

National Evaluation of the Special Olympics Unified Sports Program

Appendix A

Table 1: Participant Demographics—State

Table 2: Participant Demographics: Athletes and Partners

Table 3: Athlete/Partner-identified Positive Aspects of Unified Sports

Table 4: Participant Demographics: Family Members

Table 5: Family Table 1: Participant Demographics—State Member's Perception of Athlete Improvement in Select Areas

Table 6: Aspects of Unified Sports that Families Liked Most

Table 7: Aspects of Unified Sports that Families Liked Least

Table 8: Participant Demographics: Coaches

Table 9: Family Member's and Coaches General Priorities for Athletes

Table 10: Coach-identified Problem Areas

Table 11: Family Member's and Coaches Competition Priorities for Athletes

Table 12A: Coaches: Do you feel that it is sometimes necessary to make rule modifications?

Table 12B: Coach-identified Reasons for Rule Modifications

Table 1: Participant Demographics--State

	Athletes	Partners	Family	Coaches
AL	23	6	13	0
AR	2	0	2	1
CA	5	1	6	6
CO	25	44	24	20
CT	4	16	6	2
IL	0	2	0	0
IN	5	10	10	0
KY	1	1	0	0
MA	7	6	1	2
NE	2	0	1	0
NH	7	13	3	0
NV	2	1	2	0
OH	7	8	2	1
RI	10	11	3	5
TX	7	2	3	7
UT	19	11	10	1
VA	0	0	0	11
VT	0	0	1	0
WI	2	4	0	0
WV	4	6	0	1
Missing	2	0	1	0
Total	134	145	89	60

Table 2: Participant Demographics: Athletes and Partners

	Athletes	Partners
Total respondents	134	145
Mean Age	31	30
Age Range	10-59	7-79
Gender	35% F / 65% M	42% F / 58% M
Mean # of Sports Played	2.37	2.39

Table 3: Athlete/Partner-identified Positive Aspects of Unified Sports

Aspects that participants identified as positive:	Athletes (239)*	Partners (315)*
Specific sport (e.g. soccer, softball, golf, etc.)	14.%	4%
Exercise/ Opportunity to practice skills	10%	5%
Fun	19%	15%
Competition (e.g. games, tournaments, challenging etc.)	12%	12%
Social Aspects (e.g. being with team, camaraderie, etc.)	37%	43%
Helping others (e.g. teaching athletes etc.)	1%	18%
Organization (e.g. well-organized tournaments, facilities etc.)	0	2%
Getting medals and awards	4%	0
Travel / going to tournaments	3%	1%
Total:	100%	100%

*Total number of participant responses

Table 4: Participant Demographics: Family Members

	Family Members
Total respondents	89
Mean Age of respondents	52
Age Range of respondents	21-84
Mean Years in Unified Sports	5.86
Mean Age of Athlete	25
# of F.M. as Partners	43%
# of F.M. as Coaches	25%
# of F.M. as Volunteers	31%

Table 5: Family Member's Perception of Athlete Improvement in Select Areas

	No Improvement	Clear Improvement
Physical Abilities (Sport-specific skills)	15%	85%
Self-esteem / Self-confidence	18%	82%
Health	47%	53%
Adaptive Behaviors	30%	70%
Relationships with fellow athletes	18%	82%
Relationships with partners	27%	73%
Relationships with peers at school/work	27%	72.0%
Relationships with family members	30%	70%
Relationships with other adults (e.g. coaches, teachers, neighbors etc.)	24%	76%

Table 6: Aspects of Unified Sports that Families Liked Most

Aspects that family members liked most:	Percentage (88)*
Social aspects (e.g. friendship, team spirit, etc.)	50%
Educational aspects (e.g. teaches tolerance, social skills etc.)	11%
Competition/Events	9%
Fun	9%
Assistance from staff/volunteers	7%
Exercise/Training/Skills development	5%
Specific sports (e.g. golf, bowling, softball etc.)	5%
Opportunity to travel	4%
Total:	100%

* Total number of participant responses

Table 7: Aspects of Unified Sports that Families Liked Least

Aspects that family members liked least:	Percentage (70)*
Lack of dedicated/knowledgeable volunteers and/or partners	24%
Partner dominance	19%
Nothing	16%
Lack of resources (e.g. money, facilities, etc.)	14%
Lack of communication or leadership from area/state level staff	10%
Not enough opportunities for competition	9%
Rule modifications	6%
Partners taking athlete slots on teams or at tournaments	1%
Politics	1%
Total:	100%

* Total number of participant responses

Table 8: Participant Demographics: Coaches

	Coaches
Total respondents	60
Mean # of Sports Coached	2.8
Mean Years Coaching in Unified	6.3
Coaches whom also coach Trad. SO	92%
Mean Years Coaching Trad. SO	10.1
# of Coaches who are also Family	58%

Table 9: Family Member's and Coaches General Priorities for Athletes

	Family Percentage	Coaches Percentage
Improved Sports Skills	15%	17%
Improved Self-esteem and Self-confidence	41%	51%
Improved Health	8%	11%
Improved Adaptive Behavior	18%	10%
Improved Friendship	18%	11%
Total:	100%	100%

Table 10: Coach-identified Problem Areas*

Problem Areas	No Problem	Problem
Scheduling practices & games	60%	40%
Athlete attendance at practices & games	44%	56%
Partner attendance at practices & games	52%	47%
Communication with athlete's families	73%	27%
Communication with partner's families	84%	16%
Accessible facilities	58%	42%
Appropriate equipment and materials	63%	37%
Obtaining support/help (volunteers)	69%	31%
Matching age and ability of partners and athletes	61%	39%
Transportation to and from practices & games	41%	59%
Recruiting appropriate athletes	71%	29%
Recruiting appropriate partners	41%	59%
Domination by athletes	93%	7%
Domination by partners	79%	21%

* Percentages do not always equal 100% because of missing data.

Table 11: Family Member's and Coaches Competition Priorities for Athletes

	Coaches Percentage	Family Percentage
Winning	0%	2%
Teamwork	22%	13%
Sportsmanship	19%	21%
Personal Best	10%	17%
Team Best	7%	5%
Fun	32%	21%
Camaraderie	10%	21%
Total:	100%	100%

Table 12A: Coaches: Do you feel that it is sometimes necessary to make rule modifications?

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	34	57%
No	25	43%
Total:	59	100%
missing	1	
Total:	60	

Table 12B: Coach-identified Reasons for Rule Modifications
(Coaches who answered yes in the previous table)

	Frequency	Percentage
Partner dominance	12	35%
Athlete safety	22	65%
To increase opportunity for athlete participation	24	70.0%
To accommodate an athlete's or partner's skills	17	50%
Recommended by the local or area program staff	2	6%
Other: Coaches wanting to win	1	3%
If the partner/athlete ability are matched correctly the coach shouldn't need to make modifications	1	3%
To encourage athletes to participate in local events	1	3%
# of coaches who cited 2 or more reasons for rule modifications	26	76%