



• • • • • First Stakeholder Validation Report • • •

INTEGRATION OF NEWLY ARRIVED MIGRANTS THROUGH ORGANISED SPORT – FROM EUROPEAN POLICY TO LOCAL SPORTS CLUB PRACTICE (INAMOS)

PETER EHNOLD | ANDREAS GOHRITZ | HENNING JARCK | TORSTEN SCHLESINGER

First Stakeholder Validation Report

INTEGRATION OF NEWLY ARRIVED MIGRANTS
THROUGH ORGANISED SPORT –
FROM EUROPEAN POLICY TO LOCAL SPORTS
CLUB PRACTICE (INAMOS)

Peter Ehnold

IST-University for Management, Germany

Andreas Gohritz

IST-University for Management, Germany

Henning Jarck

Ruhr-University Bochum, Germany

Torsten Schlesinger

Ruhr-University Bochum, Germany

Contributors:

Alison Doherty, Western University Ontario,
Canada

Karsten Elmose-Østerlund, University of South-
hern Denmark, Denmark

Josef Fahlén, Umea University, Sweden

Bjarne Ibsen, University of Southern Denmark,
Denmark

Mathilde Skov Kristensen, University of Southern
Denmark, Denmark

Siegfried Nagel, University of Bern, Switzerland

Alex Richmond, Victoria University Melbourne,
Australia

Justin Robar, Western University Ontario, Canada

Ørnulf Seippel, Norwegian School of Sports
Sciences, Norway

Cecilia Stenling, Umea University, Sweden

Åse Strandbu, Norwegian School of Sports Scien-
ces, Norway

Tracy Taylor, Victoria University Melbourne, Aus-
tralia

Sarah Vögtli, University of Bern, Switzerland

Photos:

@LSB | Andrea Bowinkelmann

This project has been funded with support from
the European Commission. This publication only
reflects views of the authors, and the Commission
cannot be held responsible for any use which may
be made of the information contained therein.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Aim of the first stakeholder validation

The INAMOS project aims not only to conduct research on sports clubs, but also research for sports clubs. Thus, as a research focused consortium it was necessary to ensure that the research is not only of academic value but also meaningful to practitioners (first stakeholder validation) and transferable into local practices (second stakeholder validation).

Therefore, it is important that the view of the practice is included in the project implementation. Otherwise there could be the danger of getting entangled in irrelevant problems that are of no relevance to practice. That is why, the first stakeholder validation had been included into the INAMOS project. The first stakeholder validation was designed to confront the envisaged research process with potential critique and suggestions for improvement from different stakeholder perspectives (especially sports clubs and sports associations). The process was implemented once the theoretical framework and methodology were defined, before the actual fieldwork started. This was to ensure, that the process is applicable and that the 'right questions' were being asked in order to make the research relevant and meaningful for the practical field.

Preparation of the validation questions

The first stakeholder validation process proceeded in two steps. To this end, the working group was first put together to work out the most important theoretical and methodological questions, in order to find the right questions for the stakeholder validation. So, different meetings with and without the practice partners were held over Zoom due to the Covid-19-Pandemic. In small groups, several structured and unstructured brainstorming sessions and discussions in bigger groups were done. In this way, the advantages of brainstorming could be used to generate a lot of ideas, to identify problems and find possible solutions (Isaksen & Gaulin, 2005; Khan, 2013). As a result, five general subjects were created on the basis of the project's research focus. These subjects were:

- (1) 'Questions about the exploration',
- (2) 'Questions about form and language',
- (3) 'System-related Questions',
- (4) 'Questions about willingness to participate',
- (5) 'General questions'

Under each subject heading, 1-3 questions were developed in order to sharpen the focus for practice and to increase the comprehensibility for participants. The final questions for the stakeholder validation for the first subject 'Questions about the exploration' were:

1. 'How relevant are the research questions from your point of view?'
2. 'Would you amend something to the research questions?'

For the second subject 'Questions about form and language', the following questions were formulated:

1. 'In which format do you prefer to receive the results or conclusions of the project (e.g. brochure, report, presentation, online tools (podcast), etc.)?'
2. 'How important is it for you to receive project related results and information in your own-language?'

The third subject area 'System-related Questions' included the question:

1. 'Would you prefer to receive the results in the form of real life best practice examples or in the form of a general guidance document with information about potential problems/solutions?'

For the fourth subject area 'Questions about willingness to participate' the following three questions arose:

1. 'How relevant is the project for your sports club?'
2. 'How important is the project for other clubs in your country, from your point of view?'
3. 'How interested are you in participating in this project?'

The questions for the last subject area "General questions" were:

1. 'What information/knowledge does your sport club need for integrating newly arrived migrants (NAMS)?'
2. 'Does the project have the right focus and address the relevant challenges/problems regarding the integration of newly arrived migrants?'



○ Addressing the stakeholders via homepage

In a second step, after working out the questions for the first stakeholder validation, it was determined to find an easy-to-understand and easy-to-disseminate format to how the stakeholder validation should be carried out. In order to transport all relevant information of the project quickly and compactly and to uniformly coordinate the transmission in the various countries, a homepage was created. This homepage (inamos.org) had also many other advantages in comparison to an 'usual' questionnaire survey or an interview especially during the Covid-19-Pandemic (Best & Krueger, 2008; Hewson & Laurent, 2008).

At first, a scribble video for the landing page and as a starting point, was produced in a film studio. A Scribble video is one of the most popular explainer video styles where illustrations come from nowhere into the picture or are pushed into the picture. Explainer videos have the advantage that the knowledge of participants rises during a project and that drop out is reduced (Kraemer & Boehrs, 2017). So, the whole complex research project and the research questions were presented in a visual and easily understood manner. The 5 minutes video also guided the participants through the homepage. If the participants needed more information about the project, they were able to download a project manual or to see the whole project team including contact data in the case of questions or uncertainties. After that at the latest, the participants were led to the actual validation.

○ The validation procedure

The participants were guided through the five subjects with the particular questions, but were not forced to answer all questions in order to minimise drop out (Frick et al., 2001; Goeritz, 2006; Hoerger, 2010). To make it more interesting, easier and more diversified for the participants to answer, there was the possibility to publish the answers (Clifford, & Jerit, 2015; Michalak & Szabo, 1998). So, the answers became more the style of a blog, where the participants could answer to other participants and a possible discussion could arise (O' Conner et al., 2008; Wakeford & Cohen, 2008). In addition to the opportunity to answer the questions, the participants had the opportunity to state their name, their country of origin and their club or federation. However, this information was provided on a voluntary basis.

The online validation process was carried out in English from November 05, 2020 to February 28, 2021 via the homepage inamos.org. The link to the homepage and therefore to the validation was sent to voluntary sports clubs (VSCs) and federations in 6 countries (Denmark, Germany, Norway, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland) via our practical partners the European Non-Governmental Sports Organisation (ENGSO), EU Diaspora Council (EUDC), Serbian Cricket Federation (SCF) and our research partners at the universities in the different countries. The link was shared over social media channels (like Facebook, Twitter, etc.), newsletters and private contacts. In total n=22 responses could be generated for the validation. As far as it can be seen, there were returns from all of the 6 countries, but an exact breakdown is not possible due to the voluntary information.

All interviews were evaluated using qualitative content analysis according to Mayring (2015), and especially using the specific technique of structuring content analysis. The aim of the structuring content analysis is to classify each text passage in a category system in order to be able to present and analyse the text material in a compressed and structured form. The main and sub-categories resulted from the five general subjects and the corresponding validation questions. With the help of this deductive approach, the entire text material could be assigned.



○ Feedback of the stakeholders

Questions about the exploration

Concerning the first question ‘How relevant are the research questions from your point of view?’ of the first subject it can be said, that all participants rated the research questions as very relevant, as demonstrated by the following statements:

- “The questions are very relevant from our point of view because they are the key questions we and our member organisations also face in our daily work.” (Respondent 22).
- “The questions are engaging, clear and well aligned with the project’s research foci.” (Respondent 14).
- “I think all the Research questions are relevant, because they try to involve all dealing protagonists.” (Respondent 6).

All participants see the problems and difficulties that the research questions address in their countries and associations or clubs:

- “I think the research questions are very relevant and important for our society, because the integration of migrants in sports clubs is very important.” (Respondent 5).
- “The questions are relevant. My sports club is also working with the integration of migrants.” (Respondent 4).

In relation to the second question ‘Would you amend something to the research questions?’, none of the participants would change the research questions. Nevertheless, some participants made some objections and suggestions. Two participants mentioned that problems from “end-countries” differ from problems that “transit-countries” have:

- “The focus is on the ‘end-countries’ for the NAMs. However, for us and the remaining SE Europe countries, it may be useful to have some research questions relevant to the transit countries.” (Respondent 1).

Another suggestion was to include the intersectional perspective:

- “The suggestion is to include the intersectional perspective where it’s possible. New arrivals are more than just new arrivals, they are a man/women, young/old, have a gender identity and sexual orientation, religion and function (possible disability) and often low socio-economic conditions. And focus on seeing the norms of sport that can counteract integration.” (Respondent 20).

Questions about form and language

With regards to the first question of the second subject ‘In which format do you prefer to receive the results or conclusions of the project (e.g. brochure, report, presentation, online tools (podcast), etc.)?’ the statements differ. Most of the respondents would like to receive a report and / or a brochure including the main results. But beyond this, the suggestions ranged from a presentation or a video to a workshop:

- “I think having it both in an easy-accessible online written format (such as a report) as well as a more layman broad audience content such as a presentation or video, is of benefit. The latter can easily be presented to a broader club member audience without the necessity of reading an in-depth report.” (Respondent 1).

In answer to the second question ‘How important is it for you to receive project related results and information in your own-language?’, the respondents agreed that it is not necessary to get the results in their own-language if the results are available in English.

However, some of the participants mentioned that there would be advantages, if the results were obtained in the respective national language:

- “For further dissemination and implementation, translation into the own language would be good.” (Respondent 20).

System-related Questions

Concerning the system-related question ‘Would you prefer to receive the results in the form of real life best practice examples or in the form of a general guidance document with information about potential problems/solutions?’ the results were ambivalent and inconclusive regarding the question. However, most of the participants communicated that they would like to get both, real life examples on the one hand and general guidance on the other:

- “A bit of both would work for us. There certainly should be some general guidance/principles that would be applicable to various countries, circumstances and issues. However, it would be helpful to see the examples of best practice from other countries and see how we can learn from them.” (Respondent 1).

Another suggestion is to combine both.

- “It would be helpful to include real life good practice examples in a general document about potential problems and solutions.” (Respondent 13).

Questions about willingness to participate

The fourth subject addresses three questions about the project’s relevance for clubs and the willingness to participate in the project. The first question ‘How relevant is the project for your sports club?’ was mostly answered positively.

- “From my point of view, it is very important for my club. From time to time migrants participate in the club life, e.g. training sessions, but we don’t have any plan and/or imagination how to approach them and how fruitful a permanent membership can be for all of us.” (Respondent 11).

Just one participant answered that he does not see a relevance for his sports club, what can be attributed to the focus of the club.

- “Not especially. Hard to get newly arrived involved in Alpine skiing.” (Respondent 17).

Regarding the assessment of relevance for other clubs ‘How important is the project for other clubs in your country, from your point of view?’, all participants agreed that the project would be important for the other clubs in their country. Some of them also see not only an importance for clubs, but also for government:

- “The findings from this project would be beneficial to the sports I am involved in - to disseminate this resource from national, state and to local sport clubs would assist increase understanding and confidence of managers to encourage newly arrived migrants to their club.” (Respondent 13).

In line with this attitude, the respondents showed a positive openness concerning their willingness to participate in this project in the future. So, the participants answered the question ‘How interested are you in participating in this project?’ with yes, and some of them with the note that they are especially interested in the results:

- “We would be happy to participate in this.” (Respondent 9).
- “I could imagine that the project is an interesting experience for my club.” (Respondent 11).

General questions

In the final subject area, some general questions concerning the project were asked. At first the participants were asked ‘What information/knowledge does your sport club need for integrating newly arrived migrants (NAMs)?’ All the answers show that there is a lack of knowledge regarding the procedures and possibilities for the integration of NAMs. Some of the participants would like to know which resources or which programmes are available in their country:

- “Concrete proposals for the implementation and the provision of the necessary resources from the country.” (Respondent 5).

For some participants even the starting point, to get in contact with NAMs, is in need of explanation:

- “What do clubs have to consider concerning bureaucracy, how to address and get in contact (language, culture), what are their needs.” (Respondent 21).

As a result, the responses show a wide range of information that clubs need when working with NAMs. Encouragingly, the answers to the second question, ‘Does the project have the right focus and address the relevant challenges/problems regarding the integration of newly arrived migrants?’, show that the project is on the right track and that all participants think that their questions will be answered and knowledge deficits removed:

- “I think the project has the right focus and addresses to the proper recipients.” (Respondent 5).

Conclusions

The stakeholder validation was included to ensure that the research is relevant and applicable for voluntary sports clubs and sports associations. The feedback shows that the project seems to have the right focus and is well prepared. Important challenges and information deficits the clubs in all different countries have, appear to be covered by the different research questions of the project.

Some comments have also helped to sensitise the project with regards to finer distinctions. It is particularly important to note that newly arrived migrants should not be viewed as a homogeneous group, but rather in a more differentiated manner. ‘Newly arrived migrants’ is a highly agreeable ascription that is suitable as a basic inclusion criterion, but has to be viewed in a more differentiated manner in the study, both theoretically and empirically. Following this, we have sharpened both the theoretical framework and the methodological approach.

In addition, the feedback also draws attention to aspects of integration policy, which are of great importance, but which cannot be addressed in the INAMOS project. In particular, this refers to the fact that transit countries, compared to destination countries, are faced with completely different challenges and problems when accepting and integrating newly arrived migrants. This note is important for further research projects, while the INAMOS project deliberately focuses ‘only’ on target countries.

The feedback also helped to answer the question how the results should be presented and which form and language would be preferred. So, the research process can better cater to the needs of practice. It also seems advisable to give best practice examples in the report and not just a pure science report.



Also, the high willingness to participate is encouraging at this point. On the one hand, it can be assumed that a large number of test subjects can be found and, on the other hand, the answers demonstrate again the high degree of interest in the entire project. The participants see the project as a very important subject and very relevant for sport clubs. This also confirms the correct and useful orientation of the project.

The high and widely expressed need for information shows that clubs are not familiar with solution mechanisms for the problems arising in-practice. Even the very first steps seem to be difficult for some clubs in different countries. The clubs are in need of information and solutions and the project seems to fulfill these demands in the eyes of the participating stakeholders.

In summary, the following conclusions can be derived from the first stakeholder validation, which must be taken into account as a premise for the INAMOS project regarding both empirical field work and preparing dissemination:

- When interpreting the results and the recommendations for action, it should be noted that the focus is placed on sports clubs in target countries.
- Ethnicity and nationality are not to be used as central selection criteria for the 'Newly arrived migrants'.
- Concrete proposals for the implementation of projects and measures for the integration of 'Newly arrived migrants' should be derived from the results.
- When presenting the results, reference should be made to concrete examples from practice.
- In addition to English, essential findings have to be presented in the local language of the participating countries, also.



References

- Best, S. & Krueger, B. (2008). Internet survey design. In *The SAGE handbook of online research methods* (pp. 217-235). SAGE Publications, Ltd, <https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9780857020055>
- Clifford, S., & Jerit, J. (2015). Do attempts to improve respondent attention increase social desirability bias? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 79(3), 790–802. doi: 10.1093/poq/nfv027
- Frick, A., Bächtiger, M. & Reips, U. (2001). Financial incentives, personal information and drop-out in online studies. In U.-D. Reips & M. Bosnjak (Eds.), *Dimensions of internet science* (pp. 209–219). Lengerich, Germany: Pabst.
- Goeritz, A. (2006). Incentives in Web studies: Methodological issues and a review. *International Journal of Internet Science*, 1, 58–70.
- Hewson, C. & Laurent, D. (2008). Research design and tools for internet research. In *The SAGE handbook of online research methods* (pp. 58-78). SAGE Publications, Ltd, <https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9780857020055>
- Hoerger, M. (2010). Participant dropout as a function of survey length in Internet-mediated university studies: Implications for study design and voluntary participation in psychological research. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, And Social Networking*, 13(6), 697-700. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2009.0445
- Isaksen, S. G., & Gaulin, J. P. (2005). A Reexamination of Brainstorming Research: Implications for Research and Practice. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 49(4), 315–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620504900405>
- Khan, I. (2013). Relevance of Brainstorming in an EFL classroom. In *Elixir Soc. Sci.* 54A (2013), 12880-12883.
- Kraemer, A. & Boehrs, S. (2016). How Do Consumers Evaluate Explainer Videos? An Empirical Study on the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Different Explainer Video Formats. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 6, 254-266.
- Mayring, Ph. (2015). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken*. [Qualitative content analysis. Basics and Techniques]. (12th ed.). Weinheim: Beltz
- Michalak, E., & Szabo, A. (1998). Guidelines for Internet research. *European Psychologist*, 3(1), 70–75. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040.3.1.70
- O'Connor, H., Madge, C., Shaw, R. & Wellens, J. (2008). Internet-based interviewing. In *The SAGE handbook of online research methods* (pp. 271-289). SAGE Publications, Ltd, <https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9780857020055>
- Wakeford, N. & Cohen, K. (2008). Fieldnotes in Public: Using Blogs for Resreach. In *The SAGE handbook of online research methods* (pp. 271-289). SAGE Publications, Ltd, <https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9780857020055>

