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Background

- Perception that the sector had grown exponentially since CR’s last report in 2007
- CR updating strategy and priorities for its Sport for Change programme
- At Myles Wickstead/UK Sport meeting in July 2010, the themes of “understanding the nature of our evidence base”, and “reducing fragmentation” emerged
- CR undertook to conduct the research and report back
Methodology and caveats

‘Mapping research’ => “what is research?”

Data collection – reasonable ‘saturation’

– Interviews (12 informants, from a contact list provided by CR)
– Emails from 60 academic/independent researchers, including samples of research completed/in progress
– Academic and grey literature (proactive searches and material received)
– This was a SAMPLE, not a comprehensive and exhaustive cataloguing - coarse rather than fine grained.
Results:
Definitions of research quality

- Collection of baseline data
- Use of thematic experts as well as SfD experts
- Use of *behavioural* as well as self-report indicators (rare)
- Data management (for reanalysis/comparison/longitudinal work)
- Research should be done ‘with’ rather than done ‘to’
- Clarity regarding end use of research
- Aiming to publish in peer reviewed journals
- Good review, and understanding, of previous research
- Carefully validated research tools
Challenges: 1. Strategic

– Difficulty in accessing national level statistics
– Organisations lacking a theory of change – so ‘no effect’ may be due to design of intervention
– Concentrating on what can be measured easily (e.g. self-esteem) to the exclusion of more difficult/resource intensive areas e.g. community cohesion, peacebuilding
– Quality of research being conducted (e.g. How to improve the quality of analysis and reporting of qualitative data)
– Fragmentation/duplication of research initiatives
– Poor dissemination/learning from research
– Little methodological innovation
– Overdependence on ‘Northern’ researchers
Challenges 2: Practical

- Time & expense of translating and validating research instruments & data
- Limited local capacity e.g. Research design, data collection, analysis and report writing skills
- Resistance to research – onerous, wasteful, irrelevant
- Cost of research, in particular when using Northern researchers (why aren’t we using Northern researchers to build capacity?)
Current research emphasis (ISDP)

- 43% Olympicism and Peace (Human Rights and conflict resolution)
- 27% Communication and technology (Media, Social Media)
- 13% Strategic and Organisational Development (Law, Organisational studies, Governance and History)
- 10% Education and Sport for development (Youth, Educational, Development, Pedogogy, Leadership)
- 4% Sociocultural Issues (Culture, Homosexuality, Inclusion, Minorities, Sociology, Psychology, Health)
- 3% Policy (Disabled, Educational, Youth, Regional Studies)
Current research emphasis

164 Academic articles’
103 ‘Grey’ literature
267 Total
Research vs. ‘interest’

N=246 subscribers to www.sportanddev.org
Research gaps

– Childhood obesity
– Components of a good intervention
– Meta-analyses and systematic reviews
– Cost-benefit/value for money/social ROI vs. other interventions
– Few examples beyond individual level of analysis (family/group/community/society)
– Action research and innovative methodologies
– General overlap/duplication/fragmentation
– Lack of evidence-based argumentation
Research gaps

Thematic areas:

– Gender & sport
– Gender based violence and sexual harassment
– Sport and reproductive health
– Economic empowerment and livelihoods
Geographical focus

- Europe, 29.06%
- North America, 24.53%
- Africa, 20.38%
- Asia, 2.64%
- Middle East, 6.04%
- International, 10.19%
- Oceania, 5.28%
- South America, 1.89%
Location of researchers

- Europe, 41%
- USA, 38%
- Africa, 9%
- Canada, 7%
- Caribbean, 2%
- Oceania, 3%
Toolkits

15 SfD specific toolkits identified

Wide variety:

- What is a ‘toolkit’? (Manual/handbook, IT system, set of questionnaires, framework?)
- Expert administered vs. stand alone
- Internet enabled vs. manual
- Covering the entire project cycle (aims, outcomes, M, E, reporting) or just elements
- Primarily knowledge management, or containing embedded tools e.g. Specific questionnaires
- Open source vs. licensed vs. fee based
- Centralised data management
- Qualitative vs. quantitative
- Theme specific or generic
Toolkits

Issues emerging:

– Retention of copyright vs. open source
– Developed collaboratively vs. imposed by funders
– Need for investment in training and support
– Challenge of internet/IT based materials for low income countries
– Evolution – need for mechanisms to incorporate feedback, translations, etc
– Concerns about proliferation of requirements
– More systematic & detailed comparison and decision tree desirable for users?
Issues identified

From a ‘knowledge brokering’ perspective, the issues can be grouped into:

- Problem definition
- Knowledge generation
- Knowledge use
a) Problem definition

- What is the (research) question, and at what level of analysis does it need to be addressed? For whom is it a question? Are there any plans in place to address it? Is there an intention to act on the results?
- Reduce the number of broad brush ‘does sport work’ literature reviews and focus on specific claims
- Be clear what we mean by ‘monitoring’, ‘evaluation’ and ‘research’. Different quality standards apply to each of these, and they have different audiences and functions.
- Reduce duplication by having a research ‘wish lists’, ‘plans’ and ‘in progress’ forum
- Involve end users in research design and problem definition
b) Knowledge generation

– Does capacity to create this knowledge need to be increased?
– What are the most appropriate ways to generate this knowledge? Are we updating and innovating in terms of methodology?
– What constitutes ‘knowledge’, and how can the quality of it be evaluated?
– How can we improve research quality?
– How can we leverage the expertise of thematic experts outside SfD?
– How to make more cost-effective use of researchers from HICS, e.g. Using them to build capacity – research skills & collaborations with LICS
c) Knowledge use

– Does capacity to access and use this knowledge need to be increased?

– What specific activities are needed to translate this knowledge into action?

– Does this knowledge need to be managed in a particular way?

– How will it be shared?
  
  – E.g. Systematic abstracting of research planned, in progress and completed in a centralised repository
  
  – Build capacity to understand and use research findings: consider more engaging methods of communicating research, including action planning around the findings.

  – Budget time and cash for dissemination of research