reproduced (Bourdieu, 1986/1990/2000; Shilling, 2003).
Therefore a deductive approach to research was used as, by nature, deduction primarily draws specific assertions/claims from general theoretical principles (Dooley, 2001). Bourdieu’s (1986/1990/2000) and Shilling’s (2003) assertions, discussed in section two, aided the construction of interview transcripts used for both pre and post intervention guided group interviews. It is important to understand that data collection was influenced by Bourdieu and Shilling’s theories of capital and therefore entailed a deductive approach to research be taken.

3.3: Research Design: A Two Group Observation Study Based On Longitudinal Aspects

Based on the set of ontological and epistemological assumptions above, this section will provide a brief overview of the intervention being analysed by this study and detail the selected approach to data collection.

3.3.1: The Intervention: Providing Some Study Context

The intervention which this study analysed was devised by the Lincolnshire Sports Partnership (LSP) and was entitled ‘The LSP Wheelchair Sports Project.’ The intervention utilised a reverse-integration method of delivery, which would incorporate wheelchair basketball (disability sport) into mainstream PE lessons for 12-weeks. The intervention was implemented at a secondary school in a residential area of the city of Lincoln with a pupil base of approximately 500-550 pupils. 100 participants, 50 boys and 50 girls, aged 10-12 years participated in the intervention. Under the supervision of qualified wheelchair basketball coach Marc Blackman from the LSP, the children in the intervention used wheelchairs to participate in activities, which focused on wheelchair basketball. Each session was conducted within the schools gym. The sessions lasted for two hours and
consisted of drills to improve movement and ball control, frequently ending with some form of adapted game that focussed on the skill learned during the session. Session plans were created by the lead coach and aimed to coincide with National Curriculum requirements. The intervention was created to primarily explore whether pupils’ perceptions of disability sport and disabled individuals could be altered.

A longitudinal research design was implemented to meet the aims of the study. To accurately investigate participants’ experiences and perceptions, both during and following the intervention, it was imperative that data be collected longitudinally. Pre-intervention guided groups interviews were completed with both the intervention group (IG) and comparison group (CG) participants who had returned consent forms prior to the start of the intervention (see section, 3.3.1). Over a 12-week period, observational data of the IG was collected weekly and documented in a research log immediately after each session. Post-intervention guided group interviews were then conducted with both the CG and IG one week after the completion of the intervention. The comparison group was utilised to provide comparable data to the IG, which would indicate if any perceptual change had been achieved through participation in the intervention. Over the 12-week intervention period, CG participants participated within their normal PE lessons and focussed upon rugby and football outside on the school field. These sessions lasted for the same period of time as the intervention and were led by the school PE teachers who had devised session plans in accordance with the requirements of the national curriculum. Additionally the CG was utilised to ascertain if any potential changes in IG participants were in someway shared or transferred among individuals who did not experience the intervention, i.e. the CG, or whether any changes observed in pupils’ attitudes were purely linked to their lived experiences during the intervention.
In order to assess if the intervention altered participants' perceptions, it was considered important to assess any potential changes during the intervention (observations) and detail any changes in perceptions once the intervention was concluded (group interviews). The protocol diagram in Figure 3.1 provides a visual illustration of the proposed path each group would take during the research period.
Figure 3.1 Protocol Diagram - Details the process of both IG and CG participants experienced during the course of the study.
Due to the specific nature of working with children, it was important to utilise methods of data collection that were practical to implement but also provided the vital information to meet the aims of this research. Non-participant observations were utilised to ensure that group and individual behaviours were observed, noted and discussed. Whist videoing sessions and examining footage following each session would have proved helpful, the school in question was unwilling to grant permission to video participants. Questionnaires weren’t utilised due to the issue of flexibility. That is, researchers are unable to investigate the vast possible outcomes of a participant’s evaluation of a given target; a person or event (Crano and Brewer, 2008). Effectively Crano and Brewer argue that questionnaires do allow participants to discuss and identify individuals due to the often closed and limited response available in questionnaires. Whilst it was felt videoing interviews would provide an added dimension of physical responses and behaviour to questioning; participants parents were unwilling to give consent. Interviews were implement due to the ability of researchers to explore the many possible routes of conversation participants identified. Furthermore interviews enabled the researcher to clarify and confirm field notes taken during the intervention period. In addition it was felt that implementing guided group interviews enabled participants to discuss and explore both their and their counterparts experiences. This enabled the examination of participants’ shared experiences as well as providing explanations for the socially produced behaviours and perceptions noted during observations. This brief paragraph provides a brief explanation as to why specific data collection methods were used. The following section will further justify why each method was chosen and identify how each method was implemented.
3.4: Research Method

3.4.1: Ethical Clearance

Ethical clearance was gained through the University of Lincoln Ethics Committee (appendix A) and Lincolnshire County Sports Partnership prior to the start of the intervention (appendix B). Approval was also gained from St Peter and St Paul’s prior to the start of the intervention (appendix C). Participants were provided with a Project Information Sheet (appendix D) containing consent (appendix E) and assent forms (appendix F) to be completed by parents/guardians and participants.

3.4.2: Participant Recruitment

The 100 participant sample group was due to begin a 12-week rotation of their usual PE lessons, which coincided with the length of the intervention. Of the 100 participants, 97 participants returned consent and 49 formed the intervention group (IG) who participated in the sessions. The remaining 48 participants formed the comparison group (CG). The IG group contained 24 girls and 25 boys. The CG consisted of 23 boys and 25 girls. Again, this division of the groups was imposed due to school timetabling and returned consent, i.e. boys and girls were segregated during PE lessons. All participants were provided with consent forms (appendix E and F). Informed consent was gained from 49% of the IG group and 48% of the CG group. The one IG individual who failed to provide informed consent still participated in the intervention. However their behaviours and actions were not noted. Similarly the two CG participants were not selected for pre or post guided group interviews.
Random sampling (Babbie, 2007) was utilised to select forty-seven participants from the 97 participant sample group for pre-intervention guided group interviews. Twenty-four were selected from IG and twenty from the CG participants. The same forty-eight participants were then also recruited to participate in post-intervention interviews. CG participants were also randomly sampled to participate in both pre and post intervention interviews. However CG participants did not actively participate in the intervention during the 12 weeks. Unlike the CG participants, IG participants participated in the 12-week intervention, during which observations were completed. Creating a CG enabled data comparison between IG and CG to accurately assess if the intervention had altered/affected participants perceptions toward physical disabled individuals and disability sport.

3.5: Measures

This section will detail the two separate methods of data collection used during the study.

3.5.1: Non-Participant Observations

Ethnographic principles were utilised when conducting observations to allow the researcher to observe naturalistic behaviour that reflects the everyday social practices of participants (Fetterman, 1989; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Krane & Baird, 2005; O’Reilly, 2009; Smith, 2010; Sparkes, 2002). Throughout the 12-week intervention period, non-participant observations (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; O’Reilly, 2009) were conducted with the IG group. This piece of research aimed to provide insight into children’s experiences of wheelchair basketball. Whilst it was acknowledged that the researcher can never be fully removed from research, it was
considered important that the researcher remained as separate from the IG as possible to ensure that collected data was valid, robust and a realistic representation of participants’ behaviours and experiences (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995; Krane & Baird, 2005).

Observations were conducted to provide the researcher with participants’ genuine ‘real-time’ responses/behaviours to participating from the perspective of the wheelchairs and allow for the collection of data relating to participants’ experiences, comments and interactions throughout the intervention. Furthermore, observations were used to provide evidence of behaviours frequently reproduced during the sessions by a variety of participants. These behaviours, in their many forms, were then recorded in the research log to be discussed further in guided group interviews (see section 4 for specific behaviours).

As discussed a reflexive approach to research was taken. Whilst discussion above focuses on the desire to keep results as bias free as possible, it is also noted that this can never be achieved (Hertz, 1997). As Abercrombie et al., (2000) noted, when considering non-participant observations, the researcher continually analyses and evaluates others behaviours through their own eyes. The result of this is that during periods of observation, the researcher’s biases will remain present in the mind of the researcher. Gilbert (2008) recognised that the researcher is the key contributor to the construction of meaning. Considering this, it is crucial to understand that the behaviours noted in the research log were of the researcher’s own observations. As can be seen in appendix N, behaviour was noted and a personal (researcher) interpretation of said behaviour was made. This interpretation however was then highlighted as requiring further discussion with participants. It was essential to the
validity of the study to ensure that these behaviours could be confirmed, justified and explained by participants. This would be achieved through the use of guided group interviews and would ensure that observation data was a legitimate and accurate representation of participants’ behaviour.

3.5.2: Guided Group Interviews

Fetterman (1989) claimed that the most important part of an observer’s research is the interview. Interviews whether formal or informal provide detailed information to explain information gained during observations. Guided group interviews allow both the participants and researcher to discuss and understand behaviours, experiences and social action (Schensul et al., 1999).

Of the 97 members of the IG and CG group, 24 IG participants and 20 CG participants were randomly selected to participate in 30-minute pre intervention guided group interviews. Questions were formed using the review of literature undertaken in section 2. Participants were questioned regarding their perceptions toward disability sport and disabled individuals. Following this observation data relating to behaviours frequently displayed by participants during the intervention were coded. Information from codes was then used to devise additional questions for post-intervention interviews, which would explore and attempt to gain understanding of the experiences of participants. Bourdieu (1984) and Shilling’s (2003) theoretical concepts were applied to provide guidance in coding given responses. While the interviewer’s intention would be to guide discussion, a key objective was to allow the participants to discuss their experiences (free as far as possible) from bias or coercion from the interviewer (Bryman, 2008).
3.5.3: Triangulation of Data

As with each method of data collection, weaknesses are well documented and discussed. For example, Weinstein (1980) asserts there are numerous methodological weaknesses associated with the social sciences solely based on their qualitative nature. Ely (2001) suggests that, to target the imprecise nature of qualitative research, researchers must ardently search for multiple modes of reinforcement and support for proposed methodologies. Similarly, Greene et al., (2001) encourages using mixed methods, particularly in relation to research concerning social problems and the evaluation of social intervention programmes. Based on these suggestions, triangulation of methods was deemed appropriate. Social scientists use triangulation to provide numerous forms of data all aimed at targeting and minimising potential weaknesses in data collection/analysis methods (Berg, 2001; Ellis et al., 2006; Farmer et al. 2006; Guba, 1990). Wolf (2010) suggests that triangulation uses a repertoire of strategies that establish rigour within a researchers methodology. Amenta (2003) and Hammersley (2008) both further assert that triangulation, while difficult, ensures research and collected data is well supported and robust. Based on this prior research, a triangulation of data collection methods was used to ensure participants’ experiences and perceptions towards physically disabled individuals were accurately represented.

Consequently, the weaknesses of each data collection method were identified (see below) in order to implement a strategy to reduce each limitation. While observations provide the researcher with firsthand accounts of the interactions and actions of viewed participants, they do not provide any form of information regarding why such behavior was shown (Burke and Johnson, 2003). Furthermore, observations are only
observations made by the researcher and are open to bias. To address this issue, codes from the research log were used to provide additional question in the post-intervention interview schedule. This would ensure that the behaviours noted in the research log (appendix N) could be discussed by participants and used to justify/validate the researchers observations.

With this in mind, guided group interviews would allow deeper discussion into the experiences of participants and more importantly gain information directly from participants with regard their feelings and perceptions. As stated by Kvale and Brinkmann (2008), interviews are often mis-guided and possess no real structure, resulting in a collection of non-specific invalid data. To address this issue, as seen in section 2, a review of literature was conducted into the possible causes and reproduction of potential perceptions that participants might possess. This research therefore enabled the formation of a structured and informed pre-intervention interview guide (appendix G). Bourdieu’s and Shillings respective theories, and evidence collected during observations were then utilised to aid the formation of a post-intervention research schedule (appendix H). Questions in both interview transcripts remained open-ended to allow participants to provide evidence of their personal experiences. Figure 3.2 provides an illustration of proposed triangulation used for this study.
3.6: Study Procedure

3.6.1: Non-Participant Observation Procedure

During the intervention period, data was collected using Krane and Baird’s (2005) proposed collection method:

- During sessions shorthand ‘Field Notes’ were taken. Field notes consisted of short, concise, key word accounts (Krane & Baird, 2005) of behaviours and actions observed during the session. These field notes would act as a ‘reminder’ (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 1995) to the researcher to then be discussed in a research log.

- Following observation sessions, field notes were then transferred into a ‘Research Log’ and discussed. Research suggests that translating shorthand notes into some form of log is vital (Berg, 2001; Ely, 1991). This translation
was completed immediately after each session to ensure nothing was forgotten or inaccurate (Schensul et al., 1999; Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 1995).

- The research log primarily consisted of a precise account of the research setting and interaction of participants but also contained researchers' interpretations of behaviour (Krane & Baird, 2005). Observational data, once analysed, contributed to group interview content as participants were asked to reflect on their actions and experiences. This allowed for specific behaviours to be linked to, and validated by, reference to social theory and minimise the impact of researcher bias (discussed in section 2).

3.6.2: Guided Group Interview Procedure

As identified during the review of literature (see section 2.8), four main areas for questioning were highlighted;

- Attitudes that individuals held prior to participation in the intervention regarding disabled individuals and disability sport (see sections 2.1/2.1.1).

- Actual physical sensations of participating in the intervention (transfer of physical capital) (see sections 2.6 and 2.6.1)

- The emotive and social lived experiences (habitus) participants encountered during the intervention (see sections 2.4 and 2.6.1)

- Based on participant’s experiences, the attitudes individuals held following the intervention regarding disabled individuals and disability sport.
Based on these themes and key codes/themes identified during the observation period, an interview schedule was formed that would direct conversation, without inflicting any form of researcher bias on the participant. Questions or statements were made to encourage and direct conversation but not constrain it. This ensured results originated from the participant and not the researcher. This factor was key to ascertaining the effect of the proposed intervention on participants' perceptions as it allowed unforeseen experiences/changes to be discussed.

**3.7: Data Analysis**

This section will detail how data was analysed following collection and discuss the different techniques used to produce accurate, robust and valid results.

**3.7.1: Non-Participant Observations**

During the intervention period, data was collected using Krane and Baird’s (2005) proposed collection method (see section 3.3.3 for details). Once translation of field notes was completed data was thematically analysed using Gratton and Jones’ (2004) four stage coding method. Frequently displayed behaviours were assigned a code. Once preliminary coding was completed a secondary analysis of data was conducted highlighting any further statements that corresponded with previous codes and, if so, assigned that specific code. The frequency of these codes were then noted and compared with other behaviours shown throughout the observation period. Supervisors Adam Evans and Lindsay Brown conducted an additional validation of codes to ensure that codes were representative of participant’s behaviours.
3.7.2: Guided Group Interviews

Interview data was thematically analysed using Gratton and Jones’ (2004) four stage coding method. Dictaphone data was transcribed and statements of interest or that related to perceptions or the intervention were assigned a code. Once preliminary coding was completed a secondary analysis of data was conducted highlighting any further statements that corresponded with previous codes and, if so, assigned to a higher order theme. Once coding was completed an analytical approach was taken (Gratton and Jones, 2004) to establish patterns and relationships between codes. A final thematic analysis of raw data was conducted in order to provide an explanation of what each code meant (Bryman, 2008). Additional codes were again discussed in depth with supervisors to ensure the validity of data interpretation.

Once data from both IG and CG had been collated and analysed, a comparative element to data analysis then began. Higher order themes, identified following interview data, were analysed and compared to ascertain if similarities in the codes/themes existed. Following this, IG and CG data was then compared to note if perceptions regarding disability differ or had been altered in either group. This comparison of data provided the foundation to determining whether the intervention had altered perceptions toward disability and disability sport, and if so, how.
4: Results and Discussion

This section will identify key results found following data analysis with an aim to answering whether pupils’ perceptions of physically disabled individuals had altered following the intervention. Using key sociological concepts considered in section 2, the effect the proposed intervention had on participants’ perceptions toward disability and chair basketball will be discussed.

Analysis of data obtained from the IG identified three higher order themes. Each theme emerged from using Bourdieu and Shilling’s respective theories. Issues relating to physical capital, habitus and practice were identified as key to ascertaining perceptions of disability. Following the completion of the intervention, post-intervention interviews identified a potential change/evolution of each of these three themes. This section will identify these three higher order themes and discuss the evolution of each theme based on participants’ lived experiences and results from observations and questionnaires. Throughout theoretical concepts will be used to aid discussion and provide explanation regarding the formation and changes of such perceptions.
Figure 4.1 Process Diagram demonstrating changes in themes prior to and following the intervention

Figure 4.1 details each higher order themes transformation from pre to post intervention data analysis. Each pre-intervention theme has been colour coded to correspond to the relevant transformed higher order theme identified post-intervention. This structure will be employed throughout this section to clearly note each theme’s process of change.

Each higher order theme was identified through two stages in data analysis. Preliminary identification of a theme rested upon the frequency of its use. The more often participants identified feelings or perceptions pertaining to wheelchair basketball and/or disability sport, the more prominent the theme became. This however was not the sole criterion for identifying a theme. Observations were also used to provide examples of lived experiences that caused perceptual changes. Bourdieu (1992) asserted that the creation of an individual’s habitus was based upon their lived experiences and interaction within society. Similarly, during non-participant observations key behaviours were noted in the research log as requiring
further discussion as these provided key examples of participants’ lived experiences. Observation data was used to identify potential issues with guided group interviews acting as a means to explore each theme in detail.

Once discussion of each theme had been completed, the comparison groups’ (CG) data was used to provide evidence relating to any potential changes within the CG. Any similarities or differences were then identified and discussed.

4.1: We’re not so different: The Transformation of perceptions of Limitation to perceptions of Commonality

This section will highlight the first of the primary codes, which was given the title of perceptions of ‘limitation’ (see appendix I and J). This theme was identified when participants were questioned about their perceptions of disabled sports performers prior to the intervention. Following post-intervention interviews, it became apparent that the perceptions that seemed to emphasise limitation before the intervention appeared to have shifted towards perceptions of commonality; that is, participants began to emphasise the experience itself and how they could now relate to a disabled sports performers’ ability, rather than limitations.

4.1.1: A Perception of Limitation and Inferiority

Questioning primarily focused on detailing participants’ knowledge of the Paralympics and disability sport. Participants were asked if they knew anything regarding the Paralympics the athletes, events or the nature of the games. Participant responses identified a similar theme. For example, Charlie, Emma and Tom all expressed comparable opinions:
Charlie: ‘Erm, is it like, erm, if you like, like a leg taken off or like that, then you would do like something else…like…I don’t know’

Emma: ‘Erm, I’ve seen a bit because erm, there was this man who didn’t have a leg, but has this….thing (made curved shape)’

Tom: ‘Erm, I know that they have special bikes, but they’re not like, they…. (Mimics arm rotations required for disabled biking)

Moreover, Matthew and Mike emphasised their shared perceptions of the physical nature of disability, which in their opinion was debilitating to participants:

Matthew: ‘Like, a chopped off arm or something’

Mike: ‘Like those people, you know those guys with the one half arm’

Matthew: ‘Yeah and them with only the one leg’

While participants did suggest they had seen Paralympic events through the media, a distinct focus on the physical impairments of the athletes was apparent. The statements above support Howe’s (2009) claim that once attention had been drawn to the body, either through illness or impairment, it then became the focal point for personal analysis of their physical capabilities. Throughout the interview process, no reference was made to specific activities, events or achievements of a disabled athlete, but rather the person’s perceived physical limitations. Howe (2009) suggests that this focusing of attention on an individual’s physical disability can cause other groups to develop negative perceptions of them. This key perception links directly to the issues discussed in section 2.6 regarding the allocation of physical capital (Shilling, 1993) and how non-disabled individuals view disabled individuals. It is possible that IG participants have attributed so little value to individuals with a
physical disability that their potential to participate in sport is overshadowed by a perceived lack of physical capital; hence barriers to participation are formed. This distribution of physical capital appears to be key to understanding participant’s view of disabled athletes and disability sport. As Matthew and Mike clearly state above, there is recognition of the missing limb as a key factor in defining that individual. Frequently, these perceptions are commonly ones that are based on a perceived lack of ability to participate and a perceived lack of physical capital that discourages individuals from participating (Evans, 2004; Sherrill, 2004 and Shapiro and Martin; 2010).

Participants were then questioned regarding their opinions about disabled individuals participating in events such as the Paralympics and disability sport (see appendix G). During a conversation with IG participants, a conversation arose regarding the perceived ‘boring’ nature of wheelchair basketball.

Andy: ‘Doesn’t look, like, very entertaining, because they’re just like sat down.’

Sam: ‘Yeah, in like normal basketball they can do slam dunks and stuff, and run around, and do something really interesting, but then they’re [disabled individuals] just sat down.

Similarly IG 1 participants outlined how prior to the sessions they believed disability sport was fairly simplistic and unchallenging.

Pat: ‘It, doesn’t look that hard, it looks kind of easy’

Maggie: ‘Yeah it looks quite like, easy because he’s sat down and that must be better than running around’
Sam clearly notes the value in a non-disabled individual’s ability to slam dunk and to ‘do something interesting’ compared to that of a disabled individual who is ‘sit down’. This suggests that low physical capital value has been attributed to the achievements of the disabled individuals. Miller et al., (2004) suggest that this devaluing of disabled individuals’ achievements has led to oppressive behavior arising from the belief that disabled individuals are inferior.

Maggie’s response above suggests that the achievements of disabled athletes are overshadowed by the perception that their achievements confer lower physical capital value than that on a non-disabled athlete/performer. This perception relates to the discussion held in section 2.1 regarding society’s apparent difficulty in dealing with disability (Hay and MacDonald, 2010). Howe (2009) claimed that for society to deal with the ‘problem’ of disability, disabled individuals could be stigmatised. This could be in part due to the nature of PE lesson and the teachers organising them (Fitzgerald, 2005). Brown (2005) and Hay and MacDonald (2010) discerned ‘good’ from ‘bad’ pupils based on their ability to perform in non-disabled school sports games. It is possible that the physical capital value teachers have placed in a pupil’s ability to participate in these traditional team games has been reproduced (see practice section 2.3) by IG participants i.e. non-disabled pupils are viewed as ‘normal’ whilst disabled sports performers are viewed as ‘non-normal’.

With reference to this assertion, participants inferred from observation, that because wheelchair basketball players were sitting down, the physical demands of disability sport in general must therefore be lower than non-disabled sport. Participants appeared to attempt to lessen the achievement of disabled individuals by suggesting
their achievements possess less value than non-disabled individuals. For example, participant Matthew stated that:

Matthew: ‘In, like, wheelchair basketball they’re not using their whole body, just using their arms to power their whole body, but then when I’m playing football, you have to use every bit of your body to move around’.

Matthew appears to de-value the demands of wheelchair basketball by noting that when he plays football he is required to use his whole body compared to wheelchair basketball players who only use their arms. This perception not only suggests a sense of the perceived inferiority of the achievements of disabled individuals but also a detachment of Matthew’s (non-disabled) activities from ‘their’ (disabled) activities. This detachment appears to be consistent with social values. According to Bourdieu (1984) individuals categorise others into groups based on their perceived capital value (in its many forms). Matthew’s statement suggests that, in differentiating his own physical ability from those of a disabled person, he has allocated higher physical capital to himself (and other non-disabled team-mates) than to the disabled athletes he has encountered. In doing so he suggests the existence of two separate social groups, one of which he belongs to and is superior (‘us’) and one that is physically inferior and different (‘them’). Whilst discussing this perception of limitation and segregation Simon’s comment alluded to a potential cause of such a perception.

When questioned regarding disability sport participant Simon identified two key elements to the foundation of his perception of physical limitation.

Simon: ‘My dad says I’m not allowed to watch it because if I did it would freak me out and it weren’t like the real Olympics’
Simon claimed that his father possessed a negative perception of disability and defined disability sport as being ‘freaky’. Simon’s father’s assertion that the Paralympics ‘isn’t like the real Olympics’ suggests that within Simon’s home environment/field, the Paralympics is viewed as inferior to the ‘real’ Olympics and that a clear distinction between the two had been made. Using the concepts outlined by Bourdieu (1992), it is possible, using Simon’s example to suggest that his habitus has been created due to the values held in his home field by his parents. Bourdieu’s theories (1992) imply that influential individuals within a field (i.e. those in position of power conferred through possession of capital and taste), in this case Simon’s father, influenced the weaker members of society (Simon) and through symbolic violence, imposed perceptions and social norms upon them. In turn ideologies then become legitimate and thus became practiced/reproduced in order to maintain a distinction between social groups. In this case, Simon’s father had asserted that the disabled Paralympian’s did not possess as much physical capital value as non-disabled athletes (‘them’) and were therefore considered separate from non-disabled athletes (‘us’). Simon’s statement provides a clear example of this process of practice and habitus. His father’s negative view of the Paralympics, reinforced at home through symbolic violence, potentially through his father’s comments, the programmes watched on TV etc, were then reproduced within Simon when questioned regarding his views of disability.

Similarly Fitzgerald and Kirk (2009) noted participants in their study of sports preferences followed their father’s love for football but could not provide a reason why. Similarly, Simon’s father could have imprinted his ideology onto Simon who has then reproduced this within the school field and incorporated these perceptions into his own personal habitus. It is important therefore to consider, as Bourdieu and
Waquant (1992) claimed, if fields (in this case the school and home field) are not exclusive, perceptions can be created/formed in one field and transferred through the social agent in to another.

The examples above provide an illustration of how physically disabled athletes had been stigmatised by study participants. As stated by Fitzgerald (2005) and Hunter (2004), disabled individuals have often been discouraged from sport and PE due to the teaching styles and provision during lessons. Potentially, Simon is one of many children who have been influenced to believe that disability sport is a ‘lesser-form’ of sport.

4.1.2: No Longer ‘Us’ and ‘Them’…Just ‘We’: A Sense of Commonality

Following the intervention, participants’ perceptions relating to wheelchair basketball appeared to have altered based on their lived experiences of the sessions. When questioned regarding their perceptions of wheelchair basketball following the intervention, where they had previously thought of disabled performers in terms of physical limitation, participants now noted a sense of commonality with physically disabled individuals and their ability to participate in sport (see appendix K). For instance during an interview with Simon, Matthew and Pat, conversation focussed on this perceived sense of commonality,

Simon:  ‘Like, no offence to them, but I used to like look at them and think, like, they’re not one of us, kind of. And now, they are like us, they’re us just…’

Matthew: ‘We’re still human beings like them.’

Simon:  ‘Yeah, like everyone is different so…yeah it just changes the way I…everyone’s different.’
Pat: ‘Everyone is different, just some people can’t do certain things.’

Some participants reflected on why their perceptions had changed. For example Liz from IG group 4 emphasised how her perceptions had changed to a sense of commonality when she identified how disabled athletes are capable of participating in sport.

Liz: ‘You know what its like for them and you won’t like...like they say, never judge a book by its cover, like you don’t know, they might be able to do something, say they like they only have one arm, they might be able to do something better than us even though they have disabilities’.

Participants also suggested that due to their experiences throughout the intervention, their perception toward physically disabled individuals had changed from a sense of limitation and separation to one of increased commonality. As stated by Liz, previous perceptions of limitation had changed due to her experiences of playing sport from the perspective of a wheelchair. Indeed while Fitzgerald (2005) argues that disabled individuals are removed from the sporting environment due to the societal belief that disabled individuals are unable to meet the requirements of competitive sport, results here suggest that following the intervention participants increasingly considered disabled individuals as similar to themselves and capable of more than they initially thought possible. In essence the intervention appeared to remove the sense of division that individuals placed between themselves as non-disabled with disabled individuals prior to the intervention.

It is important then at this point to discuss the experiences participants encountered during the intervention. Participants frequently referred to their experiences of the intervention and suggested this was the primary cause behind this transformation in
their attitude towards disabled individuals.

4.1.3: Not As Easy as They Thought: The unseen ‘physicality’ of wheelchair basketball

As seen in appendix L, a key theme identified was ‘physicality’. This theme related to participants complaints and comments regarding the physical demands of the activities utilised during the intervention.

During the intervention, participants were observed to show signs of tiredness, predominantly during the game section of each session. Within the field journal, it was noted (by the researcher) that:

Suzanne: Swaps chair mid-game and states when walking over ‘my arms are hurting Miss, I need a rest’

Similarly participants following the session stated:

Anne: ‘My arms and back are killing. It’s really tiring moving cause you have to use both arms all the time [in the wheelchair]’

Molly: ‘I’m knackered, that was really hard pushing myself up and down the court’

Participants also showed a distinct struggle with the physical demands of moving the chairs and participating in the activities of each session. Contrary to the statements made in section 4.1.1 regarding the perceived unchallenging nature of disability sport, it was evident that participants were struggling with the physical demands of the session, despite pre-intervention perceptions that the sport would be easy due to being ‘sat down’. In addition to this point, it was also clear that the demands of the session were not solely physical. Participants frequently commented on the
complexity of moving the wheelchairs. For example, Guy referred to a difficulty with basic movement.

Guy: ‘It’s too hard to move and shoot’

Likewise, Ruth drew attention to the size and demands of playing a full-court game of wheelchair basketball.

Ruth: ‘Its way too big to play full court, the baskets are too high’

Beth’s frustrations originated due to the complexity of moving the chair and the cognitive demands of having to perform numerous tasks at the same time.

Beth: ‘You have to think about so much stuff, how to move to get the ball, how to move when you get it and stuff, it’s really difficult’

As shown in appendix L this inability to move around the court resulted in a clustering effect in which participants became grouped and entangled tightly together, typically around the ball, without the ability to free themselves. Potentially, due to the newness of the activities and environment participants were interacting within, any previous experiences and accrued physical capital seemed to be no longer valid. This was self-evident when Guy stated that his previous experiences of sport had not aided him when participating.

‘I play basketball all the time and, like, in a normal game, I’d run with the ball and go round someone and stuff but, when your in a wheelchair, you can’t do it that easy.’

Duncan (2007), in a study analysing interactions within the sport field, suggested once an individual had dominated the sporting arena, they often continued to dominate it. In this instance however, evidence appeared to contradict Duncan’s
claim. Results suggested that when the IG group was introduced collectively to a 
new activity, the social hierarchy could change in unexpected ways. While the field 
the participants were acting within was the same, i.e. same group, same gym etc, 
the activities presented an entirely different challenge, one devoid of any previous 
physical capital where participants struggled with the demands of the environment, 
which required them to potentially form a new habitus. Bourdieu defines this process 
as ‘hexis’, effectively the embodiment of a new habitus (Thorpe, 2009), in this case, 
based on the lived experiences of participants during the intervention. Whilst 
suggesting the process of new habitus had begun, it is important to understand that 
the process of hexis is a gradual one and the issues being discussed suggest that 
only the early stages of this process had occurred.

In identifying the process of hexis, the age of the participants should also be 
considered. The assertions made above are only relevant to the age group analysed 
during the study. Potentially the experiences of older or younger participants may 
have been different and therefore hexis may not have occurred. What is crucial to 
understand is that the issues discussed above relate exclusively to the group 
analysed during this study.

It seems that the new demands of the sessions and the introduction of the 
wheelchairs was one cause behind the perceptual change of participants toward 
disabled people. The physical demands of the session were so high, that 
participants struggled with basic movement and lacked the required strength to 
move the chairs around the court. This finding clearly suggests that it was the 
reverse-integration nature of the intervention that facilitated these lived experiences 
and perceptual change. Potentially the physical capital value participants possessed
prior to the intervention were not applicable to the new environment and therefore required participants to alter their habitus (hexis) and accrue a new form of physical capital. Whilst this process details the physical experiences of individuals causing a perceptual change, an issue relating to Bourdieu’s theory also arose.

Shilling, (1993) claims that Bourdieu pays little or no attention to the biological limitations of individuals. Bourdieu suggested that the human body is socially constructed (Bourdieu, 1992). What Bourdieu under-emphasises is the part that biology can play in an individual’s embodiment process (Shilling, 1993). Considering this, Bourdieu fails to recognise the part that puberty and the physical exertions individuals go through can play in causing habitual changes. This suggests that whilst the lived emotional experiences of participants can be explained and understood through Bourdieu’s theories, the physical tiredness and frustrations cannot be. While this limitation to Bourdieu’s theory is noted, it does affect the legitimacy of perceptual change participants encountered. As Liz aptly stated:

‘Sometimes you think disabled people can’t do this, and can’t do this but actually they can.’

4.2: Sympathy to Empathy

The second key theme to emerge from research was a movement from sympathy towards empathy in participants’ conceptualisation of disabled sports performers. This section will detail the progression from pre-intervention perception through to post-intervention perception and detail the lived experiences of participants that contributed to this change.
4.2.1: Sympathy

Following questioning into participants’ perceptions of disability sport, interviews turned to investigating participants’ personal experiences of disability, albeit within or outside of the sports field. When asked if participants were in close contact with or knew anybody with disability, participants commonly intimated they knew someone within the family circle or close friends who were, in some way, disabled.

Pat: ‘My cousin. She erm, can’t like speak properly and she can’t like, she needs help walking’

Sarah: ‘My cousins only young but I think he has Down syndrome and learning difficulties’

While participants Pat and Sarah claimed they were related to disabled people, other participants also detailed relationships with disabled friends. For example, three participants outlined how they knew others who they considered to be disabled:

Tom: ‘My neighbour, well he’s moved now but erm, every morning this coach came and he erm, got on it and went to a special school’

Rachel: ‘Erm, well I know there this girl in our class, called A and she has a sister who’s disabled...well I know she’s in a wheelchair’

Mike: ‘My friends, little brother erm, has to like, think out loud and stuff, so he thinks out loud and if he thinks, like, that person is an idiot, he’ll shout it loud’

Within each group participants discussed a variety of relationships and acquaintances with disabled people. Interestingly participants not only noted relationships with physically disabled individuals but also those with learning difficulties. During section 4.1.1 it was noted that when participants, considered a
sporting context, they only identified physically disabled athletes. However when discussing relationships with people with disabilities, individuals with learning disabilities were also highlighted. Potentially people with learning disabilities become invisible when focusing on an environment, already noted as being determined through visual, physical capital means.

The interviews also identified how participants felt when in the company of people with disabilities. Participants acknowledged a sense of unease around those they perceived to be disabled. For example, Pat explained how he had trouble communicating with a disabled person he was familiar with.

Pat: ‘It’s hard, because sometimes you don’t know what she’s trying to say’

Concurrently, Emma described how she considered the physical disabilities of many individuals to be problematic:

Emma: ‘I felt silly…erm, and bad because I’m always stood up or like sat down on a proper chair and can move around. I walk and I like run around and things and don’t…sit in a wheelchair’

Both issues of learning and physical disabilities appeared to be related for many participants. One male participant, Simon, outlined how the two could create difficulties in understanding how to approach disabled people:

Simon: ‘Sometimes it’s quite bad for him, and he’s got like er, he can’t sleep that much and he isn’t very good with people so you have to be like really careful when you introduce yourself to him’

The statements above coincide with the issue discussed above in section 4.1.1 and throughout section 2 of the stigmatisation of those with impairments (Fitzgerald, 200; Miller et al., 2004). Pat, Emma and Simon’s statements above show that while they
frequently encountered individuals who had either physical or learning disabilities, each found interacting with them difficult. It can be suggested that participants lacked sufficient lived experiences with disabled people and because of this they had not developed a habitus capable of dealing with close contact with disabled people. This became apparent in the further sections of the research (see below).

Considering issues of physical disability, Shilling introduced the body as a possessor of value (Shilling, 2003). As highlighted in section 2.6.1 varying social groups placed differing values in the ‘ideal’ or ‘normal’ body, yet frequently little capital value was perceived in disabled people’s bodies. This devaluing of the disabled body creates a problematic relationship between those not familiar with impairments and those who are (Fitzgerald, 2005).

This perception of unease had caused participants to feel sympathy toward disabled people in general. For instance, CH stated simply:

Matthew: ‘But then you feel sorry for them’

Liz similarly displayed a sense of sympathy but likened it to a sense of loss at the thought of being told if she was disabled.

Liz: ‘Yeah because if like, someone’s been, erm, someone’s been told that they’re not going to be able to walk again, you’d think, oh no, think of all the things I won’t be able to do’

Moreover, Emma associated her sense of sympathy to a perception that disability is unfair and potentially the result of someone else’s actions. In addition she added that she felt in some cases, disability could not be recovered from.
Emma: ‘I feel quite sorry for them, because it couldn’t have been, like if someone has a broken leg or something, it couldn’t have been, well it could have been their fault but someone else could have done it and then they’re stuck with it for the rest of their life’

While it is possible to suggest that sympathy is not a negative trait, sympathy is defined by Djiker (2010) as a ‘feeling of pity or sorrow for someone else’s misfortune’, in essence a sense of loss, illness or injustice. Sympathetic understanding can only imitate feelings of sorrow, as the individual displaying sympathy may not have experienced the sorrow an individual had encountered. With regard to participants’ senses of sympathy, a predominant sense of sadness toward disabled people in general was apparent. The sympathy described by participants however appeared to be founded on a negative perception of disability as some kind of incurable disease. Comparing themselves to that situation appears to suggest that participants view disabled individuals as incomplete or lacking something compared to what they perceived as a ‘normal’ existence. Shilling (1996) refers to these perceptions and defined the ‘diseased body’, this being a sense that health has been attributed to appearance through mediums such as self-help books, cosmetics and gyms i.e. if you look healthy, you must be healthy. In this instance, participants viewed disabled people as a variation from what they perceive to be healthy and immediately perceived to be sick.

Participants’ statements again focused upon the individual’s disability and how this made them ‘feel for them;’ that is, to demonstrate how they understood the situation of those with impairments as tragic. Howe’s (2009) claim again appears justified as participants noted the individual’s disability and, based solely on that knowledge, sympathised. However, as Henderson and Bryan (2011, p.177) suggested, ‘disabled
individuals do not need sympathy, they need understanding.’ Henderson and Bryan further discussed the impact that sympathy had upon some disabled people and suggested that recipients of sympathy too often began to feel inferior to others. Similarly Wilde (2004) suggests that society all too frequently pities disabled people and views their ‘situation’ (disability) as tragic. This frequently leads to the development of feelings such as limitation and inferiority. As Wilde (2004) suggests pitying often leads to a devaluing of such groups and as section 4.1 suggests, results in a perceptual limitation. The following section will detail the experiences of participants during the intervention specifically relating to the perceptual change of sympathy to empathy.

4.2.2: The shift from Sympathy to Empathy

Throughout the intervention, participants displayed frustration whilst participating. As discussed in section 4.1.3, participants experienced high physical demands when participating in the wheelchairs. As a by-product of the increased physical demands of the intervention, participants became frustrated with the height of the basketball net and the required effort to move the chairs around the court.

During session six of the intervention, participant Suzanne was asked about the game she was participating in and stated

Suzanne: ‘It’s so hard to move and get high enough to score’.

A second participant interjected and said

Molly: ‘How are we meant to do this in wheelchairs, it’s too difficult’
Suzanne and Molly displayed frustration at the height of the basket and at the
difficulty of basic movement whilst in the wheelchairs. Similarly in a separate group,
Will, during a game, attempted to score a basket but his shot was not powerful
enough. In response to his effort PH shouted ‘it’s too fucking high’. Once Will’s group
was granted a water break a conversation with Will was then conducted, during
which this incident was recalled:

Int: Will, you seemed to find that quite hard?
Will: ‘I just can’t do it’
Int: What can’t you do?
Will: ‘It’s too high. It’s too hard to move and shoot’

Will’s frank exchange proved important in ascertaining the root cause of the
frustration noted. Participants’ frustrations related to both the physical demands of
activities they were participating in and also with respect to their inability to complete
desired tasks such as moving about the court, dribbling and shooting. During post-
intervention interviews participants were then questioned on their experiences of
frustration during the intervention. Emma mentioned how she had found basic
movement of the wheelchair difficult and as a result found herself colliding with other
people.

Emma: ‘If you’re like stood up then you know you can like, move away quickly
if something’s like going to hit you or something, but if you’re in a
wheelchair and you’re not used to it you can’t move quickly’

Sarah attributed her frustration to the height of the basket and, based on being in a
wheelchair, the added distance she was required to shoot from.
Sarah: ‘Yeah it was quite frustrating especially like when shooting cause you’re lower down so you can’t get to the net as easy’

During post-intervention interviews participants compared their experiences and frustrations to previous encounters of sport and noted an increased level of difficulty when playing wheelchair basketball when compared to other sports. Matthew compared his experiences of playing football to his experiences during the intervention and suggested the complexity of moving the chair was a key source of frustration.

Matthew: ‘When you’re playing sports it different, cause like when you’re playing football your just kicking a ball but when you’re playing wheelchair basketball, it’s a bit more complicated, cause you’ve got to turn the wheelchair and you can’t just use your body to turn around’

Similarly, Simon used his experiences of football to compare his difficulties when trying to reach the ball from the wheelchair.

Simon: ‘If the balls down there and you’ve got to like try and get it, in football you just normally use your feet but, you’ve got to like bend over and try and reach it and we had to sit down which was really hard cause you normally it’s just there’ (points at feet)

Sam recalled the ease of moving across the court during a game of netball and compared it to the intricacy of directing and moving his wheelchair during the intervention.

Sam: ‘It was hard cause when you wanted, like, if the ball was there and the other team had it, in netball you’d just like run over to the other side but in, like in a wheelchair, you’ve going to steer and push and you have to go all the way round other players and stuff

Three separate participants all used comparisons to other sports they had played to
explain why they found tasks so difficult to complete. As Bourdieu (1992) suggested, individuals’ lived experiences are key to defining an individual’s taste with regard to the perceptions they embody (habitus) and social groups they interact in. Participants had developed a sense of sympathy toward mentally and physically disabled people through social interaction with their habitual groups. Participants also suggested that these interactions had led to a perception that classed disabled individuals as being unable to participate in sport due to their disability. Participants’ experiences during the intervention however appeared to have contradicted such perceptions. Participants’ displays of frustration suggested that despite being non-disabled and, at least according to interviews before the intervention, physically ‘superior’ or ‘dominant’ (Clément, 1995; Hay and Hunter, 2006; Hunter, 2004), the activities they had been asked to complete were beyond their initial physical capacity.

Opposing this finding however, Hunter (2004) and Brown (2005) both highlighted a belief that successful/able students display high levels of technical skill and fitness. Due to the reverse integration nature of the intervention, even participants previously viewed as ‘high achievers’ struggled significantly with basic movement and coordination when moving the chairs, in effect forming a new physical habitus. Due to this inability of participants to complete tasks, participants began to disengage with the activities (see appendix L) and effectively cheat to complete tasks.

Interviews conducted after the intervention focussed on the elements of participant behaviour that had contravened the rules of wheelchair basketball (see interview transcript H). This behaviour, group interview results suggested, was a key indicator to the cause of perceptual change toward disability sport. The inability participants
experienced to complete tasks had provided individuals with a retrospective view of their own previous perceptions toward disability before experiencing the wheelchair basketball sessions. Having experienced the difficulty of the activities and being able to understand the frustrations of disability sport, participants’ previous sympathetic attitudes toward disabled individuals appeared to have shifted towards empathy. Evidence pertaining to this theme will now be discussed.

4.2.3: Empathy

Post-intervention interviews revealed a change in participants’ attitudes towards wheelchair basketball players, particularly in relation to previously sympathetic opinions. For example, three participants from separate interview groups noted changes in the way they perceived disabled individuals. First, Tom described how his attitudes had changed:

Tom: ‘It made me realise like how hard it is for like disabled people, to like move around and all the things they actually can’t do.’

Maggie reflected on the feelings she had experienced whilst taking part:

Maggie: ‘I understand more like how they feel and how annoying it is to be in a wheelchair, even though I was only in it for a little bit and I could get out and walk, but if like you couldn’t get out and stuff, it would be like…just so annoying’

Finally, Guy outlined how the difficulty of wheelchair basketball had surprised him:

Guy: ‘Yeah cause like I thought it was like easy for us…now though you would know how hard it would be for them because you can’t stand up and just go running after the ball’
The statements above suggested participants had an increased familiarity with the frustrations of having to use a wheelchair. By definition empathy refers to the ‘ability to understand someone else’s feelings as if they were one’s own’ or ‘one’s ability to understand and share the feelings of another’ (Dijker, 2010). As Henderson and Bryan (2011) asserted in section 4.2.1, disabled individuals are not in need of non-disabled individuals’ sympathy but instead require their understanding. Considering this, results suggested that participants had encountered a context specific experience of the physical demands and frustrations of participating in wheelchair basketball and appeared to have shown an increased understanding of the demands of wheelchair basketball.

These experiences however are only specific to the intervention context. While Tom, Maggie and Guy suggested that they now ‘understood’ how disabled individuals felt, their experiences were in fact limited. For example, participants were not exposed to the many barriers which people with disabilities encounter on a daily basis. Likewise, they only gained experiences of one type of physical impairment limited to the lower limbs and torso, in one type of disability sport. Put simply, participants were, for a brief period exposed to an environment from which they could, as Maggie states above, ‘just stand up and walk away’ from. To suggest that participants experienced the same demands as a physically disabled individual’s daily life would not be accurate. What had occurred however was that, due to reverse-integration nature of the intervention, participants had experienced, for a brief period, the demands of playing wheelchair basketball which led to an appreciation of what could be perceived to be potential understanding of a physically disabled person’s existence.
Nonetheless, as Bourdieu (1992) stated, individuals form their habitus through lived experiences and the process of hexis. Pre-intervention results suggested that the school environment had reproduced perceptions of sympathy and inferiority. Questioning however highlighted that, at least in this context, the embodied lived experiences of participants during the intervention encouraged a perceptual change from sympathy to a degree of empathy for wheelchair basketball performers. Considering the aim of this research to ascertain whether pupils’ perceptions of physical disability could be altered following participation in the intervention, participants clearly stated that they now understood how ‘annoying’ (Maggie) it must be to be in a wheelchair and made reference to how their embodied, lived experiences, within the reverse-integration setting, where the key to this change.

One participant perhaps summed up this change succinctly when asked what he would take away from the intervention. He commented:

‘The memories of being like, in the wheelchairs, like I can take away the experience of being in one, like they have to be in one as well…forever’

4.3: Contrived to Genuine: A Changing and Broadening Sense of Respect

The final theme identified from research was a transformation from expressions of contrived respect or respect based on a perceived ‘right answer’, prior to the intervention, to expressions of genuine respect after the intervention. This section will detail the progression from pre-intervention perception through to post-intervention perception and detail the lived experiences of participants that contributed to this change.
4.3.1: Pockets of Resistance: A Small Minority Demonstrating Contrived Respect

During pre-intervention interviews, participants were asked to discuss how seeing or being around disabled individuals made them feel (see section 4.2.1). During conversation three participants openly admitted to feeling respect for people with a disability. As discussed above, two primary perceptions participants possessed toward disabled individuals and disability sport were of limitation and sympathy. Despite the majority of participants displaying these attitudes toward disability (see appendix I and J), three participants displayed perceptions of respect. When asked about their feelings when watching disability sport or seeing a disabled person, participants responded in a similar manner. Anne mentioned that she perceived disabled athletes to be brave and suggested that their willingness to do something they enjoyed, regardless of what people said about their disability, was key to this perception.

Anne: ‘I don’t know really, I guess, that they’re really brave, because they don’t care what they look like, they are just going to do what they want to do’

Similarly Rachel asserted that her perception of respect stemmed from a perceived determination in disabled individuals to continue participating despite their disability.

Rachel: ‘I think, I don’t know, like good for them, because they’re just getting on with it [life]’

Andy attributed his respect to a belief that disability sport looked difficult and that anyone who participates in it was deserving of his respect.

Andy: ‘I don’t think it [disability sports] looks easy, I think it’s a lot harder than it looks’
Whilst participants Anne, Rachel and Andy all display sentiments of respect, it is important to explore the statements made above in the context of the interviews. Firstly, Anne’s comments start with indecision followed by ‘I guess’. This comment suggests that Anne’s response potentially is not entirely genuine and instead a guess at what she feels should be a ‘right’ answer. This hesitation in her statement, although short, should be considered carefully. Andy’s statement suggests that a) a deviation from the societal perceptions identified in section 2 exists and b) that Bourdieu’s concept of practice is being displayed through Andy. This requires further discussion.

To focus on the first point made, throughout section 2 a clear, negative societal perception toward disability and disability sport was identified. Andy's statement however suggests that within society there are individuals who can deviate from the norm. As discussed in section 4.1.1, Simon identified his father as a source of his perception toward disability. While the interview with Andy failed to identify the source of his perception that disability sport deserved some respect, it is necessary to discuss how Andy produced this response.

Bourdieu suggests how this might occur through his discussions of his concepts of habitus and practice and the internalisation of taste. Bourdieu (1992) asserts that habitus refers to a set acquired schemes or dispositions, perceptions and appreciations, including tastes, which orient our practices and give them meaning. Additionally Laberge (1995) suggests that habitus generates and gives significance to an individual’s likes and dislikes. Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus is one in which an individual internalises a concept or perception because said individuals consents and believes in such perception.
Considering the internalisation of Andy’s habitus however, it is possible that Andy is reproducing what he believes to be a positive opinion to suit the context in which he is speaking. The fact that he displayed both indecision and a willingness to consider the most appropriate response indecision was due to unfamiliarity with a potentially sensitive subject. Similarly, Rachel and Anne displayed similar indecision by both stating that they ‘don’t know’. Again this suggests that a conscious search was being made for what they felt to be a potentially fitting answer to the question of how they felt around disabled individuals. This perceived sense of respect did however increase following the intervention.

4.3.2: Genuine Respect

Following the intervention, 28% of coding referred to respect, whereas before the intervention this statistic had only been 11% - an increase of 17% of references to feeling a sense of respect toward disabled athletes. This suggests that the intervention had encouraged participants to evaluate their initial perceptions. When questioned regarding the construction of this new perception, participants provided similar reasoning for this change. Tom used his experiences of traditional basketball to explain his reason for change:

Tom: ‘Its like so different to basketball and stuff, so like if you do basketball on your feet its different if you’re like doing it in a wheelchair, I think you have to have more skill to do it in a wheelchair’

Similarly, Charlie noted how the inclusion of a wheelchair completely challenged the skills he had learned during his experiences of basketball.
Charlie: ‘The fact that you are in a wheelchair and you can’t do those things, like in normal games of basketball, they’ll run with the ball and stuff but when you’re in a wheelchair, say like you have to keep it on your knees and put your chin on it, keep the ball there and then move, it’s so much harder than playing like normal basketball’

Pat highlighted a sense of respect in the daily physical demands of living from the perspective of a wheelchair:

Pat: ‘Just like every day, getting up going in the wheelchair, wheelchair-ing around, going into bed, just the same 24/7…you got to be strong to do that’

Tom, Charlie and Pat all provide a similar motive to explain the increasing prevalence of this new perception. Again participants frequently relate to their lived experiences during the intervention as the key to perceptual change. Interestingly both Tom and Charlie provided a comparison to non-disabled basketball and commented on their perceived ease with it compared with wheelchair basketball. Having experienced the wheelchair intervention both participants claimed that wheelchair basketball was more demanding and complex to participate in than they had expected.

Additionally, in section 4.3.1 Anne, previously identified as being unsure when responding to pre-intervention questioning, provided an answer (see below) that emphasised a specific change in her perception. When asked if the intervention had changed her perceptions toward disability sport Anne replied

Anne: ‘Yeah cause if you see it on the TV you think oh, its wheeling chairs about, passing to each other, good for them…but no, cause when you actually get in the wheelchair it’s really tough…you have to be proper good’
Anne’s comments demonstrate a shift from a general expression of contrived respect to a respect based on experience. Anne notes that prior to the intervention she ‘didn’t know’ and guessed that expressing respect was expected in her response. Following the intervention however she clearly states that her experiences have made her understand and respect the demands of the sport and the athletes that participate in it.

This change in participants’ perception was fostered by the lived experiences of participants during the intervention. The sessions enabled non-disabled individuals to ‘taste’ the demands of wheelchair basketball. Brasile (1990) claimed that reverse integration would promote a better comprehension of the true abilities of disabled individuals and appears justified in his assertion as results suggest participant’s experiences have both changed and new perceptions (potentially habitus) toward wheelchair basketball players have been created. Throughout this section it is clearly notable that participants, because of their lived experiences during the intervention, had developed perceptions of respect, commonality with and empathy toward the disabled sportsmen and women.

Whilst data suggests and supports perceptual change, a limitation with Bourdieu’s theory was however noted. Bourdieu (1992) refers to an individual’s habitus as being formed through influences of the social field. As discussed throughout section two, the PE environment frequently displays negative behaviours towards disabled individuals thus forming barriers to participation (Fitzgerald, 2005). Considering this, Jarvie and Maguire (1994) suggest that Bourdieu rarely accounts for agency actors within society, i.e. participants discussed above who chose to resist such dominant perceptions. As discussed in section 2.1.2, agency relates to an individuals’ ability to
resist dominant perceptions and social structures and act independently. Bourdieu suggests that change is a socially constructed process that occurs when whole societies almost revolt against dominant structures. He underplays however the influence of individual agents can have on the social field (Shilling, 1993). Participants suggest however that a change had occurred. Whilst Bourdieu suggests his theory of hexis for internalisation of social norms, he fails to account for individuals’ ability to resist such structures and pays little consideration to the processes or actions of agency members to achieve reject such influences.

It had been noted therefore, considering the aim of this research to identify perceptual change due to participation in the intervention, that a number of changes in attitude were fostered in participants who took part in wheelchair basketball. As outlined in section 3.3.1 however, interviews were also conducted with 20 CG participants in the same school who did not take part in the wheelchair basketball sessions to ascertain if these perceptual changes were fostered due to the intervention and not a wider societal movement. Therefore, the final section of this discussion will outline comparisons between the perceptions of the comparison group (CG) with those of the intervention group (IG).

4.4: Determining the Boundaries of Perceptual Change: The Comparison Group

As discussed in section 3.3.1 a comparison group was utilised to provide data directly comparable to the intervention group. This comparison would ensure that changes of perception were as a result of the reverse-integration style intervention and not another social system, a key factor in answering the research question identified in section 1. Additionally the CG was utilised to ascertain whether the
changing culture of participants in the IG was in some way shared or transferred among individuals who did not experience the intervention, or whether the changes observed in pupils' attitudes was purely linked to their lived experiences during the intervention. This section will detail the results from interviews with the CG group and detail perception held prior to the intervention and following the completion of the CG's standard PE sessions. Following this a comparison of IG and CG data will be completed to provide detail of any perceptual differences between the IG and CG. As seen in appendices I and J, participants held similar perceptions toward disability sport and the disabled community.

4.4.1: Much of the same: Similarities between IG and CG, Pre-Intervention

It became clear, prior to the intervention, that the attitudes of the CG toward disabled individuals mirrored those of the IG. Similarly to IG participants, CG participants showed a distinct lack of knowledge about the Paralympics. The statements below are typical of responses obtained from this group:

Darren:  ‘I don’t have a clue’

Natalie:  ‘I know it’s to do with sport but I don’t know what…or is it like people running and jumping over things?’

Jackie:  ‘I don’t really know anything about it?’

Phillip:  ‘I’ve heard about it, but I don’t know much about it’

The statements above are similar to the responses given in section 4.1.1. Responses such as ‘I don’t know what…or is it like’ highlight a similarity with the IG concerning a distinct lack of knowledge. Following questioning participants were
provided with a brief description of the Paralympics. Following explanation, in some cases participants provided a blunt response:

Lisa: ‘Well how are they supposed to do sport then?’

The similarities between the perceptions of the CG and pre-intervention perceptions of in the IG suggest that neither view is exceptional. Instead, Lisa’s response provides another reinforcement of the prevailing perception of limitation with regard disabled people. Lisa’s statement suggests two potential causes for this response. Lisa may simply fail to understand how disabled individuals can participate in sport due to their disability. Conversely Lisa may be unfamiliar with disability sport, as she has been taught a version of sports participation, through mainstream PE, which does not include disabled individuals. In essence Lisa is a product of the habitual influences identified in section two and mirrored by Simon in section 4.1.1. Lisa appears to have attributed so little physical capital value to disabled people that she had difficulty in simply understanding how a disabled person could participate in sport. As discussed in section 2.5.1, the school field has become one based on ‘success’ of physical attributes with Sparkes et al., (2007) noting that participants frequently suggested that only big, strong, athletic people can play sport. This perception has led to the stigmatisation of individuals who do not possess such attributes, i.e. disabled individuals (Evans, 2004; Sherrill, 2004 and Shapiro and Martin; 2010). Lisa’s statement would suggest that this perception had been reproduced and led to a similar sense of limitation. It is also possible to see similarities in negative codes such as inferiority, sympathy and unease.
4.4.2: Limitation

Frank provided a key example of a sense of inferiority when questioned regarding his relationship with a disabled member of his family.

Joe: ‘Yeah, he’s got something wrong with him’

Howe (2009), Hay and MacDonald (2010) and Miller et al., (2004) all asserted that society frequently views disability as a ‘problem’. Frank’s statement clearly supports this assertion by stating there is something ‘wrong’ with his brother. Similarly discussed above, participants in both the IG and CG’s were guilty of perceiving disabled individuals as possessing an inferior capital value due to their ‘broken’ body, which deviates from the ‘ideal’ culturally defined body. Results suggested this perception, similarly to the IG, had led to the construction of a sense of sympathy for disabled individuals.

4.4.3: Sympathy

During questioning regarding how being around individuals with a form of disability made participants feel, Eamon provided a similar example to the statements made in section 4.2.1. For example, Eamon stated:

Eamon: ‘It makes you feel like, sad, because they only have like one arm or something and we have two so we can do more than them’

Eamon’s statement provided an example of both sympathy and inferiority. Additionally Eamon provides an example of the link society often makes between sympathy and limitation. Eamon begins his statement with acknowledging a sense of sympathy toward disabled individuals and immediately follows this with a sense of limitation because he ‘had two arms and they had one’. This statement again
suggests that, like IG participants, Eamon segregated himself from disabled individuals by again creating a sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’ (discussed in section 4.1.1). Eamon’s perceived a lack of physical capital in disabled individuals, i.e. ‘they only have one arm’, and compared it to herself ‘we have two’, thus imply two separate groups of differing capital values. Indeed as Corrigan (2010, p.293) asserts:

‘We (society) expect able-bodied athletes, whom have been classified as the ‘ideal’, to compete in the Olympics; athletes with disabilities (determined by their deviation from the norm) compete in the Paralympics.’

This segregation has caused the creation of negative stereotypes that were reproduced in participants.

As discussed in section 4.2.1 conversation with the CG also focussed on how being around disabled individuals made them feel. Similarly to the IG responses, CG participants identified a sense of unease.

Tina: ‘I know I shouldn’t but I find it a bit weird, I don’t know why it’s just weird, it looks weird with just like one arm’

Tina’s statement again highlights similarities with the responses given by the intervention group. Participants commonly referred to a sense of being uncomfortable around disabled individuals due to unfamiliarity with the practices they assumed would be appropriate in relating to disabled people. This implies an assumption of difference, and that they should change their behaviour around those with impairments – albeit in unfamiliar ways. As asserted by Hay and MacDonald (2010) often society struggles to deal with the ‘problem’ that is disability and participants’ statements appeared to support this claim.
4.4.4: Contrived Respect

Interestingly CG participants also provided statements relating to a perception of respect toward disabled individuals. Darren suggested he felt respect for disabled individuals due to their skill levels when participating.

Darren: ‘Cool because they like have to, I don’t know, they just do something and they are really good at it and I guess they are just cool’

Natalie similarly explained that her sense of respect was based on disabled individuals playing sport despite a perceived lack of opportunity.

Natalie: ‘I think it is also very good, because normally they might not be able to do sport because they can’t run or anything so it’s good they get a chance’

Natalie’s statement clearly notes a sense that disabled individuals don’t often get a chance to play sport and highlights the positive that they (disabled individuals) were provided with the opportunity. Similarly she thought it was ‘cool’ that disabled individuals played sport. It is possible, as was in section 4.3.1, to suggest that there are individuals, who as an agency member (see section 2.1.2), choose to reject widely held negative perceptions toward disability. However analysing Darren’s statement, similar phrases such as ‘I guess’ and ‘I don’t know’ are evident.

It is possible to suggest then that at this point participants from both the comparison and intervention groups possessed similar perceptions toward disability. Following the intervention CG participants provided no evidence of change regarding the perceptions identified above.
4.4.5: Comparison Group: Post-Intervention

As can be seen from appendix M, the prominent response to post-intervention questioning was ‘no change’. Participants frequently failed to answer any questions simply because responses they had given previously were still applicable to the perceptions held following the completion of their 12 weeks of standard PE lessons. The lack of change in the CG group suggests that their regular PE lessons have done little to challenge or change their perceptions and in fact potentially reinforced such perceptions further. It appears that despite IG participants showing a clear change in perceptions toward disability and disabled sport, these perceptions are exclusive to the IG group. It is vital to note then that the reverse-integration style of delivery in which embodied experiences were engendered was the key factor in affecting perceptual change within pupils. This finding suggests a conclusion that to potentially change perceptions of disability, experience plays a key role in creating understanding toward disabled athletes and challenging negative perceptions, in its simplest form: no experience equals no change.

In essence the lived experiences of participants during the intervention effectively altered their habitus. The practices participants were exposed to during the intervention led to a formation of a new habitus and, consequently, taste. For example participants would now potentially detach themselves from disabled individuals less, due to their new sense of commonality.
4.4.6: Interest

Post intervention questioning did however identify one theme exclusive to the comparison group. As can be seen in appendix M, CG participants exhibited a keen sense of interest toward future participation in playing some form of disability sport:

Frank: ‘It was weird because I want to try it even though we’ve never done it before’

Joe: ‘I don’t like doing sports but I think I could do something like that, it looks quite good’

Both Frank and Joe’s statements suggest that a potential interest in disability sport exists. However participants simply have not had the opportunity or exposure to such sports through their PE lesson. This has potentially identified a primary source to the creation of negative perceptions such as limitation and inferiority in participants. These statements do suggest however, that contrary to the perceived negative view of disability sport, there is a clear interest in disability sport and future participation in reverse integration style interventions. While it is possible to suggest that society does possess a negative perception of disability, it is also possible to suggest that despite this, societal actors are interested in learning more about disability sport and future involvement.
5: Conclusions

The aim of this research focussed on ascertaining whether perceptions of physical disability and wheelchair basketball changed during the intervention period. Considering this, it is possible to conclude that perceptual change in participants, following the completion of the intervention, has been identified. The intervention used wheelchair basketball as a vehicle to engage non-disabled children in disability sport. Interviews completed prior to and immediately after the intervention made it possible to identify three themes in participants’ perceptions of disabled athletes and disability sport that appeared to change due to participants’ lived experiences of the intervention. Prior to the intervention, participants emphasised a perception of physical limitation of disabled people. They also expressed sympathy for them, while at the same time outlined that they respected disabled people, but only in a contrived manner. The immediate implication of this finding highlights the prevalence of negative stereotypes of physical disability, particularly in relation to perceptions of disability sport.

Using Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of field, capital and habitus, and Chris Shilling’s concept of physical capital, participant perceptions were linked to individuals’ perceptions of the disabled physical body. Participants attributed very little physical capital to disabled individuals and disabled athletes prior to the intervention. Perceptions of limitation and inferiority stemmed from a belief that disabled individuals, in some way, were less capable of participation in school sport due to their physical disability. In addition, results suggested that these perceptions of limitation and inferiority directly linked to a sense of pity or sympathy for disabled people. Applying Bourdieu and Shilling’s concepts, results suggested that these perceptions had been formed as a result of participants interacting within an
environment in which similar perceptions were prevalent, i.e. the PE classroom. A clear implication of this finding is that, despite pupils displaying perceptions of limitation and sympathy, teachers are failing to challenge such perceptions and instead, potentially reinforcing them through the structure and content of their lessons.

Following the intervention however, IG participants expressed changes in their perceptions toward wheelchair basketball players. Whilst the longevity of such perceptual changes is questionable (see below), this change can be explained through Bourdieu’s concept of practice. Bourdieu (1984) suggested that habitus formed as a direct result of an individual’s interactions (practice) within a social field. Bourdieu’s theory appeared to support pre-intervention findings (discussed above) as participant’s perceptions appeared to stem from their experiences from within the PE field. Results suggest that participants, having been exposed to, and practiced, wheelchair basketball, directly questioned their habitus and possibly even gradually began to alter it. The discussion below highlights these changes, explains that they came as a result of participants lived experiences of the intervention and, where possible, uses Bourdieu’s concepts to explain such processes.

Participants began to emphasise a sense of commonality with wheelchair basketball players. This finding denotes a conscious change in the way participants viewed these disabled athletes. Prior to the intervention, participants suggested they had perceived themselves as a separate social group to disabled individuals, a point Bourdieu (1984) considered vital in explaining social stratification. Bourdieu claimed that this differentiation between social groups was the key process to how society formed into powerful and subordinate groups, In essence participants reproduced
such a process by identifying a sense of ‘us’ (non-disabled individuals) and ‘them’ (disabled individuals). Results suggest however that this differentiation between social groups had been reduced, in this context, following the intervention. Participants perceived wheelchair basketball players, based on their experiences during the intervention, to possess much higher levels of physical capital than previously believed. Participants based this change on experiencing the skills and physical demands required to participate in wheelchair basketball and this conversely changed their opinion of a sport they had deemed ‘easy’. This finding again implies that the PE field in doing very little to inform non-disabled people of the physical capabilities of physically disabled individuals or challenge traditional perceptions of disability.

Participants also expressed a sense of empathy while further comments focussing on respect were now more genuine and grounded in nature. Participants claimed that these changes had occurred due to their experiences during the intervention, a view supported by the fact that little or no change was observed in the CG, whose opinion remained very much alike after the intervention ceased. Participants’ recollections of their experiences focussed upon the frustrations and physical demands of participating in the reverse-integration style sessions. With the utilisation of a CG it was possible to analyse whether change had occurred exclusively as a result of the lived experiences of IG individuals or if communication between the IG and the CG also might have had an impact on perceptions. Results suggested that no such change occurred and inferred that even if there was communication between IG and CG participants, perceptual change only occurred as a direct response to the lived experiences of the intervention. In essence, change in participants perceptions appeared to be grounded in their embodied experiences.
One issue arose during research however regarding the specific nature of the study. Bourdieu’s concept of capital, qualified by Shilling’s physical capital, proved fitting for the study. Indeed, participant’s pre-intervention perceptions focussed on analysing disabled individuals solely based on their perceived physical capital. However when asked to discuss their relationships and experiences with disabled individuals, participants identified individuals with learning disabilities. The issue of mental disability falls outside the concept of physical capital. Physical disability, in the most part, is visual and had been used by participants as a defining factor toward disabled people when considering physical capital. Learning difficulties however are potentially more invisible and comparatively unnoticed. Disability is not a solely one-dimensional issue; for example, impairments can range from minor visual impairments to paraplegia.

Considering this, it is therefore necessary for future research to question how disability is viewed. For example, individuals view certain culturally defined bodies as possessing higher or lower physical capital value, but it is unclear how this also applies to different impairments. It remains unclear from this study whether society also views certain disabled people as possessing more physical capital than other physically disabled individuals such as wheelchair basketball players. Therefore, further conclusions regarding how non-disabled individuals view disabled athletes may require deeper research.

Nonetheless, results suggest that whilst no disabled individuals were present during the intervention, reverse-integration effectively altered non-disabled individuals’ contextual perceptions of physical disability, as identified by Brasile (1990). This finding implies that reverse-integration methods of delivery can challenge both
participants’ physical ability and the dominant stereotypes of limitation and inferiority, displayed by pupils during this study. Considering this conclusion, the aim of this study was to ascertain whether pupils' perceptions of wheelchair basketball performers could be altered following the completion of the intervention period. Based on the sections above it is possible to see that participant's lived experiences of the intervention were the root cause of perceptual change.

Results imply that further studies are required to provide supporting evidence regarding the ability of similar interventions to alter perceptions. This research may ultimately provide reason for change (Fenwick, 2011).
6: Study Limitations

Following the conclusions of the study, it is important to identify any limitations the study unearthed during its completion. To do this, limitations will be outlined. Once each limitation has been identified, recommendations will be made regarding potential avenues for future research that will reduce such limitations. Again it is important to re-iterate that these limitations relate to the study itself and not the intervention within which this study was conducted.

6.1: Review of Literature: Using Bourdieu’s and Shillings Concepts

This section will discuss the use of Bourdieu’s concepts of field, capital and habitus along with Shillings work on physical capital (see section 2). Whilst Bourdieu’s and Shilling’s concepts were deemed fitting for this study, there are again shortcomings when using these approaches to research.

6.2: The Issues of Race and Gender

Frequently Bourdieu’s concepts are used in studies regarding gender inequality and individuals of varying racial and ethnic backgrounds (Jarvie and Maguire, 1993). Whilst this research utilised both male and female participants, the issue of race and/or gender did not really surface in data collection. This could potentially have been because this study focussed primarily upon perceptions of disability. Additionally, the group observed during the interview were predominantly white, British males and females and therefore ethnicity was not an immediate consideration. It should be recognised however, that different ethnic groups may view disability in different ways. It was considered that regardless of race and/or gender, disability can affect any individual with society and therefore wasn’t
considered a key variable in understanding individuals' perceptions toward disability in this case. Future research however may wish to consider such a variable to add a deeper insight into how individuals, within society, perceive disability.

6.3: Contrasting Theoretical Standpoints

Throughout section four, results identified findings that Bourdieu’s concepts failed to define or account for. Frequently the issue of agency and individuals resisting social stigmas toward physically disabled individuals was discussed. Because of this limitation, it is important to consider alternative theoretical approaches to future research. The aim of this research was to identify perceptual change amongst a group of secondary school aged pupils. Adopting Bourdieu’s theories ensured that the aims of the study were fulfilled, however, important experiences exclusive to certain individuals may have been missed due to the focus of Bourdieu’s work on individual’s experiences as contoured by the social context (Jarvie and Maguire, 1994). Consequently, experiences were aggregated across the participant group to enable general trends to emerge. For example, results suggested that frustration was a key behaviour that many participants exhibited during the intervention. However, due to the format of observations it could be that single individuals exhibiting opposing behaviours, i.e. boredom, may have been over-looked because only one participant exhibited it. With this then comes the need to consider a different theoretical standpoint to allow for such agency behaviours. Whilst Bourdieu would follow a post-structural sociological standpoint, utilising a post-modernist approach to research would enable the researcher to delve deeper into the experiences of the individual (Fox, 1994), consequently highlighting potentially more personal and unique results.
Similarly, if future research aims to identify trends amongst large sample groups, Bourdieu’s theories may well prove helpful. However, many of the findings discussed throughout this research contain elements of emotion to them, i.e. how participants formed their pre-intervention perceptions, based on their interactions with friends and family members. Bourdieu suggests his theories of habitus and symbolic violence to explain such a process and this proved key to the structure of the study. Future research however could consider utilising Norbert Elias’ concepts in his Figurational sociology (1982) or Michel Foucault’s concepts of the panopticon and discipline (1977) to provide a different perspective to understanding how such perceptions of disability sport are produced, reproduced and changed during the sessions.

6.4: Methodological Limitations

Participants, throughout guided group interviews, expressed how their experiences of the intervention were key to their perceptual changes. This study was conducted within a small, specific, sample group, and fulfilled the aims of the study. However further study, with a greater number of participants might offer further insights into pre-intervention perceptions. It is key to recognise that findings are contextually limited to the lived experiences of the age group and participants involved in the study. Potentially any variance in study context i.e. age group or location may have had a profound effect on the eventual findings of the study. For example, Bourdieu suggested that different social groups attributed different capital values to the culturally defined body. Similarly, analysing a wider sample group may provide interesting differences between how individuals from different locations viewed disability and disability sport.
Considering this then, future research should emphasise the need for a larger sample size with a potential to analyse participants from varying locations/schools. With this kind of change, participant perceptions prior to the intervention may vary and additionally a study analysing the effect the intervention had on participants’ of varying may also expose a variety of findings and lead to wider conclusions being drawn.

6.5: The Longevity of Change

Participants claimed their perceptions toward disability had been altered following the completion of the intervention. However, these perceptual changes were still recent and at the forefront of participant’s minds. As discussed throughout section 2.4, an individual’s habitus’ is continually changing based on the influences it receives and encounters within a social field.

With this in mind, the longevity of participants’ perceptual changes may be based on the altered field of the PE lesson. Despite the changes to the PE environment due to nature of the intervention, upon completion of the sessions, participants will be exposed to the same environment; an environment in which negative stigmas toward physically disabled individuals were reproduced. This suggests that by re-entering this environment a habitual shift back to previous perceptions may occur. Considering this, a longitudinal study scaling a matter of years or throughout participant’s school life, could viably ascertain whether the perceptual changes identified during this study were only temporal.
6.6: The Specific Nature of Perceptual Change

The brevity of the intervention, whilst proving a driver of perceptual change, does however create questions regarding the durability of this change. As stated above, the longevity of change is an issue already highlighted. The specific nature of the intervention also proposes some issues. The experiences and perceptual change of participants are solely based on wheelchair basketball, not disability sport as a whole. With this comes the obligation, as the researcher, to note that a limitation of these perceptual changes can only be associated to the participants perceptions of wheelchair basketball players and not, for example, blind runners/amputees. Participants’ experiences and the nature of the intervention only allow for assumptions and conclusions to be made regarding wheelchair basketball and altered perceptions of wheelchair basketball players. As discussed throughout section 2, it was noted that participants, pre-intervention, group disabled individuals into one subordinate group. Following the intervention, whilst they noted perceptual change with regard wheelchair basketball players, there is a need for research to be conducted ascertaining whether this perceptual change related to other physical disabilities or remained focussed on wheelchair basketball.

Considering this, future studies may wish to utilise interventions that use a variety of disability sports as this could provide different findings relating to scope of perceptual change.

6.7: The Absence of Disabled Participants

Due to the intervention being organised and run by the Lincolnshire County Sports Partnership, the sample group analysed was chosen by them and did not contain
any disabled individuals. This omission was circumstantial, and the school was selected completely at random due to the schedule of research and the wheelchair sports project. However, whilst results provided important data regarding the experiences of non-disabled individuals throughout the intervention, results may have held more gravitas if non-disabled participants’ experiences of interacting with a disabled individuals within the sporting field simultaneously had been investigated.

Future research could potentially follow a case-study design and focus upon disabled individuals’ experiences during a reverse-integration intervention.

6.8: The Comparison Group

The comparison group was used to provide comparable data to ascertain if perceptual change had occurred due to the lived experiences of the participants participating in the intervention rather than wider social sources. Whilst the CG did provide important and supportive results, they were not observed during their normal PE sessions. This was due to the unfortunate timetabling imposed by the school in which both sessions ran at the same time. Because of this, the IG sessions were identified as being the most important to observe in order to fulfil the aims of the study.

Because of this, no real analysis of the CG’s experiences during the intervention period was completed. Observing the comparison group could have provided data concerning that highlighted how participants’ PE lessons had produced such perceptions and ensured that their PE had in no way focussed on disability at any point.
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10 October 2011

Dear Ethics Committee

Re: Jonathan Bright - Wheelchair Basketball Study at

I am fully aware and delighted to support the above student with the carrying out of his research, on behalf of the University of Lincoln and the Lincolnshire County Sports Partnership, into the behaviour of students participating in the ‘Wheelchair Basketball’ Project at

Yours faithfully

M P Keenage
Headteacher
Dear Parent/Guardian,

I am a researcher from the University of Lincoln and I am writing to you to ask if you would allow your son/daughter to take part in a study I am undertaking.

This study is due to begin on December 1st and will evaluate a disability sport intervention that has been set up and funded by the Lincolnshire County Sports Partnership. This short letter will detail exactly what the study is about and detail the process your son/daughter may be involved in.

The Study

The suggested study intends to observe and evaluate an intervention implemented by the Lincolnshire County Sports Partnership (LCSP). This intervention aims to increase awareness and alter perceptions often related to disability sport.

The LCSP intends to deliver a number of wheelchairs to your son/daughters school to be used during P.E. lessons. The proposed project I will undertake will aim to assess how they adapt to being in these new surroundings and how social interaction alters during and after their lessons.

If you agree to your son/daughter being a part of this research there a few requirements I will be asking of them. Before you agree or disagree to give consent, please read the following section relating to the study.

Your son/daughter Role

Before reading below, remember this is only a proposal and if you feel you wouldn’t like your son/daughter to participate, please just return the attached form and tick the withdraw box on the consent form

If you agree to your son/daughter taking part in this study he/she may be asked to complete three things.

1. Prior to the commencement of the project, your son/daughter may be asked to partake in a guided group interview.

   If selected, during this group interview, he/she will discuss:

   - Their perceptions of disability sport before they took part in the sessions
2. You son/daughter will be required to attend their P.E. lessons for 12 weeks while the project is running. During these sessions I will observe and make field notes of a group during the wheelchair basketball session. These field notes will contain no personal information but will detail how participants interact during the session in the chairs.

3. Once all the sessions have been completed, if previously selected, your son/daughter will once again be asked to partake in a guided group interview.

   During this interview he/she will discuss
   - Their experiences during the sessions.

Your son/daughter may not be participating in the wheelchair basketball sessions but will still be interviewed prior to and following the 12-weeks. This will provide me with information to see if there is any difference between those who took part and those who didn’t. This entire process is a voluntary one and if you or your son/daughter would not like to participate in the proposed study there will be no repercussions/penalties from the school or myself.

Risks?

The risks to taking part in this study are minimal. Focus groups will be recorded on a Dictaphone and the use of numbers/codes, instead of names, will ensure protection of your identity. While the topic being discussed may be sensitive, no participant will be required to answer, in other words **they will only talk about what they feel comfortable discussing**. The project has been risk assessed and ethically approved by the LCSP and St Peter and St Pauls.

What happens after the study?

After the project all information collected will be kept private and safely stored at the University of Lincoln. Following the completion of the project, data will be privately stored for one year and then destroyed.

The Next Step

   - If you are happy for your son/daughter to participate in this study could you please complete the attached consent and return to your school PE teacher as soon as possible to confirm you would like to take place.
   - If you DO NOT wish your son/daughter to take part, please complete the attached consent form and return to your school PE teacher as soon as possible to confirm you wish to withdraw from the study.
   - If you would like to have your son/daughters information withdrawn from the study at any point during the study, please contact me (JB) on the phone number/email below and I will ensure that all data, relating to them, will be destroyed.
   - Please be aware, that upon completion of the interview sessions, withdrawal may only be possible for 2 months. This time period has been used as once completed, this data may be used for an academic study and if withdrawn later than two months after collection, may jeopardise the completion of said study

   In addition please can you ask your son/daughter to complete the attached Participant Information Sheet and return with the consent form.

   **Thank you for your time - please ask any questions if you are unsure about anything contained within this brief. In addition, if you would like to withdraw data please contact JB (details below).**

Contact Details

If you require any clarification, have any questions regarding the study or would like to withdraw information, please contact:
Jonathan Bright - Researcher
Tel: 07941687657
Email: jonobright86@gmail.com

If you have any complaints please contact:

Adam Evans - Supervisor
Second Supervisor
Tel: 01522 886352
Email: adevans@lincoln.ac.uk

Lindsay Brown -
Tel: 01522 837090
Email: lbrown@lincoln.ac.uk

If you have any questions or complaints regarding ethical clearance for this study please contact:

Sandy Willmott - Ethics Committee Member
Tel: 01522 886651
Email: swillmott@lincoln.ac.uk
Lincolnshire Sports Partnership (LSP) and the University of Lincoln produce a range of academic material ranging from published Masters by Research Thesis’ to Project Reports for the LSP. With this production comes a need to collect data.

Signing this form gives agreement for the individual named to take part in such a study for the Lincolnshire Sports Partnership and University of Lincoln for the above stated purpose (please see project information sheet).

I hereby consent to Lincolnshire Sports Partnership and University of Lincoln to collect data for the purpose(s) stated above and the possible publication of this research data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (block capitals)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your phone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your email address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and consenting signature of parent/ guardian if you are aged under 18 yrs:
(note, you cannot be featured without this prior consent)

| Address (if different to above): |  |
| Contact telephone details if different from above: |  |
| I have read and understood this form and give my permission for: |  |
| * data collection at St Peter and St Pauls Catholic Grammar School in Lincoln |  |
| * the use of this data in a study conducted via the Lincolnshire County Sports Partnership |  |

Please return this consent form to the interviewer at St Peter & St Pauls.
Appendix F – Participant Assent Form

School of Sport Coaching and Exercise Science

Participant Assent Form

Dear Participant,

I am writing to ask you if you would like to be a part of my study. I would visit some of your PE lessons, and make some very simple notes on what you do. Don't worry you won't be marked and I won't stop you having fun.

Once you've had your lessons I would also like to sit down with you and talk about how you felt when playing sport in the wheelchairs. Some questions may be hard to answer but don't worry, all I ask is that you try your best. Again you won't be marked and if you don't want to chat you don't have to.

Hope that all sounds okay. If you would like to be a part of my study please tick the YES box and sign your name at the bottom. If you don't just tick the NO box and don't worry you won't get into any trouble if you don't want to take part.

Thanks!

Signed: ..........................................................

Date: ............................................................
# Appendix G – Pre-Intervention Interview Transcript

## 1. Attitudes toward disability/disability sport

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have you heard about the Para-Olympics before and if so what type of things do you know? (athletes/how they participate/what it is etc)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do any of you know someone with disabilities? What disability do they have?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How do you feel when you’re around these friends/family?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is your opinion or how do you feel about disability sport?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How does watching disability sport make you feel?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H – Post-Intervention Interview Transcript

### 2. Physical sensation during intervention (only asked to IG)

- How did you feel when you first got into the chair?
- How was playing sport from the chairs? How does it compare with other activities?
- Could you use any other skills you’ve learnt while in the chair elsewhere?
- How did you feel after the sessions?
- How did you feel about being unable to stand/run?
- Do you think you would play wheelchair basketball again?

### 3. Emotions/Group Dynamics (only asked to IG)

- Did being in the chair make you feel uncomfortable?
- Did you find anything particularly good about the experience?
- Did you find anything that wasn’t so good?
- What will you remember about doing wheelchair basketball?

### 4. Positive or Negative Emotion toward disability

- Has this whole experience, of the last 12 weeks, changed the way you see disabled people?
- What do you think about disability sport now?
- Do you think your opinion of disabled sport has changed? If so how?
- What was your overall experience of the last 12 weeks together?
Appendix I – IG Pre-Intervention Data

IG Pre-Intervention

- Experience: 26%
- Lack of Knowledge: 26%
- Inferiority: 3%
- Knowledge: 9%
- Generalisation: 6%
- Limiting: 12%
- Sympathy: 3%
- Respect: 11%
- Unease: 5%
Appendix J – CG Pre-Intervention Data

CG Pre-Intervention

- Experience: 22%
- Lack of Knowledge: 23%
- Inferiority: 5%
- Knowledge: 11%
- Limiting: 15%
- Generalisation: 7%
- Sympathy: 5%
- Respect: 8%
- Unease: 4%
Appendix K – IG Post-Intervention Data

IG Post-Intervention

- Enjoyment: 17%
- Empathy: 36%
- Respect: 28%
- Sympathy: 5%
- Social Interaction: 3%
- Commonality: 11%
Appendix L – IG – Coded Observation Data

Intervention Experiences

- Frustration: 33%
- Unease: 19%
- Physicality: 23%
- Enjoyment: 20%
- Empathy: 3%
- Sympathy: 2%
Appendix M – CG Post- Intervention Data

Post-Intervention Perceptions

- No Change: 82%
- Interest: 14%
- Sympathy: 4%
Appendix N – Extract from Research Log

14-10-11

10:05 Participant stated 'its way to big to play full court, the basllets are too high'  Physicality/ Frustration

4-11-11

9:48 Participant stated; 'its too fucking high' when shooting  Frustration/ Physicality

25-11-11

9:49 Once caught participant stated 'its so hard to move with the ball'  Frustration

Participant demonstrated a clear level of frustration with things like the height of the basket and basic movement of the chair.

Either: Physical capital is being challenged thus causing people to become angered.

or

The readiness of the activity is challenging their ability beyond what they first perceived.

Need to question WHY people become frustrated and WHAT this "frustration" caused with regard their perception.