Mapping Sport for Development and Peace as Bourdieu's Field

Authors' contribution:
A) conception and design of the study
B) acquisition of data
C) analysis and interpretation of data
D) manuscript preparation
E) obtaining funding

Mariann Bardocz-Bencsik[A-E], Tamas Doczi[A,C,D]

University of Physical Education, Budapest, Hungary

ABSTRACT

Over the past two decades, there has been a growing interest in the use of sport and other forms of physical activity to reach development goals and to support peace-building and peace-keeping processes. The sport for development and peace (SDP) sector is continuously growing in terms of the types of stakeholders involved and the number of projects implemented.

This paper examines the SDP sector using Bourdieu's field theory and his concept of habitus and capital. For this, a qualitative analysis of semi-structured interviews with 10 people involved in SDP was used. Their perception of the stakeholders in the field and the connections between them are analyzed through the lens of field theory. The analysis particularly focuses on the perceived role of the former United Nations Office of Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP), which was closed during the data analysis.

KEYWORDS | sport for development and peace, field theory, capital, habitus, UNOSDP

Introduction

Over the past two decades, there has been a growing interest in the use of sport and other forms of physical activity to reach development goals and to support peace-building and peace-keeping processes. The movement is often referred to as "sport for development," "sport and development," or "sport for development and peace" (SDP). In this paper, the latter expression is used. It is defined as "the intentional use of sport, physical activity and play to attain specific development and peace objectives, including, most notably, the Millennium Development Goals and, since 2015, the Sustainable Development Goals.

An emblematic step in the development of the SDP movement was Nelson Mandela's powerful speech at the Laureus World Sports Awards in 2000. The former South African president and Nobel Peace Prize winner stated that "Sport has the power to change the world. It has the power to inspire. It has the power to unite people in a way that little else does. It speaks to youth in a language they understand. Sport can create hope where once there was only despair. It is more powerful than government in breaking down racial barriers."

Mandela's thoughts are frequently quoted by SDP practitioners, mostly when seeking the recognition of sport's contribution to social change and, in practical terms, when applying for funding. These practitioners are numerous, as SDP is a constantly growing and developing movement. It includes local, regional, national, and international organizations, encompassing governments, civil society, and the private sector. Independent

individuals, such as high-level athletes, are also involved. On the International Platform on Sport and Development, *sportanddev.org*, a social website dedicated to the field of SDP, 975 organizations and 8,704 individuals were registered as of May 1, 2018.

Despite, or complementary to, Mandela's powerful statement, it is important to note that sport is not a priori good or bad. It can have positive and negative outcomes. Therefore, it is necessary to examine what circumstances are needed for sport to make a positive contribution to social change (Sugden, 2010).

As a result of that need, research interest in SDP has been growing parallel to practice. Since the first International Conference on Sport and Development in 2003, a growing number of events – conferences, forums, debates, and workshops – have been organized on the topic each year. Recognized researchers are among the speakers, as well as policy-makers and practitioners. Although academic interest in SDP has been continuously growing, research findings have yet to contribute to fieldwork, and the field is undertheorized (Schnitzer, Stephenson Jr., Zanotti, & Stivachtis, 2013). The majority of research is done through case studies. They vary in their focus (e.g., women's empowerment through sport, sport for people with disabilities, sport and disease prevention) and also in their geographical location and scope (local, regional, national, etc.). Research is mostly conducted at the community level, using qualitative approaches (Schulenkorf, Sherry, & Rowe, 2016). This paper focuses on the macro-level of SDP: using Bourdieu's field theory, it attempts to map the SDP field through the analysis of interviews with people involved in SDP.

This paper draws on the identification of the SDP sector as a Bourdieusian field. Drawing on this theory, the paper examines the types of stakeholders in SDP, focuses on the connections and lack of connections between them, and aims to understand the perceived role of the UNOSDP among these stakeholders.

The use of Bourdieu's theory permits us to examine the collected data through the lens of a recognized theory and describe reality (Skille, 2016). In line with its objectives, the paper will first provide a description of the theory of fields, then present the institutional and policy context of the research.

Theoretical framework

For twentieth-century French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu,

> *"a field is a field of forces within which the agents occupy positions that statistically determine the positions they take with respect to the field, these position-takings being aimed either at conserving or transforming the structure of relations of forces that is constitutive of the field"* (Bourdieu, 2005, p. 39).

His field of forces is an abstraction, and it refers to a site in which power operates within certain boundaries. Agents can be individuals or institutions that occupy positions in the field. The position-takings mean that the agents choose a position from which they play. Whether the agents aim to conserve or transform the structure of the relations of forces depends on whether the current situation suits their interest. They compete to reshape the field, so it suits their interest the most to make their position the dominant one (Webb, 2012).

A field is relatively autonomous in relation to other fields in a social space. It is a part of the rest of society but, on the other hand, it is also its own world. In the field, the agents struggle for the different forms of capital that constitute that field. Capital is

> *"accumulated labour (in its materialised form or its embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, i.e., exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labour"* (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 241).

The general forms of capital are economic, social, and cultural, and there is so-called field-specific capital as well. A precondition for the field is that agents agree on the value of the field-specific capital and see it as worth

struggling for. The structure of a field is based on a fifth form – distribution capital – which is based on the results of former struggles and which directs future struggles (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 73-74).

To understand the actions of agents in the field, we introduce Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and doxa: "Habitus is not only a structuring structure, which organizes practices and the perception of practices, but also a structured structure" (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 170). Habitus depends on various factors, such as the individual agent's social class, education, and past choices. Doxa is another structuring principle in the field, which is "the universe of the tacit presuppositions that we accept as the natives of a certain society" (Bourdieu, 2005, p. 37), basically a set of rules. Not all agents agree on these rules at all times, and some attempt to change these rules for their own benefit.

Bourdieu's field theory has been used by scholars to describe the sporting field (Bourdieu, 1978; Tomlinson, 2004; Skille, 2016), and there has been some research done on sport – and SDP – using the concept of social capital (Coalter, 2007; Skinner, Zakus, & Cowell, 2008), yet the SDP movement has not yet been analyzed as a Bourdieusian field. In an attempt to fill this gap, and also in response to the call for more theory in SDP research, we use the field theory to define the SDP field.

Drawing on this theory, this paper
1) examines the types of stakeholders in SDP, a topic that has been studied in depth by Giulianotti (2011a) and Levermore and Beacom (2012);
2) focuses on the connections and missing connections between these stakeholders, as did a number of researchers, such as Burnett (2015), Cornelissen (2011), Giulianotti (2011b), and Keim (2012); and
3) aims to understand the perceived role of the UNOSDP among the stakeholders of SDP.

The history of sport for development and peace: International policy context and institutionalization in the field

The common history of the sport and development sectors goes back to 1922, when a UN body, the International Labour Organization, and a sport-governing body, the International Olympic Committee, signed a partnership agreement. After decades of further similar agreements signed and symbolic gestures taken, in 1993 the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) accepted the 48/11 Resolution about the Olympic Truce. This resolution encouraged UN member states "to observe the Olympic Truce from the seventh day before the opening and the seventh day following the closing of each of the Olympic Games" (UNGA, 1993, p. 1). Based on another UNGA resolution, 1994 was declared to be the International Year of Sport and the Olympic Ideal. In a historic coincidence, in the 1994 Winter Olympic Games in Lillehammer, Norway, a home favorite speed-skater, Johann Koss, won three gold medals and became world-famous. Acting upon his fame, after the Games he established Olympic Aid, the predecessor of one of the biggest and most well-known SDP organizations, Right To Play. With these two significant events taking place in 1994, we consider this to be the time when the SDP field was formed, when interested organizations and individuals (such as high-level athletes and politicians) became agents of the field. The formation of the field was also a response to the need for new strategies and methods of international development, as it was recognized that the orthodox policies of development did not succeed in delivering their objectives (Levermore & Beacom, 2012). In the early 2000s, the UN acknowledged the contribution that sport can have in reaching the Millennium Development Goals, which were launched in 2000. The United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace was established the following year, and it became a significant agent in the SDP field, equipped with institutionalized forms of symbolic (social and political) capital. The Office was led by the UN Secretary-General's Special Adviser on Sport for Development and Peace, and its tasks were advocative, facilitative, and representational. The role of the Office and the Special Adviser are discussed in detail later in the article, as it was a key stakeholder within SDP until its closure in 2017. In 2003, not long after the UN set up its Office for the SDP sector, the Magglingen Declaration was published as the proceedings of the first International Conference on Sport and Development, stressing the

importance of sport in conflict prevention and peace promotion. The year 2005 was declared as the United Nation's International Year of Sport and Physical Education, further raising awareness of sport as a vehicle for positive social change. A great number of United Nations agencies joined the campaign of the year, and some of them are still actively using sport for human development, including the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF); the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) (Dienes, 2012).

Also in 2005, the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDPIWG) was established, with representatives from ministers of sport, youth, and development from 15 countries, directors from the UN system, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The SDPIWG is a policy initiative that aims to promote the integration of SDP policy recommendations into the national and international development strategies of national governments.

Since the early 2000s, hundreds of NGOs in SDP were founded. That trend continues today, and those organizations are running thousands of projects worldwide.

Methodology

In order to address the objective of the research, we relied on a qualitative approach. A total of 10 semi-structured interviews were carried out from February to August 2017 via Skype with individuals who have been involved in SDP in various roles. The intention behind the sampling process was to involve professionals in various positions and ensure broad geographical representation. These professionals have been involved in different types of organizations, notably funding organizations, implementing organizations, networking organizations, and research institutions, at different levels. They have worked in diverse settings, notably in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Americas.

List of respondents (identification number – type of organization [org.] – role within the org.[1]):
#1 – implementing org. (national governmental development agency) – regional manager
#2 – networking and implementing org. – co-founder and network director
#3 – research institution – researcher
#4 – funding org. – development manager
#5 – networking org. (implementing not-for-profit organization) – senior project manager
6 – donor org. – manager
7 – implementing org. – country director
#8 – research institution – professor
#9 – networking and implementing org. – former international relations officer
#10 – intergovernmental org. – former staff member

The interview guide aimed to find out the perceptions of the respondents with regards to its stakeholders (the agents), the way they typically act (their habitus), and their relationships related to capital. The semi-structured format enabled us to expand on certain answers and ask further probing and clarifying questions from the respondents to get more precise data (Creswell, 2012).

The respondents were asked if the interview could be recorded by an audio recording program, and all of them agreed to it. Each interview lasted between 30 and 70 minutes. The interviews were conducted in English. Eight of the respondents authorized us to disclose their name and their affiliated organization, one gave us authorization to disclose the name of his/her affiliated institution but not his/her name, and one gave the

---

[1] Most of the respondents have been involved in SDP in various organizations and in various roles. Here we use the affiliation they preferred for this research.

interview anonymously.[2] In the first round, convenience sampling was used based on the professional connections of the researchers, resulting in six respondents. In the second round, snowball sampling was introduced, adding four more respondents to the sample.

The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The data was then analyzed following a six-phase approach of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The first phase was about becoming familiar with the data while initial codes were generated in the second. In phases three and four, themes were identified and then reviewed. In the fifth phase, the themes were defined and named. In the last phase, the analysis was produced. The final themes emerged from the analysis. The analysis was carried out by the first author and then checked by the second author. When there were differing opinions between the two authors, further discussions took place to review the themes until full consensus was achieved, ensuring reliability.

Results and discussion

Mapping the field: The agents of SDP

Mapping of the sector has been attempted several times since the emergence of SDP (Giulianotti, 2011a; Levermore & Beacom, 2012). According to Giulianotti (2011a), the key institutions are nation-states, NGOs, intergovernmental organizations, international sport federations, transnational corporations, and grassroots community-based organizations. However, as a growing number of types of entities, individuals, and networks come into existence, it is increasingly challenging to come up with an exhaustive list of agents and to clearly see the relationship between them. As respondent #6 put it:

> *Right now, mapping the sport for development field is something that a few organizations have tried to do but no one has successfully been able to do it fully. And I think that's because there are so many organizations that are flying under the radar and that aren't fully aware of the networks.*

The reason for this phenomenon could be that the number of organizations and projects in developing contexts increase when funding sources – Bourdieu's economic capital – are available; however, once the funding cycle ends, many of them stop operating and might never restart again – they disappear as quickly as they appeared, lacking the economic capital that is vital for their existence. In many cases, these organizations live day-by-day. They do not have the capacity to do communication work, so their activities remain unnoticed, except for by their direct beneficiaries and within their immediate environment. This also implies that they do not succeed in acquiring the other, symbolic forms of capital, which would enable them to continue with their SDP activities.

One way to divide the institutional agents of the SDP field is in line with the division of the development and the sport sectors, as respondent #5 did:

> *On the one hand, you can draw a spectrum where you have sport on one side, and that includes sports federations, professional football clubs, as well as small community clubs and stuff who somehow have become interested in doing social work or development work. On the other side of the spectrum you have people who are really much better known for development work, so UN agencies, government agencies, NGOs and stuff, who are recently more and more interested in integrating sport into their work. And in the middle, you have those who identify themselves as being sport and development organizations.*

Respondent #8 pointed out an interesting type of agent that he named an "intermediate organization":

---

[2] The respondents who gave us authorization to disclose their names were Heidi Beha, Vladimir Borkovic, Alexander Cardenas, Paul Hunt, Richard Loat, Naoki Nishiyama, John Sugden, and Karine Teow.

You've also got these kinds of almost like intermediate bodies who've got a big sort of name or place in the field. [...] Peace and Sport, [...] Play the Game or Beyond Sport, [...] They give out awards for different programs, and they almost act as a kind of goal between the international agencies and the local organizations. [...] Sometimes I think that they act as a filter, and sometimes it becomes a barrier for the flow of resources to the local organizations.

These "intermediate organizations" possess the field-specific capital of providing networking opportunities among all types of agents. These networking opportunities – award ceremonies, conferences, galas – are platforms for other agents to express their subjective interests to other types of agents and strengthen their position in the field by gaining social capital.

As respondent #9 is a former employee at Peace and Sport,[3] one of the organizations mentioned by respondent #8, and having worked for the organization in different roles, she expressed her opinion on its position within the SDP sector, pointing to its networking role:

If the UN was doing its job of gathering governments and civil society, Peace and Sport wouldn't be needed, wouldn't exist. The fact that there is Monaco and all these money issues makes Peace and Sport very attractive […] because it's a neutral ground. So I think the positioning of Peace and Sport makes it easy – an easy go-to place that is not as formal as the UN somehow, where actors can gather.

When listing all the agents mentioned by the respondents and comparing the list to the mapping of the sector by academics (Giulianotti, 2011a; Levermore & Beacom, 2012), there is one type of agent that our respondents did not mention. It is what Giulianotti (2011b, p. 770) calls "the new social movement, radical NGOs," which "have led political movements against exploitative and oppressive practices in factories that produce sport apparel, […] pressing the relevant corporations to address these practices and to engage with the SDP sector." It is not that agents in the field do not know about the habitus of such factories, but they did not mention these radical NGOs that attempt to change it. Respondent #8 posed the question of whether it is right to accept economic capital from these companies. It seems that it is not a clear doxa of the field:

Is it good to get resources from Nike or from Adidas, even though when you look at some of their practices in terms of their overseas factories, [they have] got issues to do with their global presence?

The UNOSDP: An agent that left the field

Not only respondent #9, but many other respondents expressed their opinion of the role of the UN and its Office on Sport for Development and Peace while talking about the different agents and the links between them. Between the recording of the interviews and the preparation of this paper, the UNOSDP was closed, making it even more challenging to position the UN within the field. This closure was announced in a UN press release on May 4, 2017, the day after an article entitled "IOC Welcomes Enhancement of Close Cooperation with the United Nations" was published on the IOC website. The news was not communicated on the sport section of the UN website, and that section was eventually closed. This poor communication is not unique in the history of the UNOSDP: this might be one of the reasons that several respondents found it hard to understand the role of this agent in the SDP field.

---

[3] Peace and Sport is a neutral NGO based in Monaco, and one of its main activities is the annual International Peace and Sport Forum, where an award ceremony takes place to recognize the activities and actors in the SDP sector.

The UNOSDP supported the Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on Sport for Development and Peace in delivering his three-fold duties – advocative, facilitative, and representational – within the UN system (UNOSDP 2015). However, the responsibilities of the UNOSDP either seemed vague to the agents in the field, or they did not really see the UNOSDP fulfilling them. As quoted above, respondent #9 did not see the habitus of the UN as the bridge between governments and civil society, which was its advocative duty.

While listing the agents in the field during her interview a few weeks before the closure of the UNOSDP, respondent #1 said:

> *There's the sports office of the UN [...], it's not too clear where they will head towards, but that's definitely an important stakeholder and can also support the topic.*

Respondent #3 had a more solid understanding of what the UNOSDP does. However, in his interview in February 2017, he expressed a critical opinion of their work:

> *The UNOSDP, they are running a couple of projects. As I understand, one of them is a camp, which is great, but I think they should focus more on the strategic component of this sector and on policy-making, and on accompanying countries to develop sound policy in this regard. And it is happening, but not to the full potential that they could do.*

After the closure of the UNOSDP in May 2017, a former staff member of the Office was interviewed[4] and reflected on why some agents did not fully understand the role and duties of the Office and the Special Adviser. The respondent also pointed out the constantly changing nature of the field:

> *One of the reasons that people may not know fully what the UNOSDP has been doing is because the size of the UNOSDP restricted a lot of, let's say, promotional activity. [...] Because it was so small, it always felt like we were one step behind the actual sport for development and peace sector.*

The closure of the UNOSDP hit some of the agents by surprise; others might have already been preparing for it. At the 71st session of the UN General Assembly in September 2016, 56 UN member states drafted a resolution which emphasized the importance of SDP and invited member states and the UN system to work together with the UNOSDP to promote greater awareness about sport's role in development and peace-building. The draft document also requested the UN Secretary-General to report to the 73rd session of the GA (due in September 2018) on the implementation of this resolution, including activities and the functioning of the UNOSDP (UNGA 2016). As we now know, the resolution will not be fully implemented as the UNOSDP closed in May 2017. A reason for the closure might be that the UNOSDP's influence on decision-making processes and strategic leadership in the field was unclear.

Connections and habitus in the field

Talking about connections among the agents, respondents #8 and #2 both see two types of relations. Connectivity and competition are both apparent among the agents that are struggling for capital, especially the economic form, in the field. As respondent #8 phrases it:

---

[4] While the UNOSDP was operational, its policy did not allow its staff members to give interviews for academic research.

There's a lot of connectivity, but there's also a lot of competition, which is one of the issues particularly for the NGOs because all the small NGOs need to be resourced to do what they want to do. And, of course, they're all competing for the same limited funding.

As respondent #2 puts it:

The resources are scarce. There is not enough for everything that people could do on the local, on the community level. And in that sense, there is an unnatural competition. Organizations actually don't like to compete, but they have to.

When asked about the types of connections in the field, there were varying observations from the different types of agents. Respondent #6, representing a funding organization, expressed concern about the unhealthy dependence of beneficiaries on funding organizations, which own the precious economic capital. He pointed to the fact that the field is a structured space that is based on the distribution of capital (Bourdieu, 1994):

There's a strong relationship between funders and beneficiaries, but [...] those relationships in some ways can almost become nepotistic because we haven't created a system that enables us to exit granting relationships and actively find new work without risking the sustainability of the work we previously funded.

A different type of connection was pointed out by respondent #4. Our respondent led us through an example of when an agent operating in SDP connects to fields other than SDP:

Because the awareness of sport for development programs is increasing, I think now you will start to see those thematic sectors – health, education – reaching out to proactively contact the sport for development charities. Saying "Oh, can you help me run a program that's around young people and their obesity levels?" […] In the past it would always have been the sport for development reaching out to those sectors and these stakeholders, but I think now it's beginning to work both ways.

This cross-sectoral partnership-building is noted by Keim (2012), who states that a multi-stakeholder approach in partnership-building is crucial in SDP. This trend is also mentioned in a World Health Organization discussion paper on the social determinants of health (WHO, 2011), and in two UNESCO documents: the strategy on education for health and well-being (UNESCO, 2016) and the Kazan Action Plan (UNESCO 2017).

Respondent #1 gave us an ideal partnership structure in SDP, involving all the types of agents listed by respondent #2:

There's a great potential that has maybe not yet been fully unlocked – ties between civil society and federations. […] At the moment, many NGOs are active in the field, and I think together with the federations they could really partner up and make it bigger. […] Then the other key stakeholders that have to be together definitely are government ministries. And NGOs together with federations, maybe this is a triangle. And then if you want to look into funding, […] of course the private sector and sponsorship models have to count in.

The multilateral partnership structure could be a solution to two of the field's challenges. Partnerships between NGOs and sport federations could provide a more professional background for the initiatives regarding the sport

side, while involving the governmental and business sectors could help gather some economic capital for the implementation.

Missing connections in the field

One interview question asked about any kinds of missing connections that the respondents knew of and interviewees replied with a great variety of responses.

Respondent #9 pointed out that there is a distance between agents on different levels and a missing connection between them. The respondent also referred to the difficulty in policy-making that results from these lacking connections:

> *Then you go from the local environment where the action is taking place to the national [level], which is already a big gap in some countries, and then to the international [level], where there's even more of a gap, so the information gets lost on the way and the people are not necessarily connected even nationally to the international representation. So, they are trying to build policy on the international level when locally policies are not clear.*

In many countries, there are a high number of local SDP initiatives, but the state does not have an SDP policy in place and governments might not even be aware of some of these programs. Therefore, the local implementing organizations need to go to the international level if they are looking for support. That is much more challenging because of the more intense competition that they face and the possible disadvantage they have with regards to the symbolic forms of capital required for success. Another reason for the misalignment is what respondent #10 called "sharing the information" within an organization. As he said:

> *When we were working with the Special Adviser, he would be the person to go to many events […]. And if someone from the working level were to go there, the information would be better relayed, to not just the UNOSDP office teammates, but also to the UN at large.*

Respondent #9 is not alone in her view on the missing connections among different levels of agents. Keim (2012) also takes note of this, writing that there is a lack of linkages between existing voluntary initiatives around long-term engagement in sport and policy development. Levermore and Beacom (2012) emphasize that the prominent role of the UN and international agencies needs to resonate on the governmental level, and for this many governments have to be convinced of the potential of sport in development programs.

While respondent #9 sees missing connections and a lack of communication between certain types of agents, respondent #7 gave us a specific example where within one agent, a ministry, there are missing connections:

> *The missing component is sharing the information. In the case of Japan's Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports, the sport sector and the education sector are separated basically. But physical education is, for example, under the sport sector. So, if they would like to support education, actually the education sector thinks about core education, including physical education also, but that information is not shared to the sport sector.*

One more missing connection is noted by respondent #2 – the gap between practitioners and academia:

> *There was a strong move, it started in 2005 […] I think there was a hype around monitoring and evaluation. This hype was very welcome to the field. But what I still see is a gap between theory and practice, between research at the university and research in the field.*

His perception is shared by several researchers in the field. Cornelissen (2011, p. 507) states that "one of the biggest problems with the sport for development movement is the lack of an evidentiary base, and the often substantial gap between theory and practice." Coalter (2010) claims that science is needed to help deconstruct claims of "broad gauge problems" being solved by limited-focus interventions, while others reflect on the critical work made in SDP in general (Cronin, 2011; Coakley, 2011). Burnett (2015) calls for more strategic research in SDP, as its focus underscores the potential praxis by addressing topics such as minorities, equality, sustainability, and partnerships. She also calls for "actionable" knowledge to improve program design, implementation, and effect. In a research interview, Hums advocated for scholars to connect to practitioners to make a difference and to have a positive impact (Welty Peachey, Cohen, & Musser, 2016).

Conclusion

In 2011, Comic Relief published a mapping exercise of research. They examined 277 reports published since 2005, and one of their findings was that "many individuals and organisations use the terms 'research' and 'evaluation' interchangeably, treating any form of data collection as research" (Cronin, 2011, p. 5). The study points out that "evaluations are often designed to gather merely supporting evidence." This habitus of SDP implementing agents is formed by their struggle to keep the economic capital coming from funders.

Bourdieu's theory and its concept of habitus and capital provided us with a framework to delimit the SDP field and to describe some of the relations between its agents. We also attempted to point to the changing nature of the field and the fact that these changes have broader effects, i.e., in the sporting field and in development as well. Clearly, one of the most significant recent changes in the structure of the field was the closure of the UNOSDP, which left some questions open regarding the future structure. As only one interview was conducted after the closure of the UNOSDP, only one respondent (#10) reflected on this new reality in the SDP field:

> *One of the biggest challenges now is who is going to take the lead role in the SDP promotion. Identifying who is going to be, how it is going to be done, and what are the objectives now of SDP.*

We agree with the respondent that filling the gap left by the closure of the UNOSDP is an urgent matter. Doing so would help the field solve some of its challenges, notably: 1) the establishment of a clear communication culture within and about SDP; 2) the strengthening of the connections within the field; 3) the reduction of competition within it; and 4) the establishment of exit strategies of funding organizations in projects. This paper did not intend to investigate possible future structures for the SPD field. The reasons for this are that, firstly, its main intention was to introduce SDP as a Bourdieusian field, and secondly, it is too soon after the closure of the UNOSDP to analyze the future structure of the field. Nevertheless, in future research, it would be interesting to cover what changes occur in the structure of the field and how these changes and the habitus of the agents will affect one another.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, P. (1978). Sport and social class. *Social Science Information*, 17(6), 819–840.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in Question.* London, UK: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1994). *Texts of Sociology.* Athens, Greece: Delfini.

Bourdieu, P. (2005). The political field, the social science field, and the journalistic field. In R. Benson & É. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 29–47). Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Braun, V. & Clarke, C. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101.

Burnett, C. (2015). Assessing the sociology of sport: On Sport for Development and Peace. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport,* 50(4-5), 385–390.

Coakley, J. (2011). Youth sports: What counts as "positive development?" *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 20(10), 1–19.

Coalter, F. (2007). Sports clubs, social capital and social regeneration: "Ill-defined interventions with hard to follow outcomes"? *Sport in Society*, 10(4), 537–559.

Coalter, F. (2010). Sport for Development – Limited focus programmes and broad gauge problems. In W. Tokarski & K. Petry (Eds.), *Handbuch Sportpolitik* (pp. 311–331). Schorndorf, Germany: Hormann-Verlag.

Coalter, F. (2015). Sport-for-Change: Some thoughts from a sceptic. *Social Inclusion,* 3(3), 19–23.

Cornelissen, S. (2011). More than a sporting chance? Appraising the sport for development legacy of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Third World Quarterly,* 32(3), 503–29.

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cronin, Ó. (2011). *Comic Relief Review - Mapping the research on the impact of Sport and Development interventions.* Retrieved September 21, 2018, from http://www.orlacronin.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Comic-relief-research-mapping-v14.pdf.

Dienes, E. (2012). Perspectives of the United Nations on sport as a tool for promoting peace. In K. Gilbert & W. Bennett (Eds.), *Sport, Peace & Development* (pp. 39–51). Champaign, IL: Common Ground Publishing LLC.

Giulianotti, R. (2011a). Sport, peacemaking and conflict resolution: A contextual analysis and modelling of the sport, development and peace sector. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 34(2), 207–228.

Giulianotti, R. (2011b). The sport, development and peace sector: A model of four social policy domains. *Journal of Social Policy,* 40(4), 757–776.

International Olympic Committee. (2017, May 5). *IOC welcomes enhancement of close cooperation with the United Nations* [News]. Retrieved September 25, 2018, from https://www.olympic.org/news/ioc-welcomes-enhancement-of-close-cooperation-with-the-united-nations.

The International Platform on Sport and Development. (2018, January). *Connect page.* Retrieved January 21, 2019, from https://www.sportanddev.org/en/connect

Keim, M. (2012). Networking for sport and peace. In K. Gilbert & W. Bennett (Eds.), *Sport, Peace & Development* (pp. 101–113). Champaign, IL: Common Ground Publishing LLC.

Levermore, R. & Beacom, A. (2012). Opportunities, limitations, questions. In R. Levermore & A. Beacom (Eds.), *Sport and International Development* (pp. 246–268). Basingtoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Mandela, N. (2000, May 25). *Speech at the Inaugural Laureus Lifetime Achievement Award 2000.* Sporting Club Monte Carlo, Monaco. Retrieved September 25, 2018, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GdopyAFP0DI&t=108s

Right To Play. (2017, May 15). *Our Beginning...* [Home page]. Retrieved September 25, 2018, from http://www.righttoplay.ca/Learn/ourstory/Pages/Who-we-are.aspx

Schnitzer, M., Stephenson Jr., M., Zanotti, L., & Stivachtis, Y. (2013). Theorizing the role of sport for development and peacebuilding. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics,* 16(5), 595–610.

Schulenkorf, N., Sherry, E., & Rowe, K. (2016). Sport for development: An integrated literature review. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(1), 22–39.

Skille, E.Å. (2016). The Norwegian sporting field reconsidered – the application of Bourdieu's field theory on a pluralistic and blurred world. *European Journal for Sport and Society,* 4(2), 103–115.

Skinner, J., Zakus, D.H., & Cowell, J. (2008). Development through sport: Building social capital in disadvantaged communities. *Sport Management Review*, 11(3), 253–275.

Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group. (2008). *Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments.* Toronto, Canada: Right To Play.

Sugden, J. (2010). Critical left-realism and sport interventions in divided societies. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport,* 45(3), 258–272.

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. (2005). *Sport for development and peace – the development policy context*. Retrieved September 24, 2018, from http://schwery.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/sdc_sport_magglingen2005_eng.pdf

Tomlinson, A. (2004). Pierre Bourdieu and the sociological study of sport: Habitus, capital and field. In R. Giulianotti (Ed.), *Sport and Modern Social Theorists* (pp. 161–172). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2016). *Strategy on education for health and well-being: Contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals*. Retrieved September 25, 2018, from UNESCO website: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002464/246453e.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2017). *Kazan Action Plan*. The Ministers meeting at the Sixth International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport (MINEPS VI). July 13-15, 2017. Kazan, Russia. Retrieved September 22, 2018, from UNESCO website: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0025/002527/252725E.pdf

United Nations General Assembly. (1993). *A/RES/48/11*. New York, NY: United Nations.

United Nations General Assembly. (2016). *A/71/L.38*. New York, NY: United Nations.

United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace. (2017, May 15). *Overview* [Home page]. Retrieved September 25, 2017, from https://www.un.org/sport/content/why-sport/overview.

United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace. (2015). *Annual Report 2014*. Retrieved September 22, 2018, from
https://www.un.org/sport/sites/www.un.org.sport/files/ckfiles/files/UNOSDP%20Annual%20Report%202014%20web(1).pdf.

Webb, J. (2012). The logic of practice: Art, the academy, and fish out of water. *Text*, *SpecIssue,* (14), 1–16.

Welty Peachey, J., Cohen, A., & Musser, A. (2016). "A phone call changed my life": Exploring the motivations of sport for development and peace scholars. *Journal of Sport for Development,* 4(7), 58–70.

World Health Organization. (2011). *Closing the gap: Policy into practice on social determinants of health discussion paper.* Retrieved September 23, 2018, from http://www.who.int/sdhconference/Discussion-paper-EN.pdf.

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS:

Mariann Bardocz-Bencsik
Bajcsy-Zsilinszky út 5.
1065 Budapest, Hungary
E-mail: bbmnt8@gmail.com