

## Article

# Participation of Students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) in Extracurricular Activities in Compulsory Education

Macarena Castellary-López <sup>\*ID</sup>, Victoria Figueredo-Canosa <sup>ID</sup>, Juan Rafael Muñoz-Muñoz and Luis Ortiz-Jiménez <sup>\*ID</sup>

Department of Education, Faculty of Education, University of Almeria, 04120 Almeria, Spain

\* Correspondence: mcl142@ual.es (M.C.-L.); lortizj@ual.es (L.O.-J.)

**Abstract:** Within the R + D + I project “Study of the educational response to students with Specific Need of Educational Support hereinafter (SEN) associated with disability”, one of the areas analyzed covers extracurricular and complementary activities and if these meet the needs of students with specific educational support needs. Our objective in this research is to describe and analyze the inclusion of students with SEN associated with disability in the development of extracurricular activities. A total of 1496 teachers from Spain participated in this study, answering a questionnaire prepared ad hoc. The independent variables in the study were sex, type of center (rural or urban) and ownership (public or private). The results showed that the teachers consider that most of the centers allow the participation in extracurricular activities of the students with SEN; in parallel, it was discovered that these centers are not fully equipped to serve students with SEN.

**Keywords:** disability; extracurricular activities; inclusion; teachers



**Citation:** Castellary-López, M.; Figueredo-Canosa, V.; Muñoz-Muñoz, J.R.; Ortiz-Jiménez, L. Participation of Students with Special Educational Needs (SEN) in Extracurricular Activities in Compulsory Education. *Educ. Sci.* **2023**, *13*, 383. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040383>

Academic Editor: James Albright

Received: 4 February 2023

Revised: 13 March 2023

Accepted: 5 April 2023

Published: 11 April 2023



**Copyright:** © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

The educational activities offered and planned within a school center have the purpose of achieving optimal development in the students' abilities. Although it is true that most of the proposals are carried out inside the classroom, sometimes this may not be sufficient to ensure meaningful learning; therefore, due to this demand and in the aforementioned premises, activities different from the ordinary ones take place. This difference is mainly related to the moment in which they are developed, as well as the spaces and resources used, whether material or human, to undertake them. We can differentiate between two types of activities: complementary activities and extracurricular activities. In turn, additional fundamental characteristics of this type of activities are planning, organization, execution and development since both the means and the resources will be extraordinary.

However, these types of activities are not exempt from regulation, whether at national or regional level, as the adequacy of the activities to meet their proposed purposes, as well as control and safety standards, must be guaranteed at all times.

In short, we are talking about educational activities that are carried out outside school hours that, although they are not considered essential for training, make it easier to complete it. It is necessary to take into account some characteristics that define these activities: their voluntary nature, exemption from the process of evaluating different curricular areas or subjects, non-discriminative and non-lucrative character and inclusion in the center's annual education program. We are, therefore, talking about unstructured activities in which, based on active participation, intrinsic motivation is encouraged to allow the student to develop a certain level of self-control [1].

Socially, extracurricular activities are considered to be those that meet the aforementioned requirements and are carried out both inside and outside the school institution. However, it should be noted that this research will focus on analyzing, both in terms of the theoretical framework and the results, the educational support provided by schools and carried out within their facilities.

At the same time, different studies have highlighted the importance of extracurricular activities, associating an adequate performance of the activity with an increase in interpersonal skills, as well as students' aspirations and level of attention [2], academic motivation [3], critical thinking, personal and social maturity [4], quality of life and the center's openness to the community [5], and academic performance [6] and its contribution to the development of emotional intelligence [7]. Likewise, continuous socioeconomic demands make the reconciliation of family and work an almost impossible task [8] and have led in recent years to an exponential growth in participation in extracurricular activities [9]. Therefore, these activities are ideal tools for making the school day compatible with the working day of families and, at the same time, guaranteeing an important complement to training and a beneficial option for the use of free time.

However, making a wide range of extracurricular activities available to students is no guarantee of success in the development of these factors; however, it is necessary to take into account the different motivations that lead students to participate in them. In general, when talking about motivation related to undertaking an activity or challenge, two typologies are established: intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. The first type of motivation is born within the student's own being, i.e., because they like that sport, because they want to improve in some aspect of a certain subject, because they find it fun, etc. [10]. The second type of motivation is caused by the reactions of others with respect to those activities. Many students sign up for classes due to social pressure from their group of friends or because of the "fashion or trend" in different areas; an example of the first option can be dance activities, typical of music education, in which groups of friends attend together, while examples of "fashionable" extracurricular activities can include robotics or chess [11].

With the aim of facilitating the participation of the different sectors of the educational community in the selection, organization, development and evaluation of extracurricular activities, these activities can be planned and developed by different educational agents: personnel assigned to the center, administrations or public entities, private non-profit entities and/or institutions or associations. All educational agents responsible for the design and development of such activities should strive to move towards the inclusion of all students.

Extracurricular activities and students with specific educational support needs (SEN) associated with disabilities.

In the case of students with SEN associated with disability, studies show the existence of environmental, material and attitudinal barriers in the centers that reduce and impair access to and participation in extracurricular activities [12,13]. King et al. [14] establish a multidimensional model that includes eleven factors related to the community environment, the family and the child, which act as determinants of a child's participation in leisure and recreational activities. In relation to the community environment, three major factors relevant to participation stand out:

- a. The supportive physical and institutional environment. This refers to the absence of economic constraints, policy obstacles, or physical barriers in the community and the presence of conveniently located accessible facilities, as well as positive community attitudes regarding inclusion.
- b. Presence of supportive relationships for the child. Refers to social relationships with others that help the child participate in daily activities.
- c. Presence of supportive relationships for parents. Refers to parents' perceptions of informal social support (from friends, relatives, neighbors, etc.) and formal social support (specialized emotional support services, information services, etc.).

In relation to the family, three factors relevant to participation stand out:

- a. Absence of economic and time impacts on the family. This refers to the economic impact of caring for a child with a disability on the day-to-day life of the family.
- b. Demographic variables of family support. Refers to parents' educational level, employment and family income.

- c. Supportive family environment. Refers to the physical, mental and social well-being of the parents, the impact of caring for a child with a disability on the family's social functioning and how the family functions as a unit, e.g., family preference for recreation. Refers to parents' preferences for participating in certain activities as a family unit.

Finally, in relation to the child, 4 factors stand out:

- a. Child's self-perception of their academic and sports competence. Refers to the child's perception of their academic competence, their sports competence and the degree of social acceptance.
- b. Child's physical, cognitive and communicative functions. Refers to the child's ability in all aspects of physical, cognitive, and communicative well-being (i.e., physical function, general health, cognitive function and expressive and receptive language).
- c. Emotional, behavioral and social functioning of the child. Refers to the child's emotional, behavioral and social functioning.
- d. Child's activity preferences. Refers to the child's affinity for specific types of formal and informal activities.

Faced with this reality, it is essential to promote the attendance and optimal performance of all students regardless of personal characteristics and environmental and family variables present in the environment of each one; individualized support that favors access and availability of all existing resources and opportunities in the immediate environment should also be provided [5]. The aim is to increase the availability of extracurricular activities that allow the access and participation of a greater number of diverse students.

In general, educational administrations usually direct economic support to these activities and, more specifically, to programs that pursue:

- a. The development of communicative and cognitive skills. Prioritizing those involving the use of augmentative and alternative communication systems, technical aids for communication, etc.
- b. Support and reinforcement aimed at the consolidation of basic learning in the different educational stages.
- c. Development of personal skills, autonomy, hygiene and basic care. Training programs in the learning of basic tasks, chaining of activities, autonomy in the development of skills for different professional profiles, which make labor insertion possible.
- d. Programs that familiarize the students with the use and application of information and communication technologies.
- e. Socio-affective, emotional and artistic development, as well as fostering creativity and motivation.
- f. Development of artistic and sports skills.
- g. Programs to promote equality between men and women in the educational environment.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Problems and Objectives

Once the object of study was theoretically introduced, we raised a series of questions that we considered unresolved: do these extracurricular and complementary activities really respond to the needs of students with SEN associated with disabilities?; do they facilitate their human development in all areas?; are they designed with these students in mind?; are the spaces and resources adequate?; are there any questions about music?

In short, our objective in this research was to describe and analyze the inclusion of students with SEN associated with disability in the development of extracurricular activities.

The specific objectives pursued were: (a) to know the adequacy of the proposed extracurricular activities to the needs of students with SEN associated with disability; (b) to identify the level of participation of students with SEN associated with disability in the activities; and (c) to verify whether the spaces and resources for these activities meet the necessary requirements for their development.

It was also noted that this work was part of a broader research developed by the research group HUM782 Diversity, Disability and Special Educational Needs of the University of Almeria in the framework of the R&D project: "Evaluation of the response to students with Specific Educational Support Needs associated with disability in compulsory education: Current situation and proposal for improvement" (EDU2016-75574-P).

## 2.2. Method and Materials

To respond to the objectives of the study, a non-experimental quantitative methodological design was used. This methodology was chosen because it was the most appropriate way to respond to the research objectives set out, since it was intended to provide evidence regarding the proposed lines of research [15,16]; a non-experimental methodology was chosen since the study variables could not be deliberately manipulated [15]. The dimensions referred to the proposed extracurricular activities and the perceptions that teachers have regarding the participation of students with SEN associated with disability were observed and analyzed.

The research technique used was a questionnaire survey.

The questionnaire was designed ad hoc within the framework of the R&D project EDU2016-75574-P. The technical characteristics of this questionnaire (Validity and Reliability) were found in the article "Construction of the questionnaire to evaluate the educational response in compulsory education to students with SEN associated with disability" [17]. Several general aspects are highlighted below:

- Likert format with five response options, where 1 is not at all/never/not at all and 5 is completely/always/important.
- Analysis blocks.

Organizational and curricular aspects

Teachers and resources

Inclusive culture

We visited the block used by teachers and resources to collect the questions used in the research questionnaire.

The reliability study of the questionnaire yielded the following data: Cronbach's alpha was 0.962 and the number of elements was 58.

Likewise, taking as a reference the confirmatory factor analysis carried out by means of structural equations [18], it was specified that we include nine elements that support the theoretical structure of the design. The items selected for this study make up the below factors:

- Spaces and resources for attention to diversity (Factor 4; Table 1).
- Extracurricular and complementary activities (Factor 6; Table 2).

**Table 1.** Space and resources factor for the attention to diversity.

Items	Cronbach's Alpha
30. Classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are adequately adapted.	0.832
32. The spatial organization of the center makes it possible to meet the needs of students with disabilities.	0.814
29. The classrooms and facilities used to attend to students with disabilities are conveniently located in the center.	0.794
31. The classrooms where the persons responsible for support work have sufficient resources.	0.691
28. The didactic resources used are adapted to the needs of students with special educational needs.	0.476

**Table 2.** Extracurricular and complementary activities factor.

Items	Cronbach's Alpha
34. The activities (complementary and/or extracurricular) offered by the center are adapted to the needs of students with SEN associated with disabilities.	0.742
35. The center encourages students with SEN associated with disabilities to participate in the extracurricular and complementary activities proposed	0.736
33. The complementary activities organized by the center allow the participation of all students equally, including students with SEN associated with disabilities.	0.729
36. How would you rate the participation of students with SEN associated with disabilities in the extracurricular activities proposed by the center?	0.724

For the questions selected for this study, a reliability index  $\alpha = 0.878$  was obtained (Tables 3 and 4).

**Table 3.** Reliability statistics elements involved.

Cronbach's Alpha	N° of Elements
0.878	9

**Table 4.** Reliability statistics if the element is removed.

Item Involved	Cronbach's Alpha If the Item Is Removed
28. The didactic resources used are adapted to the needs of the students with special educational needs.	0.876
29. The classrooms and facilities used to attend to students with disabilities are conveniently located in the center.	0.870
30. The classrooms and facilities to attend to students with disabilities are suitably adapted.	0.862
31. The classrooms where the persons in charge of support work have sufficient resources.	0.866
32. The spatial organization of the center allows teachers to meet the needs of students with disabilities.	0.860
33. The complementary activities organized by the center allow the participation of all students equally, including students with SEN associated with disability.	0.862
34. The activities (complementary and/or extracurricular) offered by the center are adapted to the needs of students with SEN associated with disability.	0.856
35. From the center, students with SEN associated with disability are encouraged to participate in the extracurricular and complementary activities proposed.	0.866
36. How would you rate the participation of students with SEN associated with disabilities in the extracurricular activities proposed by the center?	0.867

### 2.3. Information Sources

With respect to the participants in the questionnaire, we started by considering as a sample the groups or subgroups of the population selected to study a specific phenomenon; the size of the sample chosen represented an authentic representation of the same, where all

the subjects of the population had the same opportunity to be included in the sample [19]. The selected sample was not intentional since the general questionnaire was provided to all teachers in public and private schools through a web link where the instrument was included. A total of 2396 people responded to the questionnaire. Tables 5–8 describe the sample that responded to the survey.

**Table 5.** Distribution of the sample by genre.

	Frequency	Percentage
Men	864	36
Woman	1532	64

**Table 6.** Distribution of the sample by age range.

Age	Frequency	Percentage
15–25	112	4.6
26–35	416	17.3
36–45	732	30.5
46–55	761	31.7
56–65	375	15.6

**Table 7.** Ownership of the center.

	Frequency	Percentage
Public	1623	66.7
Subsidized	773	32.3

**Table 8.** Scope of the center.

	Frequency	Percentage
Urban	1598	66.7
Rural	798	33.3

For the statistical analysis of the data, the Statistical Package Social Science (SPSS) program, version 24.0, University of Almeria, Almeria, Spain, for Windows was used because of its reliability for the analysis of questionnaire data.

### 3. Discussion of the Results

The discussion of the data will be based on two axes. Firstly, we will deal with the data as a whole. Secondly, we will try to see the possible differences in the answers obtained grouped according to independent variables such as: sex, age, ownership of the center, urban or rural character.

We consider it convenient to make an inference prior to the presentation and discussion of the data obtained. We start from the perspective that teachers are trained and prepared to at least identify the conditions of inclusion; however, another question could be their preparation to address the response. For this reason, the scale was proposed with a central tendency response (3) which, when chosen by the subject, implies “not knowing”, “not being sure”, which is also understandable as having insufficient knowledge. This is significant as we can understand that people can clearly position themselves between answers 1 and 2 (close to disagreement, little, etc.) and 4 and 5, which are precisely on the opposite side (agree, very much). Respondents who answer 3 can be placed closer to 1 and 2 than to 4 and 5 (Table 9).

- (a) Global data
- Factor 4.



**Table 9.** Results on measure: spaces and resources for attention to diversity.

	1	2	3	4	5	Media	Stand Deviation
28. The teaching resources used are adapted to suit the needs of students with special educational needs.	1.7	8.4	31.6	41.9	16.0	3.62	0.910
29. The classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are conveniently located in the center.	4.3	16.9	30.8	34.5	12.7	3.35	1.04
30. The classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are adequately adapted.	6.2	14.2	34.6	31.8	12.9	3.31	1.06
31. The classrooms where the people are responsible for support work have sufficient resources.	7.9	19.8	31.9	30.6	9.1	3.13	1.08
32. The spatial organization of the center makes it possible to meet the needs of students with disabilities.	5.1	14.9	33.8	32.9	12.8	3.34	1.04

Looking at the data referring to factor 4, it can be seen that the mean exceeds the central tendency (3) but without great clarity. This can be understood as meaning that the sample is not inclined to strongly agree with the statements of the questions.

Particularly noteworthy are questions 29, 30, 31 and 32, in which the cumulative percentage of options 1, 2 and 3 exceeds the responses 4 and 5.

Questions 30 and 31 are very direct and ask for information on both the facilities for attending to students and the spaces in which those responsible for their care work. In these cases, the central tendency is high; if we combine the data from answers 2 and 3, we find that the cumulative percentage exceeds 50%. We, therefore, understand that the available spaces are not adequate either for the students or the teachers.

In the same sense, question 32, which covers the organization of the spaces, offers information that must be interpreted as not being adequate for the educational response (accumulated 54% from not agreeing to not knowing).

#### - Factor 6

In reference to the factor (extracurricular and complementary activities), we start from the same postulate as previously and maintain the same criterion for identifying response 3 as not knowing how to respond. We also consider options 4 and 5 as not agreeing (Table 10).

**Table 10.** Results on measure: extracurricular and complementary activities.

	1	2	3	4	5	Media	Stand Deviation
33. The activities organized by the center allow the participation of all students equally, including students with SEN associated with disabilities.	3.0	11.8	21.8	30.5	32.6	3.78	1.11
34. The activities offered are adapted to the needs of students with SEN associated with disabilities.	4.2	17.4	26.8	31.6	19.6	3.45	1.11
35. The center encourages students with SEN associated with disabilities to participate in the extracurricular activities proposed.	2.6	10.1	18.3	29.6	38.9	3.93	1.10
36. How would you rate the participation of students with SEN associated with disabilities in extracurricular activities proposed by the center?	4.4	16.5	27.3	28.3	23.0	3.49	1.14

We can observe how the teachers' vision is oriented towards favoring the presence of these students in the aforementioned activities. We note that 63% of teachers state that the extracurricular activities of the centers allow the participation of all students equally,

including students with SEN associated with disability; however, we should not disregard a high percentage of more than 35% who are against this perspective.

This apparent discrepancy becomes more acute in question 36, when evaluating the participation of students with SEN; here, we see that 48% consider that participation is not high.

In this group of questions, we can see how the percentage answers 4 and 5 is clearly higher than the rest of the options (1, 2 and 3). Thus, we can affirm that there is a general commitment to the participation of students with SEN associated with disability in these activities.

The data show an apparent contradiction since, although the offer, incentive and adequacy of the activities offered to students is valued as positive, it contrasts with the opinion that the center does not have adequate resources and spaces for this group.

All this can be seen in question 30, which considers whether the center's facilities are adequate for these students; the cumulative percentage of options 1, 2 and 3 amounts to 55%. Thus, following the criteria used it can be considered that they do not agree with the question. In question 34 on whether the activities are adapted, the cumulative percentage around answers 4 and 5 is significantly higher. From what we can extract, it is clear that although the centers are not well adapted, an effort is made to organize the activities so that they respond to the needs of the students. In general, we see that although the actions of the educational team in terms of the supply of extracurricular activities are positive, spaces and resources are not.

From this we can see, we reaffirm the results of a past study [10] that explained how the figure of the teacher within the educational system is vital to improving educational inclusion. The teacher's role is not only as a figure with the ability to transmit knowledge or guide the learning of students; rather, teachers also offer the hidden curriculum, which on many occasions guides and marks the personal development of students, since it is an arduous task for the teacher to transmit the idea of inclusion or respect for differences when they really have a different or opposite opinion in this regard.

We should not forget the nature of these extracurricular activities since although they are characterized by their voluntary nature, they are also the tool most commonly used by families to reconcile the workday with the school day. However, these are not conceived as trivial activities; rather, extracurricular activities are conceived as a training complement for students to improve all aspects of their development at multiple levels. At a cognitive level, students can use the wide range of activities in which to learn a new language, while office automation knowledge can reinforce those curricular subjects. At the affective level, the students can share leisure time with other young people who do not belong to their class group and can develop great bonds of friendship; they can also participate in musical activities for the enhancement of emotional development. At the psychomotor level, with the practice of physical-sports activities during the period of development, children and young people can avoid diseases, such as childhood obesity, and develop healthy habits. Finally, at the social level children can develop positive values, such as non-discrimination and respect for differences, companionship, teamwork and equality [20].

(b) Study of the differences in the responses.

The first factor in which we found significant differences refers to the age groups; the direct ages have been grouped into ranges. We applied ANOVA of one factor, yielding the data listed below.

As can be seen (Table 11) in items 29, 30, 32 and 36, the differences are significant between age groups. However, for the rest of the items (28, 31 and 35) there are no differences.

Particularly striking are the differences in questions 29, 32 and 36; Table 12 reviews the descriptions of these questions according to age.



**Table 11.** ANOVA results referring to age ranges.

		F	Sig.
28. The teaching resources used are adapted to the needs of students with special educational needs.	Between groups In groups Total	2.151	0.072
29. The classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are conveniently located in the center.	Between groups In groups Total	4.596	0.001
30. The classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are appropriately adapted.	Between groups In groups Total	3.898	0.004
31. The classrooms where the people responsible for support work have sufficient resources.	Between groups In groups Total	0.941	0.439
32. The spatial organization of the center makes it possible to meet the needs of students with disabilities.	Between groups In groups Total	4.611	0.001
33. The complementary activities organized by the center allow the participation of all students equally, including students with SEN associated with disabilities.	Between groups In groups Total	2.671	0.031
34. The activities (complementary and/or extracurricular) offered by the center are adapted to the needs of students with SEN associated with disabilities.	Between groups In groups Total	2.139	0.074
35. The center encourages students with SEN associated with disabilities to participate in the extracurricular and complementary activities proposed.	Between groups In groups Total	0.619	0.649
36. How would you rate the participation of students with SEN associated with disability in extracurricular activities proposed by the center?	Between groups In groups Total	4.742	0.001

**Table 12.** Results on age factor measures in groups with significant differences.

	Age	Sig.
29. Classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are conveniently located in the center.	15 a 25	4.06
	26 a 35	3.36
	36 a 45	3.36
	46 a 55	3.35
	56 a 65	3.14
	Total	3.33
32. The spatial organization of the center makes it possible to meet the needs of students with disabilities	15 a 25	3.65
	26 a 35	3.45
	36 a 45	3.37
	46 a 55	3.38
	56 a 65	3.13
	Total	3.35
36. How would you rate the participation of students with SEN associated with disability in extracurricular activities proposed by the center?	15 a 25	3.71
	26 a 35	3.34
	36 a 45	3.64
	46 a 55	3.63
	56 a 65	3.55
	Total	3.57

In question 29, we observe how the mean decreases as the age of the respondents increases. For these items, the youngest group appears to be the one that considers the answers to be adequate and that there is a good participation. The oldest group is the most skeptical.

The second study of differences between groups was carried out with regard to the ownership of the center (public vs. private subsidized).

For this case, we used Student's *t*-tests. The data found indicate a possible greater sensitivity in the private subsidized centers (Table 13).

**Table 13.** Comparative averages for public and private subsidized schools.

	t	Sig. (Bilateral)
28. The teaching resources used are adapted to the needs of students with special educational needs.	0.129	0.897
29. Classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are conveniently located in the center.	2.269	0.23
30. The classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are adequately adapted	2.755	0.006
31. The classrooms where the people responsible for support work have sufficient resources.	3.781	0.000
32. The spatial organization of the center makes it possible to meet the needs of students with disabilities.	4.194	0.000
33. The activities organized by the center allow the participation of all students equally, including students with SEN associated with disabilities.	6.121	0.000
34. The activities offered are adapted to the needs of students with SEN associated with disabilities.	5.364	0.000
35. The center encourages students with SEN associated with disabilities to participate in the extracurricular activities proposed.	5.916	0.000
36. How would you rate the participation of students with SEN associated with disabilities in extracurricular activities proposed by the center?	3.474	0.000

We observe that, except for questions 28 and 29, there is a significant difference in the means.

Once again, we resort to descriptive statistics to see how the private subsidized centers show greater significance (Table 14).

**Table 14.** ANOVA referring to age ranges.

	F	Sig.
28. The teaching resources used are adapted to the needs of students with special educational needs.	Public	3.62
	Subsidized	3.63
	Total	3.62
29. Classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are conveniently located in the center.	Public	3.32
	Subsidized	3.42
	Total	3.35
30. Classrooms and facilities for students with disabilities are appropriately adapted.	Public	3.27
	Subsidized	3.40
	Total	3.31
31. The classrooms where the people responsible for support work have sufficient resources.	Public	3.08
	Subsidized	3.25
	Total	3.13
32. The spatial organization of the center makes it possible to meet the needs of students with disabilities.	Public	3.28
	Subsidized	3.47
	Total	3.34
33. The complementary activities organized by the center allow the participation of all students equally, including students with SEN associated with disabilities.	Public	3.69
	Subsidized	3.98
	Total	3.78
34. The activities (complementary and/or extracurricular) offered by the center are adapted to the needs of students with SEN associated with disabilities.	Public	3.37
	Subsidized	3.63
	Total	3.45
35. The center encourages students with SEN associated with disabilities to participate in the extracurricular and complementary activities proposed.	Public	3.83
	Subsidized	4.12
	Total	3.93
36. How would you rate the participation of students with SEN associated with disability in extracurricular activities proposed by the center.	Public	3.44
	Subsidized	3.61
	Total	3.49

As we pointed out, except for questions 28 and 29, statistical differences between both types of centers can be seen.

Of particular note is the differences in questions 33, 34 and 35 (0.30) regarding participation, adaptation and how students with SEN associated with disability are encouraged to participate.

Finally, it should be noted that for the other independent variables considered (sex, degree or urban–rural centers), no significant differences were observed between the groups.

#### 4. Conclusions

The issue of extracurricular activities should not be considered as a tangential or relative aspect given its voluntary nature. On the contrary, it should be placed in the foreground and as a key element when analyzing the level of inclusion at a center and, of course, in a group. For this statement, we started by considering that education in the 6 to 16 years old age group in Spain is compulsory, which is why the centers must respond to the real and legal needs of children. Therefore, given the inclusive nature of the different education laws in force, the actions must be framed within the same. However, extracurricular activities are of a voluntary nature and, thus, would not have the same level of regulation and commitment, hence the data obtained and their interpretation. Thus, these activities provide a real marker of the level of inclusive culture and practices.

In response to the objectives set, we found that although the centers encourage and offer activities to all students, the means and resources are not fully available or appropriate. This is why we can consider that although the culture and practices of the teaching staff do aim to promote affective inclusion, it is not always possible for centers to meet this goal given the means and resources available to them.

Therefore, there is not a high level of participation in the activities; however, according to the data and the theoretical review carried out, this finding can be explained by the fact that the great majority of students with disabilities participate in activities organized by the groups or institutions that group them together, such as associations of people with Down's syndrome, cerebral palsy, etc.. At the same time, it can be observed that artistic education, specifically that related to musical practice, is more developed in specific centers, such as music schools. All this suggests that collaboration and coordination between specific spaces where extracurricular activities are carried out and educational centers should be greater to achieve greater participation and encourage truly inclusive learning practices.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, L.O.-J. and M.C.-L.; methodology, L.O.-J.; validation, L.O.-J., M.C.-L. and V.F.-C.; formal analysis, L.O.-J.; investigation, L.O.-J., M.C.-L., V.F.-C. and J.R.M.-M.; writing—original draft preparation, L.O.-J., V.F.-C. and J.R.M.-M.; writing—review and editing, M.C.-L.; supervision, L.O.-J.; project administration, L.O.-J. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research is funded by the R + D + I project of the national call of the Spanish government EDU2016-75574-P. "Study on the educational response to students with Specific Needs of Educational Support associated with Disability".

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Institutional Review Board (or Bioethics Committee) of the University of Almeria (Ref. UALBIO 2019/039), that it is demanded for de research EDU2016-75574-P.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** Research data are currently available on the website, while the ministerial repository publishes the research data.

**Acknowledgments:** We would like to thank the teachers of the participating schools for their disinterested collaboration in this study in order to obtain the data.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. Morillo Hurtado, C.S.; Cajiao Narváez, S.M.; Sandoval Jaramillo, M.L. La Recreación en los adolescentes. Su importancia en el desarrollo biopsicosocial: Una aproximación teórica–descriptiva. *Explor. Digit.* **2021**, *5*, 110–125. [[CrossRef](#)]
2. Franco, J.P.; Rodríguez, I.; Martínez, M. ¿Qué hacen los estudiantes de Educación Primaria españoles fuera del horario académico? Actividades extraescolares. *Rev. Complut. Educ.* **2022**, *33*, 459–475. [[CrossRef](#)]
3. Holloway, J. Extracurricular activities and student motivation. *Educ. Leadersh.* **2002**, *60*, 80–83.
4. Bauer, K.W.; Liang, Q. The effect of personality and precollege characteristics on first-year activities and academic performance. *J. Coll. Stud. Dev.* **2003**, *44*, 277–290. [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Ruiz, B.; Gómez, M.; Fernández, R.; Badia, M. Influencia de la calidad de vida, la participación y la resiliencia en el desarrollo de alumnos de educación primaria. *Rev. Esp. Discapac.* **2017**, *5*, 111–128.
6. Cladellas, R.; Clariana, M.; Badia, M.; Gotzens, C. Actividades extraescolares y rendimiento académico en alumnos de primaria. *Eur. J. Investig. Health Psychol. Educ.* **2013**, *3*, 87–97. [[CrossRef](#)]
7. Calero, A.D. Actividades extraescolares durante la adolescencia: Características que facilitan las experiencias óptimas. *Psicoperspectivas* **2016**, *15*, 102–109. [[CrossRef](#)]
8. Ortiz Castelló, V.; Urraco Solanilla, M. Conciliación familiar y rendimiento escolar: Una mirada sistémica a las condiciones del mercado de trabajo. *Zerb. Gizarte Zerb. Aldizka.* **2002**, *76*, 59–74. [[CrossRef](#)]
9. Argüelles, I. Análisis de las Actividades Extraescolares en Función de la Variable Género en el Alumnado de Primaria de la Provincia de Granada. Ph.D. Thesis, Universidad de Granada, Granada, Spain, 2015.
10. Ortiz, L. *Atención Socioeducativa a Personas con Discapacidad*, 1st ed.; Octaedro: Barcelona, Spain, 2018.
11. Argüelles Calero, I.; Campos Sánchez, A.; López Núñez, J.A. Análisis de las actividades extraescolares en función de la variable género en el alumnado de primaria de la provincia de Granada. *Eur. Sci. J.* **2015**, *11*, 480–498.
12. Steinhardt, F.; Ullenhag, A.; Jahnsen, R.; Dolva, A.S. Perceived facilitators and barriers for participation in leisure activities in children with disabilities: Perspectives of children, parents and professionals. *Scand. J. Occup. Ther.* **2021**, *28*, 121–135. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
13. Badia, M.; Verdugo, M.A.; Ullán, A.M.; Martínez, M.M. Personal factors and perceived barriers to participation in leisure activities for young and adults with developmental disabilities. *Res. Dev. Disabil.* **2011**, *32*, 2055–2063. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
14. King, G.; Law, M.; King, S.; Rosenbaum, P.; Kertoy, M.K.; Young, N.L. Un modelo conceptual de los factores que afectan a la participación en las actividades de ocio y recreo de los niños con discapacidades. *Siglos Cero* **2009**, *40*, 5–29.
15. Campoy, T.J. *Metodología de la Investigación Científica: Manual para la Elaboración de Tesis y Trabajos de Investigación*, 1st ed.; Marben Editora y Grafica: Asunción, Paraguay, 2016.
16. MacMillan, H.; Shumacher, S. *Investigación Educativa*, 1st ed.; Pearson: Madrid, Spain, 2012.
17. Fernández-Archilla, J.A.; Álvarez, J.E.; Aguilar Parra, J.M.; Trigueros, R.; Alonso López, I.D.; Echeita, G. Validation of the Index for Inclusion Questionnaire for Compulsory Secondary Education Students. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 2169. [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Ortiz-Jiménez, L.; Carrión-Martínez, J.J. *Respuesta Educativa al Alumnado con Necesidad Específica de Apoyo Educativo Asociada a Discapacidad en Educación Obligatoria*, 1st ed.; Graó: Barcelona, Spain, 2021; pp. 45–56.
19. Echevarría, B. *Estadística Aplicada a las Ciencias Humanas*, 1st ed.; Daimon: Ciudad de Mexico, Mexico, 1982.
20. Fernández-Gavira, J.; Jiménez-Sánchez, M.B.; Fernández-Truan, J.C. Deporte e Inclusión Social: Aplicación del Programa de Responsabilidad Personal y Social en adolescentes. *Rev. Humanid.* **2018**, *34*, 39–58. [[CrossRef](#)]

**Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.