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Journey in constructing a ‘body of knowledge’

Case studies
3 national case studies for SRSA (Siyadlala, School Sport MPP, Status of women and girls in sport and recreation SA 1994 – 2004)
ACC – Australian Sports Commission (ASOP – 3 African countries)
AFL – 4 provinces in SA (elite and community-based development)
GTZ – baseline in 6 African countries
Coca-Cola Africa Foundation (106 programmes in Africa)
Sappi (Protec programme)
Rössing Foundation (Community transformation – mining towns, Namibia)
JAG Foundation (Mighty Metres Programme)

++ n=28 impact assessments
For whom?
Types of knowledge?
Level of knowledge?
Assumptions, expectations, application?
Semantics – language, terms, concepts, debate, discourse?
Audience – dissemination
Reflection- making sense
- recommendations – action

Stakeholders (global – local)
Multi-national agencies
Corporate sector (SCI/R)
Government sectors
Foundations
NGOs
CBOs
Networks/partners
(funder, implementers, recipient, experts/academics, etc.)
THE KNOWLEDGE GAP

- COMPLEX
- VARIED
- NUANCED

The ANSWERS depend on the QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Causality

- ✔
- ❌
- ❎
M & E + Impact assessment: 3 tier approach

Tier 1
Experiment and innovation: Designed interventions and test new ideas

Tier 2
Focused evaluation: Case studies to establish what works, good practice, learning and improvement

Tier 3
Basic evaluation: Programme evaluation to establish value for money and benchmarking performance
Impact Assessment: Programme Development Cycle
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Figure 2: Concept for Human and Community Development Impact Assessment as part of the Sport Development Assessment Tool (S•Diat)
Knowledge = Deductive reasoning

Quantitative data
(quantities/numbers + quality/norms)
Approach to knowledge production
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KNOWLEDGE

= Compare with reality
Approach to knowledge production

- Begin with observations
- Tie hypotheses together
- More general explanation
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Programme Management & Delivery

Social Impact
## Methodology & Sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Participants</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementers of Programmes/Events</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Representatives</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Leaders &amp; Households)</td>
<td>(Infrastructure &amp; Presentation/Participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case studies*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Triangulation of data (qualitative + quantitative)
PART Model

PART (Participatory Action Research Training) Model
Methodology in action
**Methodology**

- **124 interviews** with national, provincial and cluster coordinators (n=46), school principals or deputy principals (n=38 + 40=78).

- **156 focus groups – 1118 participants** representing a quota sample of educators (n=202), learners (n=842), school sport assistants and cluster coordinators (n=74) and community representatives (n=36).

- **33 case studies** representing a quota sample of school sport assistants attended the centralised training.

- **590 questionnaires/spreadsheets** coaches and school sport assistants.

- **General questionnaires** – 720 coaches & school sport assistants, 1848 secondary school learners and 2233 primary school learners

- **Specific questionnaires (n=3515)** for secondary school learners - A Health-HIV/Aids questionnaire (n=1819) and University of Johannesburg Self-esteem Scale was completed by 1291 sport participants and 405 non-participants (n=1696).
**Reporting:**

Compliance with the programme marketing interventions

- Meetings with parents: 100%
- Letters to parents: 50.0%
- Newsletter: 50.0%
- Events: 50.0%
- Word-of-mouth: 50.0%
- Radio/Television: 50.0%
- Visits to donors to school: 50.0%
- Articles in local newspapers: 0%
- Posters: 0%
- Rössing newspaper: 0%
Compared to Atlantic Junior Secondary School, Festus Igonteb Primary School showed higher percentages in almost all the categories.

- Visit places: 64.0% vs 63.0%
- Improve Science marks: 82.0% vs 64.0%
- Interesting classes: 89.0% vs 74.0%
- Improve English mark: 89.0% vs 85.0%
- Feel good: 98.0% vs 90.0%
- Improve Maths mark: 90.0% vs 84.0%
- Enjoy classes: 90.0% vs 82.0%
- Access to 'good' school: 94.0% vs 73.0%
- Improve total marks: 94.0% vs 80.0%
- Improve understanding: 96.0% vs 91.0%
Participation over time

The graph shows the percentage of participation of boys and girls across different grades. The percentage decreases significantly from Grade 8 to Grade 12 for both genders. The data points are as follows:

- **Boys**:
  - Grade 8: 61%
  - Grade 9: 46%
  - Grade 10: 28%
  - Grade 11: 13%
  - Grade 12: 17%

- **Girls**:
  - Grade 8: 66%
  - Grade 9: 25%
  - Grade 10: 11%
  - Grade 12: 3%

The trend indicates a sharp decline in participation from Grade 8 to Grade 12 for both boys and girls.
## Evidence: Alcohol consumption of sport participants versus non-participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you currently participating in sport?</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Never to sometimes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Sometimes to regularly</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>823</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within: Are you currently participating in sport?</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.20%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within: Are you currently participating in sport?</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.70%</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>25.10%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within: Are you currently participating in sport?</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.50%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rating of impact

- < zero = negative impact (a decrease)
- zero = no change
- 1 - 39% change = low impact
- 40 - 69% change = medium impact
- 70 - 89% change = high impact
- > 90% change = very high impact
Visual ‘evidence’
Bonding Capital
Linking social capital: the catalyst role of the Active Community Club (ACC) in Tshabo (Eastern Cape Province, RSA)
Baseline: Development of operational framework

GTZ – YDF (Youth Development Through Football)
Environmental scan: Situation analysis
ZAMBIA: GTZ-YDF

Ministry of Youth, Sport & Development (Sport for all)

GTZ-YDF

FAZ

Sport in Action

Edu-Sport

Break-through Sport

Embassy

Play soccer

GTZ

4 – 5 proposals and 1 MoU
DONOR(S)

Mission
Vision

Strategy
Outcomes/Aims/
Objectives
Politics
Partners

ACADEMIA
(Evidence)

Mission
Vision

Strategy
Objectives
Politics
Partners

• Practitioners (implementers)
• Recipients
• Context

Impact

Intended consequences

Unintended consequences
Social impact – Project learning

- Capacity building
- Ownership
- Needs/strengths-based
- Community-driver
- Resources (HR)

Reflect → Act (M & E – Outcome Monitoring)

Reciprocity → Responsible and Responsive

(‘Donor deafness’ versus ‘Recipient Manipulation’)

Impact – lessons learnt/good practices – challenges –
RECOMMENDTIONS - strategic planning – policy development, etc.
- WHAT QUESTIONS TO ASK

KNOWLEDGE

(Criteria)

Comprehensive (cover question)

Representative (multi-vocal)

Understandable (different target groups)

Usable (decision making)

Innovative

Reciprocal agency = dependency - independency – interdependency