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Summary

Sport for Development (SfD) aspires to achieve social impact by using sport, play and physical activity. The Dutch organizations NSA International, the Royal Netherlands Football Association (KNVB) and the Dutch office of Right To Play, implementing partners of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the field of SfD, wish to further improve the quality and effectiveness of their SfD programs. For this sound evidence and more insight in working mechanisms between sport and development are needed. They asked Utrecht University to compose an independent academic document in response to the question: *What is the potential of sport as a tool for development and how to benefit from that in the best possible way?* To answer this question, Utrecht University has done a thorough policy and academic literature review, including the analysis of more than 200 articles, books and policy documents over the 1998-2013 period.

**Origins**

The emergence of SfD as a sector in the 90’s and 00’s is largely due to two factors. First, there has been an increased recognition of the societal meaning of sport by politicians and policy makers. Before the 1990’s sport was considered a luxury. Gradually, the conviction emerged that sports can not only be a source of inspiration, but also an effective tool in combating social problems. National and international policy documents and declarations consistently, and increasingly, assign positive meanings to sport. The tenor seems that at least ‘sport can play a role as a tool for development’ or even ‘build a better world’. Second, the factor which created opportunities for the sport for development movement is the ‘aid paradigm shift’ in development cooperation. Critics on traditional approaches to development cooperation claim that the efforts by traditional development organizations did not contribute to significant change in developing countries. New insights in the concept of ‘development’ led to a paradigm shift, in which more emphasis is laid on social development and creation of social networks. This opened doors for new organizations, such as SfD organizations. Their sport-oriented approach is considered refreshing and offers new possibilities in development cooperation.

**Position of the Netherlands**

Since 1998, the Dutch government has published a number of consecutive SfD policy documents, which have had an influence internationally, both at policy level and in practice. However, each policy document had an expiration date. The main reason for these short lived policy documents has been the fluctuating political attention and accompanying resources for SfD. The current SfD policy and program only allows a limited number of experienced implementing partners and local embassies to deliver context specific SfD interventions. The current implementing partners of the Dutch SfD program, i.e. NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play, have played an important role in the continuity of the Dutch participation in SfD. A distinct ‘Dutch approach’ has not been developed, but there are similarities in the approaches of NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play, such as a focus on ‘software’, the transfer of knowledge and skills, development of curricula, training courses and manuals, local capacity building through multi-stakeholder approach, local coaches and community leaders as role models, knowledge development, and a variety of local implementing partners.
Academic research

The increasing popularity of sport as a tool for development comes along with an increasing amount of claims made on the ‘power’ of sport for development, such as individual development, health promotion and disease prevention, promotion of gender equality, social integration and the development of social capital, peace building and conflict prevention/resolution, post-disaster/trama relief and normalization of life, economic development and social mobilization. Since 2000, academic interest and output on sport for development issues increased significantly and the policy claims have been tested and often challenged in more than 2,000 studies.

Based on these studies, it can be stated that sport has some unique features to contribute to development, especially in comparison with other interventions. Individuals and groups all over the world are interested in sports, regardless of background, age, race, religion, gender or status. Therefore, sport can attract target groups that are usually hard to reach. They can easily be involved, sport is visible and accessible, sport offers role models and it contains intrinsic values that play an important role in society. Particular sport activities and social processes of participation can be key to reach certain development goals.

Nevertheless, many claims of the power of sport in policy and practice cannot be met according to empirical research. Research analysis has made clear that sport has the potential to contribute to development goals, but sport does not necessarily lead to the desired developmental outcomes. According to the academic literature, health is the only overarching outcome that shows a direct relationship with physical activity. For all other overarching development outcomes it is hard to prove a direct causal relation between sport for development activities and development outcomes. This also counts for ‘youth and education’, ‘gender equality’ and ‘peace and reconciliation’ - development goals that are foci in Dutch funded SfD programs.

At the same time, academic research offers clear suggestions to use sport as a vehicle to contribute to these goals. It is important to approach sport as ‘site for socialization experiences’, not causes of socialization outcomes. It is not sport in itself that leads automatically to development. Sport takes place in a complex social context in which various factors influence the final outcomes of a sport for development program.

A basic SfD model

To provide insight in the potential of sport for development and how to contribute to development in the best possible way, we developed a basic SfD model. This model takes into account that the relation between sport and development often is indirect and that the outcomes of SfD programs depend on, sometimes hard to affect, variables. The model starts with sport as a site for socialization experience and then distinguishes ‘necessary conditions’, ‘supporting conditions’, ‘the moment of truth’, ‘intermediate outcomes’ and ‘overarching outcomes’ taking into account external variables as well.

A necessary condition for any outcome is participation in sport. Supporting conditions refer to processes and organizational and program components that should lead to the achievement of desired outcomes. Frequently mentioned supporting conditions are related to the organization of the activities and programs, the role of coaches or leaders and the social environment in which the
activities take place. Some conditions are general and apply to almost every SfD project, while others are more context specific. If conditions are met, sport may result in intermediate outcomes. Examples of intermediate outcomes are the development of ‘life skills’, increased social interaction, but also development of leadership and community building. These intermediate outcomes, often referred to as (aspects of) social capital, are an essential element in the achievement of the overarching developmental outcomes, like child and youth development, gender equality, conflict resolution and peace. At the same time, it should be noted that intermediate outcomes are not always desired or positive outcomes. Sport can lead to injuries, to exclusion and to anti-social behavior. The value of sport for development is created during ‘the moment of truth’, i.e. the actual interaction between a sport coach or leader and the participants. The exact mechanisms during ‘the moment of truth’, which result in either positive or negative outcomes, are still unclear, including the best way for SfD organizations to facilitate ‘the moment of truth’. What is required is a developmental approach based on a realistic view on the meaning of sport, and an understanding of the social processes and mechanisms that may lead to desired outcomes for some participants or organizations in certain circumstances. From this perspective, monitoring and evaluation need to pursue this understanding via participatory, process-centered and formative evaluation.

Next steps
The academic literature learns that, to maximize the outcomes, SfD organizations should accept that a direct relationship between sport and development is hard to prove and that they should focus on the intermediate outcomes instead. According to the presented SfD basic model, SfD organizations should take care that the necessary and supporting conditions are met to increase the chance of achieving the desired outcomes. In the years to come one of the main challenges for the SfD sector is to invest in quality of programs and sustainability of results. Dutch organizations can play a valuable role in dealing with these challenges, making use of the findings and recommendations of this review. They can increase their impact using sport for development by a stronger focus on:

- **Facilitating the moment of truth**: This means that SfD organizations operate from a service management perspective to facilitate and be subservient to interaction between the coach and participants, which determines to a large extent the outcomes of a program.
- **Investing in local involvement, capacity and partnerships**: This means that SfD involves local civil society organizations, i.e. sport organizations and/or other organizations, which can support the moment of truth. Further investment in local partnerships and organizational capacity will be crucial to deliver sustainable programs with impact.
- **Programs at micro level, structurally supported at meso and macro level**: This means the SfD organizations – either local or foreign - have to structurally cooperate with civil society organizations and have to make sure that they have relations with governments, multilateral institutions and (i)NGOs, who are supportive to the SfD programs at grassroots level.
- **Integration of practice, policy and research**: This means that programs can be improved if systematic cooperation between SFD organizations and local partners and academic institutions is stimulated and facilitated. This cooperation should lead to smart integration of scientific research and evidence - besides monitoring and evaluation - within SfD programs, especially with regard to the organization of partnership and capacity building.
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Preface

In recent years, the field of Sport for Development (SfD) has grown exponentially, with hundreds of initiatives around the globe. All initiatives aspire to have social impact by using sport, play and physical activity. Whereas five years ago 166 organizations could be found on the 'International Platform on Sport for Development' (Kidd, 2008), today 484 initiatives are listed\(^1\). The amount of programs is almost impossible to oversee and sport is claimed to be a 'universal language' and the 'ultimate tool for social change and development' by a variety of actors, such as the UN Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP), the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and national governments.

This emerge of SfD is remarkable. Until the 1990s, sport was dismissed as a luxury and funding sports programs in developing countries was not at all an option worth reconsidering for governments and international development agencies (Van Eekeren, 2006). Major shifts and developments have taken place over the years, both at the national and international level. Whereas the Netherlands was one of the pioneers in the field for a long time and one of the first countries to formulate formal policy regarding sport for development in 1998, today various other (international) organizations and countries have emerged to 'pick up the ball'. Simultaneously, UN Agencies, international sport federations, international and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and national governments started incorporating sport as tool for development in their policies and agendas.

Essentially, sport is increasingly becoming accepted both as a goal in itself and as a medium to achieve development objectives. As a result, relevant questions arise, such as: When and how can sport be a meaningful instrument for development or a development goal in itself? What are the possible outcomes of sport in specific situations for specific development goals? Which conditions are necessary to achieve these positive outcomes? What are the limits of sport for development programs? How can sport for development organizations adequately use the knowledge available in their program design and execution? How should they organize themselves, and with whom should they cooperate?

These questions have led to the academic community taking an interest in sport for development as an object for research. Nowadays, academics are involved in monitoring and evaluating SfD programs, and the number of critical followers of the sector is growing. These critics claim that ‘the belief’ in the potential of sport is often based on the ‘common sense’ of advocates who already are convinced of the power of sport. Their belief is reflected in UN phraseology and various country policies that sound wonderful and promising, but are often thin and poorly founded. Without a sound foundation, there is a risk that ‘sport for development’ is based upon the claims of ‘sport evangelists’ (Coalter, 2010).

\(^1\) www.sportanddev.org July 2013. This number of organizations might be the tip of the iceberg, since many - often local based - SFD organizations are not registered at the platform.
A more critical and academic approach will help to improve the quality and effectiveness of future projects and to firmly establish the issue for the years to come. This entails being willing and able to learn. Increasing the learning capacity of the sector may be the biggest challenge in the years ahead (Van Eekeren, 2006).

NSA International, the Royal Netherlands Football Association (KNVB) and Right To Play have addressed this challenge. Over the past 15 years, these three organizations have been the main Dutch actors in the sport for development landscape - setting up programs in different countries worldwide. NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play approach sport as a means for addressing social issues and achieving development goals. They aim to address social issues such as child and youth development, peace-building and conflict resolution and women empowerment. The three organizations collaborate in the program 'Sport for Development 2012-2015', initiated and funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The main objective of the organizations is to develop and execute well-designed programs at grassroots level in eight developing countries, which are all focus countries in Dutch foreign policy: Kenya, Mali, Egypt, Mozambique, South Africa, Indonesia, Suriname and the Palestinian Territories.

NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play realize that a sound evidence base and insight in working mechanisms are needed to improve the quality and effectiveness of their future programs. Therefore, they asked Utrecht University to compose an independent academic background document, which provides an underpinning analysis of sport for development.

The main question of this document is: What is the potential of sport as a tool for development and how to benefit from that in the best possible way? The question is answered through a thorough policy and academic literature review, for which more than 200 articles, books and policy documents over the 1998-2013 period have been analyzed. With the following chapters we endeavor to formulate an answer:

Chapter one describes the origins of ‘Sport for development’ and what is understood by the concept, as many stakeholders define the significance of sport in their own way.

Chapter two provides a historical overview of the field of sport for development internationally, in which the relevant policies and milestones affecting the maturation and growth of the sector will be outlined. In this overview, the Netherlands is the point of reference and a comparison with other countries and stakeholders in the field of sport for development will be made.

Chapters three and four elaborate on the current body of academic knowledge in the field of sport for development. First, we will outline how the amount of academic publications has increased since 1998. Subsequently, we will provide insight in what is scientifically known about the potential of sport, with special attention for the thematic areas, which are particularly relevant for Dutch policy and the work of NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play. This will result in a basic model for the potential value of sport for development.

Chapter five formulates an answer to the central question. By concluding what the added value of sport for development is, the limits of sport will be discussed as well. Future challenges and opportunities for practice, research and policy development are outlined.
1 Origins and definitions

This chapter will give a concise introduction of the concept of sport for development. It describes the origins of using sport to achieve developmental goals (on the national and international level). The second part of the chapter provides an overview of the most used claims and definitions of ‘sport for development’ in order to reach a common perspective on what SfD entails and how different programs can be classified.

1.1 Recognition of sport for development

The legitimacy of sport for development is nowadays based on long-standing traditional assertions about the nature and contribution of sport to society. Dunning (1999) simply states: “Sport matters”. Sport reveals characteristics about a society; through the types of sport they do, through the importance they attach to sport, through the amount of people, above all women, who do sports and through the way they do sports. Sport can be seen as a mirror of society which reflects and influences contemporary issues, or, as formulated by Briene, Koopman & Goessen (2005): "Sport is part of society and society is part of sport".

In historical terms, the idea that participation in sport offers a utility (other than being enjoyed for its own sake) can be traced to the mid-nineteenth century United Kingdom. Middle-class reformers in the areas of education and urban welfare began to develop the idea that sport participation, when appropriately directed, could be involved in the development of character, work discipline, teamwork, fair play, and other socially approved characteristics (Van Bottenburg, 2004). In the United Kingdom, sport became increasingly used in educational settings, in the form of physical education and the organization of games. Furthermore, sport was being used by community organizations and detention centers, where sport was approached as a tool for character building or changing. Subsequently, these ideas spread to other first world countries and their colonies.

This is one of the reasons why Coalter (2013) argues that ‘sport for development’ is not a new field, as is proclaimed by many (e.g. Kidd, 2008). In industrialized countries, sports have been a topic in public policy for a long time now. In the first place to extend social rights of citizenship, while also emphasizing the presumed wider collective and individual benefits of sport, referred to as ‘externalities’ by economists (Coalter, 2007). Despite Coalter’s claim that SfD is not new, there was marginal attention for sport as tool or catalyst for development in developing countries prior to the 1990s. Although some individual country-level initiatives were undertaken, sport was mainly seen as either luxury or leisure.

The emergence of SfD as a sector in the 90’s en 00’s is largely due to two factors:
1) The (renewed) recognition of the social meaning of sport
2) Changes in the approach to development cooperation.
1.1.1 Recognition of the social meaning of sport

Sports and politics have been (artificially) separated for a long time. Both politicians and sport administrators stuck to the adage of former IOC president Avery Brundage of almost sixty years ago: ‘[s]port is completely free of politics’ (as cited in Cashmore, 1990). In the Netherlands, government interfered as little as possible in sports affairs. Sport was seen as a private domain, where government intervention (and funding) was unnecessary and inappropriate. A combination of sport and development was out of the question. Development cooperation policy was focused on ‘hard’ poverty issues, including agriculture, infrastructure and water and sanitation. Sport was seen as luxury.

The perspective on sport has changed dramatically in recent years. In hindsight this change began in the Netherlands in 1992. At the time, a report was published named ‘Sport as a source of inspiration for our society’ (AT Kearney/NOC*NSF, 1992). The report made governments reflect on the relationship between sports policy and the social significance of sport (Van Bottenburg & Schuyt, 1996). Gradually, public funds came available to achieve social goals such as economic growth, social inclusion and health through sport (Boessenkool et al., 2008). It is in these areas that sport has become increasingly important in the public domain and part of the public debate.

This new thinking on the value of sport coincides with ideas about public value and the government’s role in society in general and is consistent with broader socio-political developments: Dutch governments in the 1990s and 2000s increasingly relied on the personal responsibility of citizens and private organizations. There seemed to be a new idea on social engineering, although this time it is not the government but citizens who have to improve society. Citizens must demonstrate active citizenship in advocating for public interests (Verhoeven & Ham, 2010). Addressing social issues is no longer the domain of government alone, it is also a role of the private sector, civil society and individuals (albeit in cooperation with government). Sport organizations are often regarded as civil society organizations and therefore, politicians and policymakers encourage sport organizations to take on a social role. Sports organizations in the Netherlands tap into this development, claiming their social position and arguing a causal relation between sport and solving social problems. Where classic care or welfare pathways have not led to the desired solution, this is now expected from the sport sector. Gradually, the conviction emerged that sports is not only a source of inspiration, but also an effective tool in combating social problems.

A brief inventory of national and international policy documents and declarations (EU, UN, governments, international sport federations) shows that, also outside the Netherlands, policymakers and politicians consistently, and increasingly, assign positive meanings to sports. The tenor seems that at least ‘sport can play a useful role as a tool for development’ (European Parliament, 2005) or even ‘build a better world’ (IOC, 2013). Nowadays, it is hard to imagine that sport is not used to address all kinds of social issues. Developing and investing in the sport has - in the eyes of many - not only sporting value, but also value for other domains. Or, as former NOC*NSF president Erica Terpstra tends to say: ‘Sport is gold for society’.
This recognition of the social meaning of sport has opened doors for sports within development cooperation. Anno 2013, the United Nations state: ‘Sport can no longer be considered a luxury within any society, but is rather an important investment in the present and future, particularly in developing countries’ (UN, 2013).

1.1.2 Changes in the approach to development cooperation

Other factors which created opportunities for the sport for development movement are the ‘aid paradigm shift’ and the emergence of ‘the fourth pillar’ in development cooperation.

There is much debate among the general public, politicians and academics about the current role of development aid; what it has accomplished after more than fifty years of development work, its effectiveness, and its prospects for the future. Perspectives on these questions are diverse. Assessments range from claims that development aid has had quite limited success (Easterly, 2006); that it serves to promulgate the neomercantilist tendencies of the West (Petras and Veltmeyer, 2002); or, that while being modestly successful, a reframing of purposes and goals is now in order to match the needs of a changing world (Sen, 2006).

Critics on traditional approaches to development cooperation claim that the efforts by traditional development organizations did not contribute to significant change in developing countries, despite of the billions of euros that were invested over the last 50 years. Their critique, among other comments, focuses on the emphasis on economic and material development in the traditional development cooperation sector (cf. Petras and Veltmeyer, 2002). New insights in the concept of ‘development’ led to a paradigm shift, in which more emphasis is put on social development and creation of social networks.

Traditionally, official development cooperation has been the playing field of governments, multilateral institutions and established development NGOs. Develtere and De Bruyn (2009) call them the ‘three pillars’ of development cooperation. In the last decade however, other actors (such as businesses, migrant organizations, trade unions, professional groups, groups of friends, schools, etc.) in so called ‘donor’ or ‘Northern’ countries have actively shown interest in development related activities, and in developing and implementing development oriented initiatives in developing countries (the ‘South’). This has led to the emerge of the ‘fourth pillar’ and the involvement of civil society organizations in development co-operation.

The fourth pillar offers an alternative for the public that has lost confidence in traditional development cooperation and for those who support a development approach that focuses on social development and the creation of social networks. Political appreciation of the fourth pillar is on the rise and their credibility is growing at the international level. Representatives of the fourth pillar can increasingly be found in international networks and at forums, where they have earned their place next to UN experts and other development specialists (Develtere & De Bruyn, 2009).
Sport for development organizations, such as NSA International and Right To Play, or private sport organizations who got involved in sport for development, such as KNVB, can be conceived as representatives of the fourth pillar. Their sport-oriented approach is refreshing and offers new possibilities in development cooperation. Their involvement is also welcomed, since political support for development cooperation is decreasing in the Netherlands. Development budgets are cut rigorously, new ways of funding are needed and support of the general public is necessary. Sport may help to provide a more recognizable and visible image to development cooperation. Furthermore, governments are looking for cooperation with private organizations, in so called ‘public private partnerships’. Cooperation with sports organizations fits well, because sports (with its famous role models) opens doors to businesses and other potential partners.

At the same time, sports are immensely popular in most developing countries, which contributes to local involvement. Also, large sporting events increasingly take place in developing countries and cities (think of the FIFA World Cup in South Africa and Brazil, Commonwealth Games in New Delhi and the Olympic Games in Beijing, Sochi and Rio de Janeiro). In addition, many sports organizations, such as KNVB, FIFA and IOC, are aware that they cannot limit their work to the organization of sports, and realize that they must show broader social commitment, for example with a corporate social responsibility (CSR) strategy.

All this means that governments are more open to integrate sport into their development policies and strategies. This was illustrated by the European Parliament in 2005, who drew a direct line between sport and the Millenium Development Goals, by declaring: ‘(...) physical education and sports projects may help to attain the Millennium Development Goals, especially with regard to themes such as health, education, social mobilization, gender equality, environment and peace among people.’ Nowadays, supporting sports-based development programs and projects, through earmarked budgets, is legitimate in development policies.

1.2 Claims

The increasing popularity of sport as tool for development comes along with an increasing amount of claims made on the ‘power’ of sport for development. These claims concern different social issues and affect different levels in society (micro, meso and macro). The SfD sector uses different concepts to indicate what is meant by sport for development. An often used definition is ‘the use of sport to exert a positive influence on public health, the socialization of children, youths and adults, the social inclusion of the disadvantaged, the economic development of regions and states, and on fostering intercultural exchange and conflict resolution’ (Sugden, 1991, 2006, 2008; Lyras, 2007; Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011).

According to the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG, 2007), sport is seen to have the most benefits in:
- Individual development
- Health promotion and disease prevention
- Promotion of gender equality
- Social integration and the development of social capital
- Peace building and conflict prevention/resolution
- Post-disaster/trauma relief and normalization of life
- Economic development
- Communication and social mobilization.

A selection of claims by SfD actors can be found in Box 1.

**Selection of claims on the potential of sport for development**

Play is NOT a luxury; it is a tool for education and health. It can bring entire communities together and inspire every individual. A game of football can teach children about tolerance and peace, and a game of tag can teach about malaria. Play helps teach important life lessons and develop skills like cooperation, leadership and teamwork. *(Right to Play International, 2013)*

(…) football is more than a sport. Football develops individuals. It increases life quality and encourages participation within the community. For disadvantaged areas, developing countries and the young people who would otherwise stand on the sidelines of life living there, football is a development tool. *(KNVB, 2013)*

Sport can strengthen the confidence and life skills of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds to drive their own future, become active citizens and commit themselves to building up their community. They become agents of change, and as such break the vicious cycle of poverty, injustice, violence and inequality that has kept them and their families at the margin of society. *(NSA International, 2013)*

Sport is because of its popularity, visibility and social significance a catalyst for achieving specific development goals. Sport in this context is a tool for health promotion, peace-building in fragile states and conflict prevention, reconciliation and rehabilitation in (post) conflict countries. *(Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Health, Welfare and Sport (VWS), 2008)*

By its very nature sport is about participation. It is about inclusion and citizenship. Sport brings individuals and communities together, highlighting commonalities and bridging cultural or ethnic divides. Sport provides a forum to learn skills such as discipline, confidence and leadership and it teaches core principles such as tolerance, co-operation and respect. Sport teaches the value of effort and how to manage victory, as well as defeat. When these positive aspects of sport are emphasized, sport becomes a powerful vehicle through which the United Nations can work towards achieving its goals. *(United Nations, 2005)*

*Box 1: Selection of claims on the potential of sport for development*

Sport has been linked to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In the past, sport has been most commonly linked to: eradication of poverty and extreme hunger; achieving universal primary education; responding to the psychosocial needs of victims of disasters and emergencies; promoting gender equality and empowering women; and combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases *(www.sportanddev.org, 2013)*.

The relationship between sport and development, however, is not as obvious as it seems at first. Besides all positive outcomes associated with sport, like improved fitness and health, inclusion and
fair play, there is sufficient evidence of the ‘dark side’ of sport, such as injuries, exclusion, violence, hooliganism and foul play. Chapter 3 will analyze the claims of the power of sport for development on the basis of academic literature.

1.3 Definitions

The concept of ‘Sport for Development’ seems self-evident and indisputable: there is a link between sport on the one hand and development on the other. However, often it is not explicitly defined what is meant by the used concepts of ‘sport’ and ‘development’. For instance, a long term sport for development program aiming to contribute to peace-building is very different from an one day grassroots sport event that aims to bring joy. When claiming a (positive) causal relationship between sport and development, it is crucial to operationalize and conceptualize the main concepts.

1.3.1 Sport

Many books have been written on what is exactly understood as sport, trying to formulate an answer to questions such as: Do we only talk about organized sports or do we also cover leisure activities? Is playing chess a sport and do we include indigenous games? ‘Sport’ is relative from culture to culture, according to Eichberg (1984): “It oscillates between game, dance, competition, fight, gymnastics, festivities, ritual, carnival, theatre, health-techniques, magic, erotic presentation and other forms of physical culture.” Elias and Dunning (1970) argue: “Sport activities and games, particularly in their traditional national forms, reflect cultural configurations and stable patterns.”

In the area of Sport & Development, ‘sport’ is generally understood to include physical activities that go beyond competitive sports (www.sportanddev.org, 2013). The United Nations Inter-agency Taskforce on Sport for Development and Peace (2012) states: “Incorporated into the definition of ‘sport’ are all forms of physical activity that contribute to physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction. These include: play; recreation; organized, casual or competitive sport; and indigenous sports or games.”

UNICEF (2004) expands this definition: “Sport involves rules or customs and sometimes competition. Play – especially among children – is any physical activity that is fun and participatory. It is often unstructured and free from adult direction. Recreation is more organized than play, and generally entails physically active leisure activities. Play, recreation and sport are all freely chosen activities undertaken for pleasure.”

This conceptualization of sports is very comprehensive by incorporating all forms of sport, physical activity and exercise that contribute to physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction. Since sport manifests itself in many different forms within sport for development programs, reaching a very diverse target population, sport cannot be limited to formal organized activities. Whereas football is often being used to attract at-risk youth in communities, traditional sports and indigenous games are regularly being used to promote unity and cultural heritage or to target hard-to-reach populations which are not attracted by popular sports. Different forms of physical activity are used for different objectives.
Furthermore, the ambiguous and sometimes paradoxical nature of sport should not be neglected. It is important to see sport as a social construction which is malleable according to the social force (Sugden, 2010). Sport has both positive and negative aspects, it does not have one face. Moreover, it is important to note that sports and elements of sports are being discussed at different levels and from different perspectives (Allison, 1986).

1.3.2 Development

The concept of ‘development’ is not easy to demarcate; a generally appealing term, however deeply complicated and multidimensional. ‘Development’ means many things to many people (see, for example, Escobar, 1995; Cooper & Packard, 1997; Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Black, 2010). The level of development of a nation was initially considered only in economic terms and concerned the extent to which its economy depended on the agricultural, industrial and/or service sectors (the latter being considered the most ‘developed’). The level of development was measured in terms of the gross domestic product (GDP) or gross national product (GNP) (SDP IWG, 2007). But, development is not only an economic issue, as it has political, social and cultural implications as well (Schulpen, 2001). Often, a distinction is made between social and human development.

Social development is a broad term that describes actions that are taken to build positive outcomes and prevent negative social outcomes that can adversely affect a community. The aim of social development is to improve the availability of support systems in the community, which prevent negative outcomes before they occur or buffer (lessen) their impact. Therefore, social development focuses on the social organization that enables to achieve the goals of society.

Human development focuses on individuals to develop their capacity to achieve the goals they aspire for. Human development, according to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP, 2006), may be defined as a process of enlarging people’s choices. UNDP argues that at all levels of development, the three essential choices for people are to live a long and healthy life, to acquire better knowledge and to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living. The UNDP uses the Human Development Index (HDI) to measure improvements in the quality of life of humans, based on an index with three criteria:

- A long and healthy life, as measured by life expectancy at birth;
- Knowledge, as measured by the adult literacy rate (2/3 weight), and the combined gross enrolment ratio in primary, secondary and tertiary education (1/3 weight);
- A decent standard of living, as measured by the GDP per capita in purchasing power parity (PPP) terms (measured in US$) (Human Development Report, 2006, p.394).

In general, development is concerned with increasing health and longevity; improving knowledge and education; ensuring an adequate standard of living (UNDP, 2006); and providing avenues for human rights, justice and citizenship for those who have been excluded and disenfranchised from public life (Small, 2002).

Mwaanga (2013) warns that these development concepts are the outcomes of a hegemonic Northern development paradigm, indicative of the hegemonic position of Northern countries in the SFD movement. He argues that ‘modernization’ is the one dominant development theory: ‘Such development thinking implies a binary understanding of the world, distinguishing between the less
desired (developing, traditional) and the more desired (modern, civilized) society.’ According to Mwaanga, this view on development compels Northern countries to proactively ‘assist’ the poor countries in their attempt to become modern. He proposes alternative development discourses for SfD, such as postcolonial theory and the Ubuntu philosophy, in which the notion of a goal for development can be reached only through a truly democratically imbued process, whereby those at the receiving end negotiate their own initiatives.

It is important to note that, under all presented definitions or concepts, no country ever achieves a final state of being ‘developed’ – as the UN Declaration notes, development is a process of “constant improvement.” However, key questions remain: “who determines the form of development in a country?” and “what are the appropriate roles for foreigners in the development of another country?” (SDP IWG, 2007).

1.3.3 Sport (for) development

The conceptualization of sport for development not only faces difficulties in academic circles, in practice the use of unambiguous concepts remains a challenge as well. The terms sport for development, development through sport, sport-in-development, sport and development, sport-for-change and sports development are used interchangeably to refer to programs and projects.

Various classifications are being used in literature and in the field to clarify the specific nature of different sport programs and in order to clarify the difference between ‘sport development’ and ‘development through sport’.

Kidd (2008) suggests three broad, overlapping, approaches: firstly, traditional sports development in which the provision of basic sports coaching, equipment and infrastructure are the central concern. This is for instance how the KNVB initially started its sport programs in developing countries. Later, they took a wider approach, and started addressing social issues in the training of coaches. Secondly, humanitarian assistance in which fund-raising in sport is used to provide forms of aid assistance, frequently for refugees. Some of the Right To Play projects fall into this category. The third category is the rather grandiosely named ‘sport-for-development-and-peace movement’, which covers a wide variety of organizations and loose coalitions. These organizations and coalitions focus on broad social development, such as NSA International and Kicking AIDS Out.

Levermore (2008) proposes another classification based on a more disaggregated approach to the desired outcomes of sport-for-development organizations: conflict resolution and inter-cultural understanding; building physical, social and community infrastructure; raising awareness, particularly through education; empowerment; direct impact on physical and psychological health and general welfare; economic development and poverty alleviation.

The most used and user-friendly classification is the distinction between ‘sport plus’ and ‘plus sport’ approach (Ministries of Foreign Affairs and VWS, 1998; Coalter, 2007). ‘Sport plus’ means: programs and projects with a focus on the delivery of sport, which may (also) result in development outcomes. ‘Plus sport’

Both ‘sport development’ and ‘sport for development’ are aimed at making life more meaningful through interaction with one other.
takes a certain social or development issue as starting point and uses sport as a tool to address that issue. This classification is rather a continuum on which programs can be placed than a strict classification.

Engelhardt (2013) argues that the overarching aim of ‘sport development’/‘sport plus’ or ‘sport for development’/‘plus sport’ may seem very different, but that is not to say that they cannot work together with mutual benefits. She states: “Both ‘sport development’ and ‘sport for development’ focus on delivering quality interventions and active, planned participation on the ground. We would perhaps do well to view them both as variations of the same idea, interventions in society aimed towards the most human of goals: making life more meaningful through interaction with one other” (www.sportanddev.org, 2013).
2 Policies, programs and approaches

This chapter will give a concise introduction to the field of sport for development on a national and international level. It describes how sport for development has been integrated in international and national policies. The Netherlands and the year 1998, when the first Dutch formal policy has been formulated (Sport in Development: Teamwork Scores!), will serve as point of reference. The chapter analyzes what can be said about the role and approach of the Netherlands in the international field of sport for development.

2.1 Policy and programs in the Netherlands

1980-1998

The historical relationship between the Netherlands and South Africa plays an important role in the emerge of sport for development policy and programs in the Netherlands. During the 1980s, the sport boycott against the Apartheid system in South Africa was the first political involvement of the Netherlands in sport in developing countries. After the first non-racial elections in 1994, Dutch sport organizations opened talks with their South African colleagues, various NGOs started development programs in the post-Apartheid country and the Dutch government was willing to invest in the build-up of the new South Africa. Various sport for development initiatives emerged, such as the cooperation between SCORE, a South African sport based NGO, and the Netherlands Olympic Committee/ Netherlands Sports Federation (NOC*NSF) and between the South African Football Association (SAFA) and the Netherlands Royal Football Association (KNVB).

Various other private initiatives emerged in response to requests from local governments, sporting organizations and individuals from the south - not only in South Africa. For example, the sport leaders program of the Netherlands Catholic Sports Federation (NKS, one of the predecessors of NSA International) in Burkina Faso, and volleyball programs related to dealing with trauma in Rwanda. Sport organizations and passionate individuals were pioneering on various fronts. Subsequently, these pioneers increasingly turned to the government for subsidies for their projects.

At the time, sport for development funding by the Dutch government was merely incidental. The first time funding from the Dutch government was used for sport for development was after the plane crash in which the Zambian national football team perished in 1993. The then-minister of Development Cooperation, Jan Pronk, made funds available to rebuild the Zambian football team, which had lost almost all its players in the run-up to the 1994 World Cup in the USA. The minister acknowledged that good performance by the national team was important to a developing nation. Dutch parliament called the minister to account for this initiative.
The new political situation in South Africa, the various private initiatives and changes in policy (due to the earlier mentioned paradigm shift – see Chapter 1), gave way to a more structured approach (and budgets) by the Dutch government. In 1998, the Ministry of Sport and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs developed a combined memorandum which explicitly linked sport as tool for development to international development cooperation (entitled “Teamwork Scores!” [Samenspel scoort], 1998). The memorandum motivated and brought together Dutch organizations and announced structural plans to encourage and support sport in developing countries. Its official goal was formulated as follows: “To promote the best possible use of physical education, sport, games, and activities involving physical exercise in developing countries with the aim of increasing both individual health and well-being and social cohesion and development.” One of the goals was to integrate sport and physical exercise with other development activities, such as rural development projects and programs for street children, thereby encouraging the integration of sport in a wide range of sectors, which was totally new at that time.

1998-2008

Typical for the Dutch organization of sport for development is the involvement of two different ministries, which requires thoughtful coordination and management of tasks and responsibilities. The memorandum from 1998 appointed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as responsible for all NGOs and multilateral agencies working in development cooperation, while the Ministry of Sport had the responsibility for liaising with the International Olympic Committee (IOC), sport-based NGOs, local sport associations, and other sport-oriented organizations.

The SFD memorandum gave the Ministry of Sport the ability to sign Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) with various countries. These MoU’s were designed to exchange sport knowledge between countries. The KNVB became an important partner for the Ministry of Sport in implementing the MoU’s. Dutch football coaches ran courses in Zambia, South Africa, Indonesia, Burkina Faso and Surinam. Also, NKS gained the opportunity to sustain their program in Burkina Faso and start off in Surinam.

Moreover, the government subsidized a Sport and Development program, run by the National Committee for International Cooperation and Sustainable Development (NCDO), an independent administrative body. This organization set up a platform for sport and development organizations to regularly meet and exchange information. NCDO also developed a website (www.sportdevelopment.org) making relevant information about projects, organizations, funding, and so on accessible. In addition, NCDO published “Supporter”, a quarterly about sport in developing countries, which ensured that the issue was brought to the attention of the Dutch public.

Although the budget for projects in developing countries remained limited, the new policy document, the MoU’s and the NCDO Sport and Development program sparked a number of new large-scale projects. Some Dutch sport organizations, among which KNVB and NSA, formally
incorporated sport and development into their mission and even appointed a specialized employee. It proved harder to involve the traditional development cooperation sector. Incidentally, NGOs such as Terre des Hommes, Cordaid, IKV Pax Christi and Oxfam Novib cooperated in sport for development projects, but it was not systematically included in their programs and strategies.

The policy memorandum of 1998 was followed by a joint position statement from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Sport in 2000. While the Ministry of Sport’s responsibilities remained the same, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs adopted a large-sector approach. Development cooperation policy shifted from the uncoordinated support on the project level in a large amount of countries to a focus on support at program level in a smaller amount of countries. Smaller sectors like sport, youth, and inclusion of people with disabilities were integrated into a broader, overarching policy focus, such as health, education and rural development, as well as good governance. Furthermore, the Dutch embassies were assigned a different role, as they no longer received direct support for sport for development projects.

This policy shift made it difficult for smaller NGOs to obtain funds for sport for development projects. At the same time, global operating sport for development organizations such as Right To Play fit in well in the new policy. The Dutch Foreign Affairs ministry was so impressed by the Right to Play projects, particularly those focusing on health promotion and refugees, that, in 2002, it announced to support Right To Play to conduct a large multilateral program. Right to Play Netherlands became a member of the Innovation Platform Development Cooperation and in 2008; it was assigned a grant of 1.2 million Euro for programs in Sudan and Burundi.

Many sport for development programs changed substantively in this period. From 2004, it was made possible for Dutch sports organizations to join PSO, a member organization with a large body of knowledge in the field of development cooperation. The PSO membership of NOC*NSF was a turning point that made various sport for development organizations think differently about their approach. It stimulated NKS (later: NSA International), for instance, to focus on capacity building. In the NKS programs human resource, organizational and institutional development became key. Moreover, new funding possibilities for Dutch sport for development organizations arose through PSO.

2008-2013
On 11 February 2008, the then Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation Bert Koenders and the State Secretary for Health, Welfare and Sport Mariëtte Bussemaker presented the policy memorandum entitled The power of sport in development cooperation. An open goal [Een kans voor open doel. De kracht van sport in ontwikkelingssamenwerking]. This policy memorandum had the intention to stimulate Dutch involvement and commitment in the field of sport and development cooperation.

The vision behind this memorandum was to enable development cooperation bodies and organizations to make optimal and sustainable use of the power of sport and play programs. Furthermore the starting point was a focus on cooperation in which sport can make a contribution to development goals. Therefore, the policy was built around the following three elements:
• Commitment to the use of sport within international development cooperation by Dutch organizations (also known as ‘Sports coalitions in action’, via NOC*NSF);
• Commitment to the use of sport within international development cooperation by local organizations (via Embassies);
• Commitment to reinforcing the support for the use of sport within international development cooperation in the Netherlands (via NCDO).

The program aimed to improve the position of young people, girls and women, and the disabled in 10 selected countries (partially) through the application of Dutch sports know-how. The selected countries were South Africa, Suriname, Kenya, Burkina Faso, Zambia, Mozambique, Senegal, Bhutan, Indonesia and Guatemala. Aside from these countries, special projects were set up in three fragile states: Burundi, Sudan and the Palestinian Territories.

The program focused specifically on the themes of health, education and emancipation/participation and was implemented by so-called main contractors: NSA, KNVB, Todos, Respo and Bhutan and Partners. They cooperated with Right To Play, Women Win and various local organizations, mainly community based. The explicit role of Dutch embassies in this memorandum was new. In the years before, embassies were incidentally involved in sport for development programs, for example in Zambia and South Africa. Their involvement heavily depended on personal interest by embassy staff members. Now, with the new memorandum, embassies in 10 countries had to integrate sport for development in their activities and programs.

The budget made available for the period between 2008 and 2011 was 16 million Euro. This money was partly allocated to fund the commitment by Dutch sport and/or development organizations. An evaluation by NCDO (2011) provided insight in the quantitative and qualitative results of the program. The most important successes were formulated as ‘new network relations’ and ‘collaborations with domains outside sport’. For example, NSA created a large network of grassroots community based organizations in Kenya, where it runs programs focused on peace, security, education and livelihood. Also, ‘knowledge exchange’ through joint training programs and cooperation with universities was mentioned as a yield of the program. The evaluation also provided various recommendations, such as ‘more focus on knowledge exchange through the re-use of products and exchange of best practices’ and ‘provide frameworks (such as guidance indicators) for monitoring and evaluation’.

The 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa provided a boost to sport for development activities. In the context of this World Cup, the KNVB re-named their global coach the coaches program into ‘WorldCoaches’ and re-positioned their program with the explicit integration of life skills in football courses. The WorldCoaches program became less dependent on government subsidies thanks to the interest and involvement of private organizations, such as Nike. Also, the WorldCoaches program offered various opportunities for public-private-partnerships (so-called PPPs), which was acknowledged by the water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) sector. In 2011, a PPP between KNVB, the WASH sector and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs emerged, resulting in a Football for Water program in Ghana, Kenya and Mozambique.
Because the 2008 policy memorandum on sport for development expired in 2011, a new program was developed in 2012. This time, the program was composed solely by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Ministry of Sport has sport for development not formally in its portfolios anymore, since its focus is more on domestic issues now. Within the newly initiated program ‘Sport for Development 2012-2015’ the main themes are sustainable development and peace. Disadvantaged groups – youth, children, women, girls and disabled people- again have a central position within the program.

Furthermore, the program is less focused on raising public support and knowledge sharing than before and has shifted to the support of sport networks for social entrepreneurship. Whereas in the period 2008-2011 a budget of 16 million Euro was available, for this program a budget of 6 million is allocated, due to overall budget cuts within development cooperation. The number of target countries also went down from 10 to 8. At the same time new target countries have been appointed as part of those 8 selected countries. NSA International, KNVB and Right to Play are the implementers of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Dutch SfD policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980s Sport as private domain; traditional development cooperation</td>
<td>No policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s Sport as a source of inspiration for society; more emphasis on social development</td>
<td>First formal policy on SfD: ‘Sport in Development: Teamwork Scores!’ (Ministry of Sport and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s Sport as an effective tool for development; emerge of 4th pillar in development cooperation</td>
<td>New country program SfD: ‘An open goal. The power of sport in development cooperation’ (Ministry of Sport and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010s Sport as a contributor to development and social entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Program: ‘Sport for Development 2012-2015’ (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sport for development in policy in the Netherlands

2.2 International policy and programs

Brief history

‘Sport for All’ was the name of probably the first sport for development program and was implemented in Tanzania by the Norwegian Olympic Committee and Confederation of Sports (NIF) in 1983. In Norway, athlete involvement played a large role in the emergence of sport as a development instrument and still, national sport role models have a large influence on the public opinion of sport for development. Right To Play (formerly: Olympic Aid), headed by erstwhile Norwegian Olympic speed skating champion Johann Olav Koss, became the largest international NGO for sport and development and uses popular elite athletes as their ambassadors.

Another sport for development early adaptor is Canada. Formal involvement of the Canadian government was initiated at the 1991 Commonwealth Heads of Government (CHOM) meeting. Since 2000, Canada is accommodating the headquarters of Right To Play in Toronto. In the early 2000s, the Netherlands together with Norway and Canada were able to call themselves the frontrunners of the ‘movement’, with Right To Play as a strong lobbyist for the sport and development issue internationally.
Norway
The Norwegian Olympic Committee and Confederation of Sports (NIF) was able to implement a sports development aid project because of the changes in Norwegian development aid strategies in the 1990s. These changes made funds available for private organizations. In order to be funded, certain demands were proposed by NORAD, which was Norway’s public implementing aid agency at the time. Over the years public support for sport has been an important factor as well. Many governments indicated that individual champions, like Johann Olav Koss, were invaluable in mobilizing government support for sport for development and peace by demonstrating the power of sport in highly personal and compelling ways (Straume & Steen-Johnsen, 2012).

Canada
Formal involvement of the government in Canada was initiated at the 1991 Commonwealth Heads of Government (CHOM) meeting and since then Canada has been well known within the sport for development sector (Hayhurst & Frisby, 2010). Internationally, Canada plays an influential role by structural cooperation with multilateral partners as the forum of Commonwealth Sports Ministers Conference, the Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport, the Conference of the Youth and Sports Ministers of French-speaking Countries (CONFEJES) and the United Nations Group of Friends for Sport for Development and Peace.

Box 2: policy development in Norway and Canada

During the Olympic Winter Games in Salt Lake City (2002), Right To Play organized a round table conference on SfD. The Salt Lake City conference resulted in the founding of a special taskforce on Sports for Peace and Development and the appointment of mr. Adolf Ogi as the special UN ambassador in 2003. The taskforce evolved into the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG) who aimed at achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Right To Play served as Secretariat to SDP IWG from 2004 to 2008. The SDP IWG was a high-level policy initiative mobilizing 59 national governments and key stakeholders from UN agencies and civil society. The focus on using sport for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals has been present in the approach of the UN since the 2003 UN Task Force Report Sport for Development and Peace: Towards Attaining the Millennium Development Goals. Subsequently, many governments refer to the MDGs when stating to use sport as tool for development.

In 2003, the UN set up the Office of Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP) in order to further contribute in a more systematic and coherent way to the promotion of sport as a cost-effective development tool. Since then, the UN Member States, gathered in the General Assembly, have repeatedly demonstrated commitment and support to the use of sport as a vehicle for human development and peace-building by adopting a series of resolutions.

Sport and United Nations
As early as 1922, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the United Nations International Labor Organization (ILO) already established institutional cooperation, resulting later on in partnerships with other United Nations agencies and programs. Furthermore, the right of access to and participation in sport and play has long been recognized in a number of international conventions. In 1978, UNESCO described sport and physical education as a “fundamental right for all”. However, sport and physical education programs directed at achieving development goals tended to be used in an ad hoc, informal and isolated manner. In 2001, former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan nominated Adolf Ogi as his Special Adviser on Sport for Development and Peace, who was succeeded in April 2008 by Wilfried Lemke.

Box 3: Sport and United Nations

The increased interest from donor countries, such as Australia, the UK, Switzerland and Germany and the EU, stimulated a rise in requests from the developing countries, especially from Africa, and at the same time these requests from the South could be more adequately targeted by specific
organizations. UK Sport and Commonwealth Canada organized a donor conference in London and a recipient conference in Johannesburg. The main issue of debate at these conferences was cooperation between North and South. Here, the first steps were taken to formulate a code of conduct for cooperation between Northern and Southern organizations. SCORE, a South African NGO, was the coordinating organization for recipient countries in and played in import role in the formulation of the code of conduct.

At the first Magglingen conference in February 2003, many international organizations and governments signed the Magglingen declaration, expressing their commitment to sport and development. Just like its 2005 edition, this conference was organized by the Advisor to the UN Secretary General on Sport for Development and Peace, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SAD) and Federal Office of Sport Magglingen (BASPO). In November 2003, the Netherlands – specifically NCDO, the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport (VWS) and NOC*NSF – organized an international meeting of experts, entitled ‘The Next Step’. Here, practitioners from both the North and the South gathered for the first time to debate the value of sport and to decide what steps to take. The Next Step Conference in Amsterdam was followed by editions in Zambia (2003), Namibia (2007) and Trinidad & Tobago (2011). After those conferences, new network organizations arose, such as Kicking AIDS out.

However, sport and physical education programs directed at achieving development goals tended to be used in an ad hoc, informal and isolated manner. In 2005, which was declared by the UN as the Year of Sport and Physical Education (IYSPE), this has been recognized by stating: “What was missing, was a systematic approach to an important sector in civil society: sport” (UN, 2005). Consequently, “the United Nations is turning to the world of sport for help in the work for peace and the effort to achieve the Millennium Development Goals”.

The IYSPE was for various governments, both in the North and the South, the starting point for allocating budget to sport for development programs. International umbrella sport organizations, such as the IOC and FIFA, came to realize that sports could contribute significantly to development, and as a result they formulated their own policies, strategies and programs, such as Football for Hope. Also, the interest of developing countries in organizing mega events, such as the Olympic Games and the football World Cup, and accompanying pressure of public opinion not to organize such expensive events at the expense of the poor, forced IOC and FIFA to pursue a social legacy through the organization of such events. In 2008, IOC and the UN agreed on an expanded framework for action to use sport to reach the goals of the UN.

In 2013, the sportanddev.org platform celebrates its 10th anniversary. The platform is a hub for sharing knowledge, building good practice, facilitating coordination and fostering partnerships between and within different stakeholders in sport and development. The International Platform on Sport & Development is currently supported by a diversity of organizations, from the private sector (Nike), the sports sector (International Sport and Culture Association; UEFA), multi governmental (the Commonwealth secretariat), charity (Laureus Foundation), to organizations of national representation (Australian Sports Commission, Norwegian Olympic Committee, UK Sport). In 2012,
sportanddev.org organized an expert meeting held at the Commonwealth Secretariat to develop guidelines on Sport for Development and Peace to be used throughout the Commonwealth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3rd UN-IOC Forum on Sport for Peace and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Experts Meeting at the Commonwealth Secretariat to develop guidelines on Sport for Development and Peace to be used throughout the Commonwealth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF Roundtable on child protection in sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4th conference 'The Next Step', held in Trinidad &amp; Tobago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd UN-IOC Forum on Sport for Peace and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010 FIFA World Cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>First UN-IOC Forum on Sport for Development and Peace held in Lausanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online e-debate with SfD experts, convened by sportanddev.org and NCDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon establishes a trust fund on Sport for Development and Peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. W. Lemke appointed as the new Special Adviser on Sport for Development and Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IOC and the UN agree on an expanded framework for action to use sport to reach the goals of the UN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>European Commission publishes a White Paper on Sport stating it will promote the use of sport as a tool for development in international development policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd conference 'The Next Step', Windhoek, Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Magglingen 2005 Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Parliament Resolution on Sport and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd conference 'The Next Step', Livingstone, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF Workshop on Monitoring and Evaluation, New York, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Council of Europe: The Contribution of Sport to Intercultural Dialogue, Istanbul, Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roundtable Forum: Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace, Athens, Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>UN Resolution 58/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Next Step: 'International Expert Meeting on Development In and Through Sport', Amsterdam, The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP-IWG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of International platform <a href="http://www.sportanddev.org">www.sportanddev.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Donor Meeting, London, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Recipient Meeting, Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UN Task Force Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment of mr. A. Ogi as UN Special Advisor on Sport for Development and Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration and Recommendations: Magglingen Conference on Sport &amp; Development, Magglingen, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Round Table Conference - Salt Lake City, USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 4: Selection of International and National Milestones
Over the years, a SfD sector emerged. The sector is characterized by its broad engagement of acting players; governmental and nongovernmental, sport and non-sport. Also private organizations get involved in SfD. Sport related businesses, like Nike and Adidas, choose cooperation with organizations, projects or programs that match with their marketing or corporate social responsibly (CSR) strategy. The same applies for soft drink manufacturers, telecom suppliers and health insurance companies, who share an interest in image building and awareness in developing countries. Even the English Premier League clubs expand their social activities from deprived areas in their own home town to less privileged countries in the South.

The SfD sector can be characterized as an arena (Van Eekeren, 2006). This arena is formed by diverse actors: target groups (in the South), recipients (governments, NGOs and community based organizations in the South), intermediary organizations (SfD organizations and their implementing partners) and donors (governments, UN, EU, sponsors). The arena gets more and more complicated because of the increasing number of actors, a great variety of roles and forms of cooperation, and conflicting interest. Furthermore, the actions by the actors are influenced by ‘soft and intangible powers’, such as (international) politics, public opinion, lobby, relationships and access of information.

2.3 Dutch policy and approaches in international perspective

Anno 2013, the Netherlands is no longer one of ‘the frontrunners of the SfD movement’ – as it used to be in the early 2000s. This is due to national policy changes (in finances, content and capacity) and the massive expansion of SfD in other countries. However, this does not mean that the Netherlands plays an insignificant role.

2.3.1 Donor country policies

Not in all donor countries a self-standing policy on this thematic area exist. The United Kingdom for instance, a significant actor in the sector, has no overarching or self-standing policy. In the UK, sport for development is integrated in a less-structured way into their international development and international sport efforts. Departments within the government are working together informally. Canada also lacks an overarching policy on its international approach to sport for development. Its involvement is characterized by the engagement of different departments and agencies. Sport has been linked at various points in time to Canada’s foreign policy, international development and international sport policy objectives.

Another significant actor, Switzerland, has taken a mainstreaming approach since 2007 by embedding sport as a development theme within the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation on par with other development themes (such as education, health, water, sanitation, etc.). This means sport has to compete for funding with other methods and instruments and the recognition of sport as valuable tool became increasingly important. Before, sport for development used to be a freestanding program with its own budget.

Norway and Australia seem to have the most centralized and uniformed approach. Norwegian government formulates one of its main lessons learned over the years as follows: Long-term commitment is important in sport for development. Unless the government and its partners are
prepared to work in a country for a prolonged period of time, it will be difficult to achieve positive results and to establish true collaboration among multiple stakeholders (SDP IWG, 2007). At the moment, one of the most ambitious SfD policies by donor countries seems to be delivered by Australia. Recently, it launched its Development-through-sport 2013-2017 strategy, which can be described as elaborate. It identifies development objectives first and then identifies how well planned sport-based activities can contribute to these objectives via a joint strategy between the Australian Sports Commission (ASC) and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID).

**United Kingdom**
The national government supports sport development and human development through sport under the International Development Assistance Program (IDAP). UK Sport, a semi-independent agency of the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), is leading the activities of the United Kingdom.

**Switzerland**
The Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC), as part of the Foreign Ministry, is the leading body for SFD within the Swiss government, in close cooperation with the Federal Office of Sport (FOSPO).

**Canada**
Canadian Heritage (PCH) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Department of National Defence (DND), and Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT) all make and have made significant investments in sport for development over the years.

**Norway**
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) is responsible for the Norwegian Strategy for Culture and Sports Cooperation. MFA and Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) are jointly involved in SFD. Norad primarily works with NGOs and provides long term development assistance. NIF is an important implementing partner.

**Australia**
The Development-through-sport 2013-2017 strategy is a joint effort of the Australian Sports Commission (ASC) and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID).

**Box 5: international policy**

National Dutch policies on SfD have been influential, but not very stable over the years. This fluctuation can be traced back to several factors, such as the varying political attention and accompanying resources. Over the years, the Dutch political landscape and development cooperation policy changed, influencing the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ involvement in sport. At times, sport and international cooperation became either marginalized or stimulated, as has been described in 2.1.

Remarkable in the Dutch organization of SfD over the years is that the program is not implemented by one or two central parties, but rather by a number of mutual reinforcing partners. These are both local active partners as well as various Dutch organizations. The current implementing partners of the Dutch SfD program, i.e. NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play, have played an important role in the continuity and enforcement of SfD in the Netherlands. NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play developed their programs partly because of the possibilities of Dutch national policy, partly because of the liberty (and sometimes need) to take own initiative.
Another remarkable notion is the way in which the Netherlands selects its target countries. All government funded programs take place in developing countries which have a historical relationship with the Netherlands and/or are a fragile state. Since this criterion is decisive for receiving funding, this has had a major impact on the country selection by Dutch SfD organizations.

2.3.2 Differences and similarities in approaches

The current SfD program can be characterized as a policy framework that allows a limited number of experienced implementing partners and local embassies to deliver context specific SfD interventions. Point of departure for the implementation is to bundle forces and to avoid fragmentation in order to strengthen ownership, quality and efficiency. Therefore a programmatic approach is being used, which is needs-based, cohesive and based upon a context analysis in each country. This means the Dutch approach is not characterized by ‘one size fits all’, but by ‘tailor made’. The program aims to connect the operations at micro (grassroots) level with the cooperation at meso (organizational) level and advocacy at macro (national and international) level.

NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play can be characterized by their structural involvement in SfD, long-term relationships in both the North and the South, and their specific approaches. In the end, all three partners want to use the power of sport to improve the lives of people in developing countries. ‘Change’ – in knowledge, attitude or behavior – is their main objective. At the same time, they differ in the way they want to achieve this objective. They focus on different approaches, target groups, social issues and countries, as illustrated in Table 2:

‘Change’ – in knowledge, attitude or behavior – is the main objective of NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>NSA International</th>
<th>KNVB</th>
<th>Right To Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity building in sport and peace programs and organizations. Increasing support for SfD</td>
<td>Educating football coaches Developing local communities</td>
<td>Educating youth leaders Implementing sport and play programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main focus</td>
<td>Youth development through human resources development (sport leadership), organizational enforcement, institutional development. Influencing (national) SfD policies</td>
<td>Football skills combined with life skills Local capacity building</td>
<td>Behavioral change: physical, social, emotional, cognitive Local capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social issues</td>
<td>Security and safety Health Economic empowerment Gender</td>
<td>WASH Gender HIV/AIDS Crime Addiction</td>
<td>Education Health Peaceful communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Kenya, Uganda, South Sudan, Surinam, Burkina Faso, Mali, Egypt, Indonesia, The Netherlands</td>
<td>Netherlands Antilles, Surinam, Brazil, Senegal, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Zambia, Mozambique, South Africa, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Jordan</td>
<td>Benin, Burundi, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, China, Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories, Thailand, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of programs</td>
<td>Youth Development/Country programs International Sport Leaders Exchange Peace Beyond Borders Active citizenship Dutch movement SfD</td>
<td>Football for Water SOS Children’s Villages Lighting Up Communities Club Linking Arabic Spring</td>
<td>Country programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nsa-international.nl">www.nsa-international.nl</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.worldcoaches.nl">www.worldcoaches.nl</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.righttoplay.nl">www.righttoplay.nl</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Dutch SFD partners

NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play differ, but are in many ways complementary. Whereas Right To Play is to a large extent an implementing organization, NSA International does not execute sport and play projects itself, but focuses on structural capacity building of local organizations and its institutional surroundings in order to deliver valuable and sustainable programs for youths. KNVB and Right To Play both educate sport coaches. KNVB takes sport (i.e. football) as a starting point for development, whereas Right To Play and NSA International regard sport and play as a tool for development. All organizations have developed curricula and manuals for sport/football trainers/coaches.

Also, similarities in approaches can be analyzed. The Dutch SfD partners are all aimed at ‘software’ in the form of capacity-building (i.e. transfer of knowledge and skills) instead of ‘hardware’ (i.e. building sport facilities). This comes along with the development of curricula, training courses and manuals. This approach is comparable with the Australian one, recently presented in their strategy.
for 2013-2017, but it contrasts with approaches from FIFA for example, whose programs float on building sport grounds.

Furthermore, the Dutch approach can be characterized by its attempt to set up local networks, or closely cooperate with local organizations, in order to contribute to local capacity building and sustainable programs. The Dutch SFD organizations consider local coaches or community leaders as the most effective role models and change agents. Again, similarities with the Australian approach arise. Also Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) from Germany and Norges Idrettsforbund (NIF) from Norway invest in local ‘soft’ structures. Others, such as UK Sports, focus on strengthening the national sports systems within developing countries working with ministries, sports federations and NGOs, and not so much in cooperation with community based organizations. Canadian Heritage invested a large extent of their sport for development funds in advocacy and support of international networks.

The three Dutch partners emphasize knowledge development and sharing. NSA International works closely together with various universities of applied sciences in the Netherlands, KNVB has a long term relationship with Utrecht University and Right To Play cooperates with the University of Toronto. Similar relationships between SFD organizations and scholars can be seen in Australia and the UK. The AustralianAID and Australian Sport Commission have founded their SFD strategy on various academic reports and UK Sports has had studies carried out by the University of Stirling. At the same time, the cooperation between academics and SFD organizations in other countries is often limited to incidental monitoring and evaluation (M&E) studies.

In general, it can be argued that there is not a specific Dutch approach nor that Dutch organizations do something completely different than other SFD organizations. Nevertheless, the Dutch organizations do have certain features that characterize their way of working. See Box 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common features of Dutch sport for development organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on ‘software’: transfer of knowledge and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of curricula, training courses and manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local capacity building through multi-stakeholder approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local coaches and community leaders as role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variety of implementing partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 6: Features of the ‘Dutch approach’
3 Academic research: towards a model

This chapter describes the expansion of academic interest in SfD. This will be illustrated by the growing numbers of conferences, journals, education, and publications. In the second part of this chapter we explore in depth what has been studied by this growing number of interested scientists. This results in the introduction of a basic model of sport for development.

3.1 The expansion of academic interest

As stated in the previous chapter, ‘sport for development’ is the use of sport to exert a positive influence on public health, the socialization of children, youths and adults, the social inclusion of the disadvantaged, the economic development of regions and states, and on fostering intercultural exchange and conflict resolution (Sugden, 1993, 2006, 2008; Lyras, 2007; Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). In recent years, the number of new programs and projects has increased, just as the attention by policy makers for sport for development. Subsequently, scientists from different academic disciplines delve increasingly into the topic of sport for development (Hognestad & Tollisen, 2004; Coalter, 2007, 2010; Kidd, 2008, 2011; Levermore & Beacom, 2009; Straume & Steen-Johnsen, 2012; Donnelly & Coakley, 2013). Scientists become interested in this societal phenomenon, they want to research the claims that are formulated in policy and/or are asked by policy makers and policy contractors to study the impact of projects and programs.

3.1.1 Quantity

It is noteworthy that the increasing use of the concept ‘sport for development’ in studies suggests a significant change in perspective on this field as an academic discipline has occurred. Until the 1990s, sport for development seemed to have a low standing academic status (Van Eekeren, 2006). Studying sport for development was approached as a hobby gotten out of hand, and not as a factor contributing to a serious academic career. Now, we can argue that academic output (such as conferences, education and publications) has increased significantly.

Conferences

A decade ago, one or two annual international conferences were taking place where all possible topics within sport for development were discussed (e.g. the Next Step Conferences, meetings between practitioners and academics with a very practical approach, and the Magglingen conferences, with policy makers, academics and practitioners and a focus on policy formulation) or sport for development was a small part of a broader summit (e.g. World Conference on Sport, Education and Culture). Nowadays, well-attended international conferences and networking
meetings are taking place the whole year round, both in First World countries and in the developing countries, often focusing on just one specific theme within sport for development. An overview of recent events on www.sportanddev.org (2013) shows that from February until July 2013, 37 conferences, seminars and debates were held all over the world.

**Journals**

Journals like the International Review for the Sociology of Sport, Sport in Society, Sociology of Sport Journal, Sport Management Review, Journal of Sport and Social Issues and Soccer and Society publish articles about sport for development. In April 2013, the first academic journal exclusively focusing on sport for development was published. The editorial team of the ‘Journal of Sport for Development’ (JSFD) conceived the idea in November 2011. They were ‘frustrated by the paucity of published evidence supporting the positive rhetoric that continued to fuel the growth of Sport for Development programs’ (Richards et al., 2013) and noted that many practitioners did not have access to the few subscription-based journals that were publishing relevant content. Therefore they came up with the idea to develop a peer-reviewed, open access journal dedicated entirely to sport for development.

**Education**

Academic institutions are offering an increasing number of bachelor, master and PhD courses and degrees in the area of Sport for Development. Some examples of academic programs: Sport and International Development (University of Brighton, UK), Interdisciplinary Training and Research in Sport and Development (The First Citizen Sport Foundation, the University of West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago; The Interdisciplinary Centre for Sport and Development (ICESSD), University of the Western Cape South Africa), Sports Coaching Science with Disability Sport (University of Worcester, UK), Sport for Social Coexistence and Conflict Resolution (Open University of Catalonia, UNESCO, and Futbol Club Barcelonafoundation, Spain), PhD in Sport for Development and Peace (University of Ulster, Ireland), Sports Policy and Sport Management (Utrecht University), Sport and Development (University of Johannesburg, South Africa). This development is also detectable in other regions, like America and Australasia.

**Publications**

The increased academic interest is best reflected in the number of scientific publications over the last couple years. Searching in Web of Science, traditionally regarded as the most useful and trustful academic database (Mikki, 2009), gives an impression of the increased amount of articles published in peer reviewed journals. Searching on the keywords “Sport for development”, “Sport and development” and “Development through Sport” in the period between 1998 and 2012, results in 44 articles. Most of those articles were published since the year 2010, as illustrated in the following graph:
Figure 2: Number of articles per year about ‘sport for development’, ‘sport and development’ and ‘sport through development’ in Web of Science

An important remark is that Web of Science is limited to articles which are published in journals which have passed a thorough selection process based on publication standards, expert judgments, regular appearances and quality of citation data (Garfield, 1990; Mikki, 2009).

Google Scholar, another academic database referred to as ‘a new paradigm in academic research’ (Drewry, 2007), covers a wider variety of publications than Web of Science. Next to journal and conference papers, it also includes theses and dissertations, academic books, pre-prints, abstracts, technical reports and other scholarly literature from all broad areas of research. In the period before 1998, 141 articles with these keywords are identified. 124 of them were published in the 15 years between 1982 and 1997. In the period 1998-2012 the foregoing keywords resulted in 2,050 publications, as illustrated by the following graph:

Figure 3: Number of publications per year about ‘sport for development’, ‘Sport and Development’ and ‘Sport through Development’ in Google Scholar

Important side note is that in Google Scholar, compared to Web of Science, less degree of control is offered for performing systematically searches. Moreover it is criticized, content lacks important sources and the amount of noise makes the service less useful for thorough literature searching (Mikki, 2009). However, the amount of qualified scholarly content has increased considerably in Google Scholar since its launch in 2004 and it is therefore a relevant tool to provide insight in the increased interest in the topic.
This graph shows undoubtedly that the number of scientific publications about sport for development is rapidly increasing. Every year, more articles and books are written about this subject. The increase might be fuelled by mega events taking place in developing countries, such as FIFA World Cups and the Olympic Games. Several organizations started for example new projects in the context of the World Cup in South Africa in 2010. This might have drawn the attention of academics as well.

3.1.2 Quality

An analysis of the published scientific articles over the last years makes clear that not only quantity has changed, the qualitative aspect of these publications as well. In the early years of sport for development as an academic discipline, most published studies concerned single case studies. They gave valuable insights in the projects, but had two disadvantages: not all kinds of projects were covered and they mainly had a focus on sub-Saharan Africa. Moreover, the results were not always comparable. Nowadays, more often a multiple case study method is used and those studies have a longer time span than before. The largest study ever conducted in the field concerns an evaluation of six sport-based projects in various parts of world (funded by Comic Relief and UK Sports) over a five-year period by Coalter and Taylor (2010). Nonetheless, the need for more longitudinal studies remains, since the majority of studies is based on a short time frame.

Themes

Different themes are covered in the scientific publications, as shown in figure 4. They can be divided in themes related to the implementation of projects, like volunteerism, coaching and training, and themes which are related to outcomes, like health and social capital. Most studies are written about sport for development in relation to health, but in general the implementation-related themes are the most studied. Many articles mention evaluations, partnerships, and coaching and training. Volunteerism is, to a lesser extent, also frequently studied. Articles about sport mega-events like the Olympic Games/Olympics and the World Cup are also frequently published.

![Figure 4: Number of publications in English about a certain theme and 'sport for development', 'Sport and Development' or 'Sport through Development' in Google Scholar, 1998-2012](image-url)
Authors
Most studies are conducted by researchers from donor countries. This is not a truly surprising fact, however it emphasizes the mutual – often termed ‘unequal’ - relation between donor en receiving countries. The conducted literature review is focused on academic publications in the English language, because of the language proficiency of researchers and the potential global reach of publications (see figure 5).

![Diagram showing the distribution of publications in different languages.]

**Figure 5: Number of publications in a certain language about Sport for Development in Google Scholar, 1998-2012**

It is relevant to take a look as well at research published in the Spanish language, because developmental work also takes place in Central and South America and is implemented by Spanish speaking organizations. A quick scan (using the keywords “deporte para el desarrollo”; “deporte y desarrollo”; “desarrollo a través del deporte”) made clear that this amount is still quite limited. In Web of Science no articles were found, in Google Scholar this search resulted in 100 unique articles in the period between 1998 and 2013. Furthermore, we also looked at publications in French, since these may capture research undertaken in French-speaking countries in Africa (using the keywords “sport pour le développement”; “sport et développement”; “développement par le sport”). Again, no results in Web of Science, while Google Scholar provided 125 unique results.

In light of the upcoming amount of programs in Arabic countries, research published in Arabic has been reviewed. A search in Arabic (العربيةукていبلايد فيييبخس ومعيي شرایط علاقة) in Google Scholar resulted in 176 publications. Most of them are websites leaving the amount of scientific articles relatively low. Recurring themes in these publications are the promotion of participation in sport for disabled people and health-related themes. A search in English for articles about sport for development in Arab countries resulted in about 66 articles. Popular themes are female role models in sport, peace building and sport as a mediator between cultures (most projects are school-based co-existence projects for Jewish and Arab children), and the role of the media (especially in the United Arab Emirates).
When looking at the research from ‘the South’, researchers from South Africa are present in international academic circles. Researchers from other Southern countries are scarce. Nicholls et al. (2011) argue that the lack of evidence in the field of sport for development can be partly explained by the subjugation of local knowledge and knowledge of sport for development practitioners. They suggest that acknowledging and privileging the contributions typically made to the field by the female, young, black African sport for development grassroots practitioners’ knowledge, have the potential to result in a more robust evidence base and challenge the lack of evidence discourse. This is an interesting perspective, since current evaluation of programs - if there already exists any form of systematic evaluation – is often donor-driven and provides in many cases mainly relevant information for funders. This knowledge is not added to the current academic knowledge base and in some cases is not even being used for program development.

Academic disciplines
The ordering of keywords of the academic articles found in Web of Science results in the word cloud depicted below in Figure 6. Remarkable is that most concepts are in the angle of development studies (social, moral, youth, communities, education, social, rights and decolonization) and can be less associated with purely sport sciences. This can be explained by the fact that just a small part of research is done from a sport science perspective. The main research areas in which sport for development studies are conducted, are in public administration, social sciences, sociology and psychology.

Figure 6: Wordcloud based on ordening of keywords of the academic publications found in Web of Science

Sport for development compared to creative activities
Several developmental organizations use creative activities like drama, music, theater and dance in a comparable way to the use of sport for development. Frequently, discussions arise about the added value of each activity: which activity is most effective? Questioned is also whether organizations in different fields can or should learn from each other. Figure 7 shows that academics have published less about these creative activities than about sport. Within the creative activities, academics have written more scientific publications about drama and music than about theater and dance. But even if all those activities are combined, the conclusion is that the academic attention for creative activities is less than the attention for sport for development.
Figure 7: Number of publications in English about a certain activity and development in Google Scholar, 1998-2012

Research methods
Gratton and Jones (2004) describe several possible research designs for sports studies: from experimental designs to surveys and from case study's to longitudinal approaches. The choice for a research design is based on the research question and the objectives of the study, but is also influenced by practical issues and the background of the researcher. Whereas since recent years within development studies quantitative methods (household surveys in combination with regression analysis) are increasingly being used, this kind of research is hardly done within sport for development. This can be explained by the fact that most research conducted in the field of sport for development is done in academic disciplines such as public administration, social sciences, psychology and sport sciences.

Economists and statistics advocates are underrepresented, and so are health scientists. Most health related research in the field of sport for development is focused on the prevention of HIV/AIDS, since this involves awareness and education interventions and requires behavioral change. Behavioral change is most researched by psychologists and sociologists. At the same time, the academic debate on sport mega events has attracted the attention of economists, which often focus on a macro level approach.

The outcomes of sport for development programs are often hard to explicit and subsequently to measure. Therefore, the main quantitative data is on output, such as participation in sports (number of participants, number of trained coaches, number of training sessions etc.) and not on the subsequent higher development goals. At the same time, politicians and policy makers feel the necessity and tendency to quantify outcomes and to suggest a causal relation between interventions and outcomes, in light of accountability issues. This can result in a clash with the perceptions of grassroots practitioners.

Recently, an academic altitude has been reached, when Lyras (2009) advanced a Sport for Development Theory (SFDT) grounded in empirical evidence from the field, which advocates an
interdisciplinary approach. Although other theoretical approaches have previously been explored within the global sport for development literature, SFDT is the one of the first attempts to provide a theoretical foundation for the management of sport interventions effectively promoting social change, peace, and development (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011). More specifically, SFDT was designed to address the gap between theory and practice by using scientific procedures to assess three components – content, process, and outcomes – of sport for development programs.

3.2 Towards a basic model for sport for development

In light of the increased amount of research and inspired by the SFDT, in this paragraph a theoretical model will be explored that describes how sport (not) contributes to development. One of the most relevant questions is: What claims can and cannot be made about sport for development based on the current existing academic literature and under what circumstances can sport contribute to development goals?

3.2.1 Overarching development outcomes

As the first chapters revealed, for years high expectations have been imposed on sport for development: sport was supposed to bring peace; poverty and racism would diminish; healthcare and education would improve. Sport for development programs are often executed, evaluated and funded with the expectation of reaching one of these overarching development outcomes. In academic studies, the outcomes ‘health’ and ‘social capital’ have frequently been object of research.

Fundamental to many sport for development programs, is the desire to influence the behavior of people. Via SfD projects, developmental workers try to transfer knowledge (for example, about the consequences of not washing your hands). This knowledge is supposed to influence the attitudes of people (e.g., about the importance of hygiene) and lead to a change in their behavior (e.g., to wash their hands more often). Fishbein & Azjen (1975) explained in their theory of planned behavior how people base their behavior on knowledge and attitude. According to them, it is complicated to reach the desired behavioral change, because many factors influence this change, like perceived control and social norms. Their theory makes clear that it is not easy to reach the overarching development outcomes which are sometimes claimed by SfD projects or their funders.

It is hard to prove a direct causal relation between sport and overarching development outcomes except for health, because all other relationships are indirect and correlate with a variety of other factors. It is hard to prove a direct causal relation between sport and overarching development outcomes, except for health, because all other relationships are indirect and correlate with a variety of other factors (Coalter, 2013). Sport takes place in a complex social context in which various factors influence the final outcomes of a sport for development program. Therefore, SfD projects should be seen as sites for social experiences, not causes for social outcomes (cf. Coakley, 1998). Similarly, Sugden (2006) suggested that sport is like all collective human endeavors, it is a social construction which is influenced by the social forces that surround it. This means that the success of sport in
‘doing good’ depends on the context and the management of a supportive (social, cultural, political, resource and sport) environment. It is not simply ‘sport’ which achieves possible positive or negative outcomes, but the way that sport is provided and experienced (Catalano et al., 2004; Coalter, 2006; Sugden, 2010; Coalter, 2010; Lyras & Welthy Peachey, 2011).

Surveying the research, health is the only overarching development outcome that shows a direct relationship with physical activity. The assumption that sport and physical activity can lead to improved health is incontestable nowadays (WHO, 1995). In the literature a dual relationship has been proven: good health is the outcome of sport, but a good state of health is also a precondition to practice sport (Güldenpfennig, 1996). Sport interventions, like programs and playgrounds, can play an important role in stimulating people to participate in sport, even those who would usually refrain. Empirical evidence exists on the beneficial outcomes of sport on different levels: individual, community and nation/society (SDP IWG, 2007).

Next to studies that point at improved health or better fitness in general, more specific studies have been published. For example, a reduction as a result of physical activity has been proven in non-communicable diseases, such as cardiovascular diseases (Warburton et al., 2006; WHO, 2007), some forms of cancer (Holmes et al., 2005; Haydon et al., 2005), osteoporosis (Warburton et al. 2006), and sport leads to a lower risk on heart disease, chronic respiratory disease, early death, stroke and high blood pressure (SDP IWG, 2007). People who play sports have a lower Body Mass Index (BMI). Therefore, sport helps to prevent obesity (Currie, 2011; Blair & Church, 2004; Rock, Valle & Grabman, 2013) and certain types of diabetes (Warburton et al., 2006).

A less tangible effect is that sport leads to mental health and psychological well-being (Biddle et al., 2000; Fox, 1999, Valois et al., 2004). Sport supports the prevention of depression (Stubbe, 2006) and helps to cope with stress (Berger, 1996). Sport might decrease the likelihood of unhealthy practices, such as illegal drug use (Taliaferro, Rienzo & Donovan, 2010). Research also suggests that sport and physical education may play a role in the fight against HIV/AIDS, by providing a popular site for preventive education and some retardation in the progress of the virus (Mustafa et al., 1999; O’Brien et al., 2004; Delva & Temmerman, 2006; Delva et al., 2010; Maro, Roberts & Sørensen, 2009; Lindsey & Banda, 2011; Njelesani, 2011; Banda & Lindsey, 2011). A more overarching outcome is that regular physical activity may reduce the days individuals are sick during the year. This has potential for reductions in health care spending as well as increased national productivity.

It is important to pay attention to the existence of health objectives varying from country to country. Whereas in developed countries more emphasis is put on specific health objectives for an aging population (such as osteoporosis), this can be different for developing countries, where health objectives are focused on the reduction of communicable diseases (e.g. HIV/AIDS). One should also be aware that there can be several conditions in developing countries, such as a shortage of medicines or conflicting cultural beliefs, that make it more difficult to reach desired outcomes. It is also important to warn against an overly positive judgment of sport, because sport also has a more dark side. Even in the field of health, where many positive outcomes have been proven, negative outcomes are frequent. Sport can result in injuries, and losing a game can produce negative feelings like depression or anger (Berger, 1996).

**SfD projects should be seen as sites for social experiences, not causes for social outcomes.**
Based on the literature, it can be argued that in and of itself, sport is of no intrinsic value: it is neither naturally good nor irrevocably bad (Kidd, 2008). Coalter (2010) warns for the danger of de-contextualized, overly romanticized, communitarian generalizations about the ‘power’ of sport for development. It is not simple sports participation that can hope to achieve most desired outcomes.

3.2.2 Intermediate outcomes

In the previous part of this chapter, it became clear that the desired development outcomes for SfD programs are often too ambitious. Although a direct relation between sport and overarching development outcomes are hard to prove, if certain conditions are met, sport might result in intermediate outcomes as an essential element in the production of the overarching developmental outcomes, like socialization of youth and economic development.

Academic literature shows a long list of possible intermediate outcomes, which are (also) valuable in itself, such as improved social skills, increased self-esteem and increased confidence. Examples of intermediate outcomes of sport for development are (cf. Jarvie, 2003; SDP IWG, 2007; Coalter, 2010):

- development of life skills
- increased social interaction
- new relationships and role models
- increased self-esteem and self-confidence
- leadership development
- increased understanding of social issues
- community building.

Also less desired outcomes can occur. For example, sport programs can lead to more self-esteem, but also to arrogance. Sport can lead to team building, but also to exclusion of others, who are not part of the team. Sport leads to health benefits, but prolonged exercises may increase the risk on upper respiratory tract infections (Nieman, 2001). Social capital can be seen as an overarching term that comprises several possible intermediate outcomes of a sport for development program. A useful general definition of social capital is that it refers to ‘social networks based on social and group norms, which enable people to trust and cooperate with each other and via which individuals or groups can obtain certain types of advantage’ (Coalter, 2010). In other words, social capital emphasizes and refers to the value of social networks. Like other forms of capital, social capital makes the achievement of certain ends possible. It is assumed that an increase of social capital will have a positive impact on social issues, such as gender relations, HIV/AIDS, crime and alcohol and drug addiction. Fukuyama (1999) states that social capital can have an economic and a social effect. Economically, social capital includes norms and values that facilitate exchanges, lower transaction costs, reduce the cost of information, permit trade in the absence of contracts and the collective management of resources. Socially, social capital encourages responsible citizenship. Social cohesion between people in the community, besides physical quality, can contribute to a safer living environment. In a community with high trust, it is likely to have less
crime, less antisocial behavior and less social fragmentation (Jarvie, 2003). In the end, however, social capital remains quite intangible, because it exists in relationships (Coleman, 1988).

Social capital is seen as essential for a community, though. Communities with high levels of social capital are characterized by three main components (Coalter, 2010). Firstly, they have strong social networks and civic infrastructure. Secondly, they are characterized by strong social norms. Thirdly, these norms both support and reinforce mutual trust and reciprocity among members of a community. These three components are illustrative for the potential of social capital for development ends. Two main components of social capital are bonding social capital and bridging social capital. Bonding refers to the value assigned to intra-group connections or social networks between homogeneous groups of people. The bridging component of social capital is more diverse and inclusive of people of different backgrounds, but tends to be weaker. Schulenkorf (2013) added a third component: linking social capital, which refers to the relationships of individuals and groups with people in positions of influence within formal institutions. The key point of linking social capital is “it’s not what you know, it’s who you know”.

Sports have extensively been related to social capital and its consequences. For example, several studies have mentioned that sport leads to more self-confidence, self-approval and self-efficacy, and to ‘life skills’ like discipline, responsibility and perseverance (e.g. Van Bottenburg & Schuyt, 1996; Berger, 1996; Malloy et al., 2003; Bailey, 2005), but there are also examples of studies that show that sport can lead to negative consequences. For instance, sport does not automatically provide bridges for disparate communities, but sport may in fact serve as a locus for intergroup division. Members of marginalized groups have used sport clubs as an outlet in which they exclusively confirm their ethnic identity through homogeneous activities. Thus, a sport project can also lead to the exclusion of outsiders (Portes, 1998; Vermeulen & Verweel, 2009).

The positive consequences associated with social capital are summarized in table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro</strong></td>
<td>Development of human capital:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual</td>
<td>• Social and emotional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher access to employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>Social inclusion and community building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(community/group)</td>
<td>Strong relationships/networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reciprocal service provision: people are offering help and receiving advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or support in other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energetic communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher level of civic and voluntary activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro</strong></td>
<td>Stronger civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nation/society)</td>
<td>More civic pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Positive consequences associated with social capital (based on Jarvie, 2003; Schulenkorf, 2013; SDP IWG, 2007; Verweel & Anthonissen, 2006)*
Jarvie (2003) also gives an overview of the negative consequences that might be associated with social capital. These consequences are summarized in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro (individual)</td>
<td>Restrictions of personal freedom and autonomy because of conformity within the group or community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso (community/group)</td>
<td>The exclusion of outsiders Group or community closure which inhibits the economic success of its members. Free-riding on the part of some group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro (nation/society)</td>
<td>Downward leveling norms because of conformity within the group or community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Negative consequences associated with social capital (based on Portes, 1998 and Jarvie, 2003)

Schulenkorf (2013) warns that the ability of short-term interventions to create social capital needs to be critically assessed, especially regarding claims about events’ lasting contributions to social capital. Despite the strong theoretical and anecdotal support highlighting that sport and event programs can have a positive impact on communities, little empirical evidence supports this claim – particularly in relation to culturally or ethnically divided societies. A need remains for empirical evaluations of programs. Coakley (2002) adds that, despite the many studies on the importance for sport and character building, a direct influence is hard to prove, the impact of sport cannot be separated from the impact of contextual factors. He concludes that sport is mainly important as a place for socialization experiences that might influence the character of an individual.

3.2.3 Necessary and supporting conditions

Kay & Dudfield (2013, p. 5) argue: “Sport is not a panacea for global social and economic challenges, but used appropriately it is a valuable cross-cutting tool that can significantly strengthen established development approaches.” Now, the question is: What is ‘appropriate use’? It is clear that certain conditions have to be met in order to be able to create intermediate outcomes. Academic literature gives insight in some of the necessary and supporting conditions.

Taking part in sport can be seen as a necessary condition for desired outcomes to be achieved and increased participation is a clear objective of all programs (Mahoney and Stattin, 2000). Sport can be seen as a tool for engagement and mobilization: people show up at a sports event because they are attracted by the programs. This offers SfD organizations the opportunity to reach them, to inform them or to educate them (Kay & Dudfield, 2013). In line with the broad possibility of possible outcomes, the effects of sport for development can go beyond the participants in a sport for development program. Sport also contributes to the development of the spectators (for instance, if they see that disabled people can play sports), of the leaders that are involved (e.g. via leadership skills for coaches), to the family of the participants (for example, children tell their parents about hygiene) and for the community as a whole (e.g. when organizations are formed and more children attend schools) (Van den Heuvel et al., 2007; Kay & Dudfield, 2013). At the same time, it cannot be assumed that all those who take part in sport experience it the same way and obtain the intended benefits.
Supporting conditions refer to the nature of processes and the various organizational and program components which lead to the achievement of desired outcomes, such as the organization, the role of coaches, and the context or environment. These conditions apply mainly on a local level, but they are strongly influenced by the policy and organization on a higher level (Kay & Dudfield, 2013): the programs and policies for developmental work or the way a SfD organization works.

Some supporting conditions are general and apply to almost every SfD project. For instance, without the provision of (basic) sport facilities and equipment, information about the activities and an organized event or competition, it is hard to run a sport for development program. Kay & Dudfield (2013) argue that programs should be designed on the basis of evidence-based models, and that the SfD organization should take care of conducting programs with systematic measurement of progress and appropriate monitoring and evaluation. More research needs to be done to answer this question.

Also, a well-organized organization is essential for the achievement of development through sport (Mahoney & Stattin, 2000). Various studies argue that successful SfD organizations are consciously and systematically organized to maximize the possibility of achieving social capital. The type and strength of the outcomes will depend on the size and type of organization (e.g. isolated or connected, single or multi-sport, urban or rural, competitive or recreational, single or mixed sex) and their relationships with the ‘community’ (both local and sporting) – the ‘radius of trust’. However, both Coalter (2010) and Mahoney and Stattin (2000) are not clear which forms of organizations lead to which outcomes.

An important supporting condition is the training of the coaches, who should have the possibility to transform themselves into leaders and to improve their leadership skills. A sport coach needs to be more than just a trainer in the sport - he or she should also be a coach in life skills. Good coaches become mentors of the participants. This is in line with the theory of planned behavior, where Fishbein & Azjen (1975) also explain that subjective norms, the beliefs of people in the social environment and of experts, are important for behavioral change. Requirements to the environment can be physical (like the availability of a pitch), but also social (e.g., the moral acceptance of girls playing sports) (Sallis et al., 2004). An important condition for the delivery of SfD programs is to involve the social environment, such as the coaches, parents and other local stakeholders, in the design, implementation and reflection of the program. To ensure that leaders and participants are safeguarded at all times, Kay & Dudfield (2013) argue that decentralized programs involving the intended beneficiaries, and taking their communities into account in the planning process, and considering the local needs and assets, are useful to maximize positive outcomes and minimize negative consequences in the organization of SfD.

3.2.4 The moment of truth

The extent to which the fulfillment of the conditions eventually leads to the desired (intermediate) outcomes depends on the way the program is executed. Coalter (2008 etc) makes a strong case in
arguing that outcomes are very much dependent on the specific local contexts in which the projects take place and on the processes between participants that happen within these contexts (see also Hartmann & Kwauk, 2011; Coakley, 2011). The ‘magic box’ of sport for development projects contains complex situational processes that need to be understood in more depth in order to be better able to assess/ contextualize the outcomes and to make contributions for improvement. According to Coalter (2010), we are left at the moment with questions about how to understand the relationships between forms of sport, forms of organization, types of social capital and forms of development, or the extent to which such relationships can exist. Once again, the statement is confirmed that ‘social interventions are always complex systems thrust amidst complex systems’.

According to Coakley (2011: 309) outcomes of sport for youth development are dependent on ‘combinations of multiple factors’ including the orientations and actions of coaches. The role of coach and sport leader is considered crucial in the projects: ‘finding that quality coaching is critical for ensuring the beneficial effects of youth sports participation’ (Hedstrom & Gould, 2004: 9). The sport coach or sport leader can be an identity agent by participating in the identity formation of children (Van Eekeren & Vermeulen, 2011). It can be argued that the interaction of the sport leader with participants on the pitch, notably the youths, is the ‘moment of truth’ in SfD projects. The concept of the ‘moment of truth’ is well known in management and organizational studies and is usually defined as an instance wherein the customer and the organization come into contact with one another in a manner that gives the customer an opportunity to either form or change an impression. The original theory was introduced by Richard Norman (1991). Value, in Normans view, is created during the actual interaction between the contractor on behalf of the organization and the client.

Although literature tells us that the role of sport coaches is crucial, qualitative insight in his or her performance on the sport field, and the actual moment of truth, is scarce. Little is known about what takes place on the sport field or about the voices of the participants on the field, in order to assess the outcomes of SfD projects. As a consequence, little is known about the way SfD organizations can facilitate the moment of truth and the sport coaches in order to create value and contribute to desired outcomes.

3.2.5 Uniqueness of sport for development

Before integrating all this into a comprehensive model, the following question will be answered: Why should one use sport as a means for achieving developmental outcomes at all? It can be argued that for several reasons sport is very suitable for developmental projects. Firstly, sport has an unique attractive power, which contributes to the necessary condition for development, i.e. participation. Sport has the ‘X-factor’: all over the world, individuals and groups of various ages and backgrounds are interested in sport. Sport is part of the ‘cultural heritage’: it is a basic part of many societies (Van Eekeren, 2007) and it has worldwide role models that enthuse millions around the globe behavior. Also, sport is very visible and accessible. Sport can be a fun, non-threatening and informal way to bring people together: participants, spectators and volunteers. Sport events are integrative and
offer opportunities for the development of a sense of community, social commitment and social regeneration (Misener & Mason, 2006). Therefore, sport is suitable for attracting groups that are usually hard to reach, like teenagers.

Secondly, sport has some intrinsic values that are very important for society. Sport contains elements that play an important role in everyday life, such as dealing with success and failure, following rules as well as rule evasion, team unity and individual differences, and self-control (Van den Heuvel et al., 2008). At the same time, training can be used to spread social messages and to expose model behavior to specific target groups. The benefits of sport are considered especially relevant for the most vulnerable, including the poor and excluded, girls and women, people with a disability, those living in conflict areas, and those recovering from trauma (Bailey, 2006). All these features make sport a site for socialization experiences (Coakley, 1998), a unique opportunity that might help to reach development outcomes.

### 3.2.6 A model for sport for development

The literature review gives us insight in the potential value of sport. It can be argued that sport offers a unique site for socialization experiences, which in an indirect way might have an impact on overarching development goals, such as health, child and youth development, gender equality and girls and women empowerment, conflict resolution and peace-building and economic development. The actual achievement of these development goals depends on many variables and on many sports has little or no influence.

The contribution of sport to the overarching goals is through achieving intermediate goals. These intermediate goals can be reached directly through sports interventions and often relate to increasing social capital. These goals are not easy to achieve and several conditions must be met. One condition is necessary: participation. Other conditions are supportive in achieving the intermediate goals, such as the participation of the intended beneficiaries and local stakeholders in the planning process. The effect of the SfD programs depends primarily on ‘the moment of truth’: the actual interaction between sports coaches and participants in the local context. Little is known about how ‘the moment of truth’ is best facilitated by SfD organizations, in a way that maximizes the chances of achieving the intermediate outcomes.

The relationship between SfD programs, the necessary and supporting conditions, the moment of truth, intermediate outcomes, external variables and overarching development outcomes is shown schematically in a basic SfD model, see Figure 8. In the model a distinction is made between two levels. Level 1 is the part of the model where sport for development can influence results. If the necessary and supporting conditions are met, it is likely that this results in the intermediate outcomes. That is not the case for the overarching outcomes. The intermediate outcomes help in achieving the overarching outcomes, but the context is more influential. Therefore, this is called level 2: the variables that are hardly, or cannot be, influenced by sport for development organizations.
Figure 8: The relation chain of sport and overarching development outcomes

**Sport as a ‘Site for socialization experiences’**

**Necessary condition**
- Participation in sport

**Supporting conditions, such as:**
- Provision of sport facilities and equipment, competition and events
- Programs consciously and structurally organized to create social capital
- Involvement of intended beneficiaries and community in planning process,
- Involvement of sustainable and representative grassroots organizations
- Programs based on evidence-based models, continuous learning through M&E
- Educating sport coaches, including leadership training
- Safeguarding of leaders and participants, involvement of social environment

**‘The Moment of Truth’**

**Intermediate outcomes, such as:**
- Development of ‘life skills’
- Increased social interaction and mobilization
- New relationships and role models
- Increased self-esteem and confidence
- Leadership development
- Increased understanding of social issues
- Community building

**External variables**

**Overarching development outcomes, such as:**
- Health, including HIV/AIDS prevention
- Child and youth development
- Gender equality and girls and women empowerment
- Conflict resolution and peace
- Economic development
4 Specific development issues

In the following paragraphs we will explicitly zoom in on some specific development issues which are particularly relevant in light of current Dutch policy on sport for development, as formulated by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and which are the focus of the programs of Right To Play, KNVB and NSA International, namely:

- Child and youth development: education and behavior change
- Girl/women empowerment/ gender equality
- Peace-building and conflict resolution

4.1 Child and youth development: Education

One of the overarching development outcomes for the Dutch organizations active in SfD is child and youth development. There is a strong association between sport and youth, which makes sport a valuable tool for working with young people (Kay & Dudfield, 2013). Sport can be used as a direct educational tool. Kay (2009) mentions for example that SfD programs examine moral issues from the perspective of the ‘fair play’ rules in sport. Sport is, in this case, used as part of the educational program. In this chapter we will look at a more indirect relation between sport and education: does participation in physical activities lead to better school performance? The relationship between physical activity and educational outcomes has been studied frequently (SDP IWG, 2007). These studies have mainly been conducted in industrialized countries, like the United States (e.g. Scheuer & Mitchell, 2003; Valois et al., 2004; Bailey, 2005).

Research suggests contradictory outcomes for the relationship between sport and education. On the one hand sport is assumed to have a positive impact on education by improving cognitive skills. On the other hand, spending time on sports means less time to spend on school work. This has also been called the ‘zero sum’ approach: a larger amount of time spends on sports has a negative impact on school performance. However, French, American and Australian research has proven that the logic of ‘zero sum’ is not true (Hervet, 1951; Dwyer, 1983; Sallis et al., 1999). More physical education in schools, resulting in less time for other subjects, does not have a negative influence on school performance, as the school performances of pupils stay the same or improve (Visscher et al., 2011). Besides, the attractiveness of SfD projects, also for children who are not engaged in a school or other developmental program, makes that sport can be used as a tool to encourage young people to enroll in a school program and to encourage attendance (Kay & Dudfield, 2013).

In short, the relationship between sport for development and education has been proven to be positive or neutral. Sport can lead to better educational results and has certainly no negative effect on the educational development of children. But, this relationship can only be seen as indirect. Participation in sport leads to development of certain skills, which subsequently leads to improved educational performance. These intermediate outcomes will be discussed in the next paragraph.
4.1.1 Intermediate outcomes

It can be argued that two different intermediate steps play a role towards better educational results through sport: 1) the development of social or psychological skills and 2) the health and fitness that follows after regularly participating in sport.

Development of social and psychological skills
As mentioned in paragraph 3.2, sport leads to the development or improvement of social and psychological skills as discipline, effective working, self-esteem and self-efficacy. Sport programs provide young people the opportunity to develop themselves as athletes, sport coaches or leaders. They can take an organizational role in the community and become peer leaders (Kay & Dudfield, 2013; Coalter, 2010).

Also, sport improves dealing with aspects of sport such as winning, losing and improving yourself mean for young people that they develop or improve skills for self-reflection and self-regulation (Boonstra & Hermens, 2011). These skills are important for learning. Sport is an environment where people strive to win and to achieve certain goals. Experiences from this context can also be used in other contexts: children learn to pursue goals in life. Those skills can be transferred to other life domains, such as school. It is assumed that those skills help children to achieve better school outcomes. This can be illustrated by an example of a comparative study of several articles. Ekeland, Heian and Hagen (2005) conducted a meta-analysis on the relation between sport and self-esteem of children and youth between three and twenty years old. They found that sport in the short run leads to improved self-esteem. This has not always been proven: some studies show a positive effect, while other studies show no effect at all. Negative effects were not found.

Improved health and fitness
A second approach is that sport leads to health and fitness, as stressed in paragraph 3.2, which has a positive effect on cognitive abilities because of biochemical factors. Several studies have been conducted to prove this statement. A study in Aberdeen showed that children who participated in physical activity have better cognitive skills than children which did not participate (Hill et al., 2010). A comparative study on five Dutch sport interventions also found that school performance improved among the participants. However, there is no certainty about the causality and researchers concluded that more academic research is needed (Jacobs & Diekstra, 2009; Boonstra & Hermens, 2011).

The relationship between sport and cognitive abilities is explained by the fact that motor skills go along with good cognitive skills, especially regulation skills (Wassenberg et al., 2005). Regulation skills, like planning and problem solving capacity, are assumed to be important in an educational setting. Hartman et al. (2010) found that good motor skills go along with regulation skills for children with learning problems. Houwen et al. (2007) conclude that sport and play are good settings to develop motor skills and regulation skills. However, not all scientists agree. Etnier et al. (2006) conducted a meta-analysis on 51 studies on the relation between cardiovascular fitness and cognitive skills. Their results stated that fit people did not have better cognitive skills. An important remark to this result is that the studies that were used by Etnier et al. mainly were conducted among adults. Therefore, the relationship between fitness and cognitive skills among youth and children remains questionable.
Again, most results are contextual; participation in sport does not automatically lead to positive effects, but the effects depend on the type of sport and the context. Sport can only lead to more child and youth development through education if certain conditions are met.

4.1.2 Conditions

Several conditions in the sport context are important for the extent to which sport leads to improved educational performance. First, there is the necessary condition ‘participation’: children need to participate in sport (programs). This means sport has to be offered in an accessible and attractive way to the target group. Furthermore, several supporting conditions can be determined: 1) Positive coaching in a child oriented setting, 2) Didactical basics, 3) A supportive social environment, 4) cooperation with schools and community work.

Positive coaching in a child oriented setting
Good coaches, trainers or leaders are essential (Coalter, 2007). With ‘good’, Coalter refers to positive coaching and paying attention to a positive learning environment. A good learning environment should be a child-oriented setting (Devereaux, 1971), a setting in which the existing knowledge and skills of children are the main starting point and attention is paid to the psychological, emotional, social and intellectual development (Potrac et al., 2000).

Didactical basics
A ‘good coach’ uses ‘good didactics’. Six different didactical conditions can be identified:

- fun and enjoyment,
- challenge,
- variation,
- a participative learning process,
- structured repetition, and
- reflection and a safe and stimulating learning context.

Especially when working with younger children, the focus should be on fun. Having fun motivates children, who will enjoy the activity and are able to get the maximum effect of learning (Coakley, 2001). This creates a pedagogical climate in which the children learn their skills by playing. Experiencing challenge creates a high powered, exciting training, which allows children to learn optimally and develop their talents. Challenges teach children not to give up easily (Wormhoudt et al., 2013). This concept is based on the believe that individuals will grow when they face challenging situations, which enables them to overcome their hesitancy or fear (Brown & King, 2000; Prouty et al., 2007). Children who experience a healthy level of challenges will take the maximum out of their learning process. Variation, either in the composition of the group or in the offered exercises, effects the learning process positively by motivating children to achieve an optimal level of challenge, fun and development in the learning process (Wormhoudt et al., 2013). The learning process should have an interactive character, because this increases the experience (Roussou, 2004) and this helps the participants to reflect on their own behavior and on what they have learned. Boud et al. (1985) state that learning by doing, evaluating and doing things again in order to improve the activity are crucial elements in an effective learning process. Finally, a good pedagogical climate comprises a safe and stimulating learning context, with physical and psychological safety.
Supportive social environment

A third important condition that influences learning of a child or teenager is the social environment. Koekoek, Knoppers and Stegeman (2009) conducted research among school children and concluded that the group in which children play sport is important. How they experience sport and whether they learn new things depends partly on the motivation of other participating children. Unmotivated children can be seen as an obstacle in the learning process. Related to the reactions of other children is the support of parents. If parents are involved in the sport activity and if they are informed and supportive, more successful outcomes can be expected.

Cooperation with school and community work

A fourth condition is the cooperation between schools and other community based organizations and the sport for development program (Lederach, 2005). It is more likely that programs have success if the sport activities are linked to school and learning situations. Sport can be a tool to stimulate school performance and school can be a tool to stimulate sport. Therefore, some sport for development programs explicitly use school settings to offer sport in order to increase the reach.

4.2 Child and youth development: Behavior change

The expectations of the impact of sport on behavior change of children, youth and young adults are high. Behavior change can be seen from a broad perspective. For example, sport is expected to reduce negative and criminal behavior, but sport should also contribute to the learning of life skills. It is assumed that through sport participants learn to cooperate, positively change attitudes and values and learn to cope with losing. Sport can help to approach youngsters who are usually hard to reach, because they are not engaged (anymore) with schools or religious institutions (Holroyd & Armour, 2003). However, the contrary might also be applicable when focusing specifically on children and youth; sport might also serve as a context wherein a lot of violence and aggression takes place.

Scientific research shows that sport programs have booked good results that might lead to behavior change. Children engaged in sport programs were for example less often send out of class and were showing less negative behavior (Sandford, Duncombe, & Armour, 2008). At the same time, Cameron and MacDougall (2000) studied a sport program in Australia and found that sport does not necessarily lead to benefits in the form of character building. They see the sense of belonging and the developed relationships as key results that are outputs of the program. Just as stated in paragraph 3.2, they also stress that the introduction of sport and physical activity alone cannot achieve a behavioral change, like the prevention of crime.

A direct relationship between participation in sports and reduced behavior problems has not been proven. There might be an indirect relation, because sport leads to a wide range of intermediate outcomes that might influence behavior and the development of children (SDP IWG, 2007).
4.2.1 Intermediate outcomes

Scientists like Schafer (1969), Morris et al. (2003) and Carmichael (2009) mention several intermediate outcomes of sport for development programs that help to reduce negative behavior: sport reduces boredom and provides a good alternative for criminal practices and antisocial behavior, because it gives a ‘kick’ that teens need while growing up. Sport decreases the ‘unsupervised’ leisure time of youth, while providing an alternative social environment where they can learn positive norms and values (SDP IWG, 2007). In this social environment, sport also provides an alternative way to increase status among peers. Sport leads to more self-esteem (Daniels & Leaper, 2006; Sandford et al., 2008), which for some youngsters might help to protest against imposed criminal behavior by peers. Sport programs give them a sense of belonging with their team mates, which also helps to ‘escape’ from criminal friends. Therefore, there is a difference between team and individual sports. Participation in individual sports results in more self-confidence in conducting individual tasks and participation in team sports leads to more perceived control on relationships (Van den Heuvel et al., 2007). Team sports help participants also to develop communication and decision-making skills (Kay, 2009).

However, research shows that sport can also lead to negative outcomes. Sport can have a ‘dark side’: youngsters who practice boxing, wrestling, martial arts and weight training show more antisocial behavior. Endresen and Olweus (2005) use social learning theory as a possible clarification for this outcome; what youngsters learn in sport, they will use as well outside of sport. In this case, they learn to solve conflicts by fighting. A second possible explanation is the specific sport culture, which is characterized by macho behavior (Endresen & Olweus, 2005). When sport is used as tool for behavior change among young people, the context and conditions are crucial for the impact.

4.2.2 Conditions

Researchers have linked several supporting conditions to the success of a program in achieving behavioral change, regarding the organization of the program, and the quality and competences of the sport leaders and the reactions of the peer group. Several researchers stress that there is no ‘one size fits all’ strategy (Morris et al., 2003; Sandford et al., 2008; Right To Play, 2013). Different types of problems ask for specific approaches. However, some ‘best practices’, highly valuable for most projects, can be identified.

**Small groups, clear objectives and cooperation with relevant actors**

Sandford, Armour and Washington (2008) mention a carefully managed program that consists of small groups as a success factor. Morris et al. (2003) agree with them on the fact that cooperation with relevant actors like school, community workers and family is important for a successful program; if possible, a sport for development project should be embedded in a school program or comparable parts of daily life of children and youth. According to an evaluation report of Right To Play (2013), it also helps if a program has clear and realistic objectives. The participants should also participate in the formulation and setting of these goals (Sandford et al., 2008).

**Empathetic coaches with leadership skills and same background as target group**

Regarding the competences of sport leaders; the trainers and coaches should be able to build friendly relationships with the participants. An ideal leader should empathize, show concerns and interest, have humor, create mutual trust and respect, set rules and realistic goals and be
consistent: he or she should show leadership skills. What helps, according to Nichols (1997), is a trainer or coach with the same background as the participants. Such a leader is able to build a relationship with the participants, which is grounded on mutual trust. These coaches know the local context and the youth. A task for the leader, trainer or coach is also to reflect on what the participants have learned. If the leaders pay attention to gaining certain skills within the sport activity, and maybe even discuss them with the participants, these skills can be transferred to life domains outside sport (Papacharisis et al., 2005).

Peer acceptance
A final condition for success is the peer group. When children or youngsters receive positive reactions from friends, so called ‘peer acceptance’, this leads to more self-esteem through sport (Koekoek, Knoppers, & Stegeman, 2009). This process can be encouraged by the sport leaders; the acceptance or appreciation of the teachers is of importance.
Figure 9: The relation chain of sport and child & youth development

**Sport as a ‘site for socialization experiences’**

**Necessary condition**
- Participation in sport

**Supporting conditions:**
- Positive coaching in a child oriented setting
- Didactical basics: fun and enjoyment, challenge, variation, a participative learning process, structured repetition, and reflection and a safe and stimulating learning context.
- Supportive social environment
- Cooperation with schools and community organizations.
- Small groups, clear objectives and cooperation with relevant actors
  - Empathetic coaches with leadership skills and same background as target group
  - Peer acceptance

**‘The Moment of Truth’**

**Intermediate outcomes:**
- Social and psychological skills
- Improved health and fitness
- Alternative for criminal practices and antisocial behavior out of boredom or ‘unsupervised’ leisure time
- Learning positive norms and values

**External variables**

**Overarching development outcome:**
- Child and youth development:
  - Improved educational results
  - Reduced behavioral problems
4.3 Gender equality and girls and women empowerment

Girls and women continue to lack access to the same quality of life as men, especially in low and middle income countries (Brady & Banu-Khan, 2005; Nanayakkara, 2012). For years, policy makers and activists are trying to change the inequality between men and women. The right to gender equality is established in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948); and in 1979 the United Nations organized the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Gender equality in education, employment and representation is one of the Millennium Development Goals. Although policies are developed, and despite the emergence of woman movements and their efforts, in many countries equality between men and women still does not exist. The empowerment of girls and women is often seen as a step towards equality. Therefore, more gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls are similarly mentioned as desired outcomes for many SfD projects.

Just being able to participate in sport is for women in some countries a novelty. For instance, for several years, access to participation in sport and physical activity has been restricted for Muslim women in Iran. The Muslim Women’s Games, however, has provided some Iranian women with a novel opportunity to engage in sport on their own terms in a gender-segregated environment, and is serving as a catalyst to increase the overall participation of Iranian women in sport as both participants and coaches (Pfister, 2006). Sport can provide an unique opportunity to reach a vulnerable and otherwise hard to reach group, such as girls. Qualitative data from the Mathare Youth Sport Association (MYSA) in Kenya indicates that one of the most important benefits of the program for young girls is the sexual-health education component regarding HIV and AIDS protection (Belew, 2005), a subject that is more difficult to discuss in a mixed gender group. Gender-based SfD programs are ideal for the dissemination of health-related messages and health education (Brady, 2005).

Research consistently points out that the significant increase in the number of girls and women in sport has done much to dismantle conventional notions of gender and to promote gender equality (SDP IWG, 2007). Although correlation evidence is often strong, there is little evidence of causality in terms of beneficial outcomes of sport participation. It remains important to consider contextual factors. The sport experiences of girls and women in developing countries, or even the accessibility of sports, and the outcomes in terms of gender equality and empowerment, are inseparable from other socio-cultural factors, such as social class, religious affiliation, regional concerns, and geographical location (Pfister, 2006). Nevertheless, the use of sport and physical activity as a tool for development, and as a means of empowering women to take strides towards achieving justice (Small, 2002), should be considered as a viable option that is well supported by research evidence.
4.3.1 Intermediate outcomes

Based on current research evidence documenting the relationship between sport and physical activity programs or interventions for girls and women, participation is generally associated with positive results. Benefits for girls and women in both high-income countries and lower- and middle-income countries relate to 1) social inclusion, 2) self-esteem and empowerment, 3) dismantling gender norms and 4) providing leadership opportunities (SDP IWG, 2007).

Social inclusion and social integration
The most significant finding in this review concerns sport, gender, and social integration. Fabrizio-Pelak (2005) & Hargreaves (1997) have documented the social benefits of sport participation for women in the post-apartheid era in South Africa. In a country where attention to racial oppression has served to "trump" gender inequality, football participation is serving as a vehicle for female players from diverse backgrounds to mentor one another, as well as to demonstrate care and friendship.

Brady (2005) and Brady & Banu-Khan (2002) have documented the social outcomes associated with sports participation in the Ishraq (Egypt) and MYSA (Kenya) girls’ football program. Brady (2005) related sport participation to the concept of a ‘safe space’. Access to safe space is crucial for overall health and development, but such space becomes increasingly confined, restrictive, enclosed, and domestic as girls approach adolescence, especially in developing countries. In addition to the role of sport in enhancing social inclusion, integration, reconstruction, friendship and social ties, sport assists in expanding access to safe social spaces for girls in lower income countries, thereby allowing them to take charge and ownership of space (Brady, 2005). A safe social space can be used as a neutral platform for dialogue and interaction in a conflict situation (Kay & Dudfield, 2013). Reports from the Nigerian Association for Women in Sports (NAWIS) conference also underscore the crucial role of sport and physical activity in facilitating social cohesion among girls and women, friendship, and social interaction in Nigeria (Adeyanju, Aliu, & Chado, 1993).

Overall, there is significant evidence to suggest that sport and physical activity participation may act as a catalyst for social inclusion, social integration, and relationship building for girls and women. These are important intermediate steps towards gender equality and the empowerment of girls and women.

Self-esteem/empowerment
Self-esteem is a multi-dimensional psychological construct. It refers to a measurement of feelings of positive self-worth in several domains (Richman & Shaffer, 2000). A great deal of research has been carried out using these constructs, and some of the results are reviewed here. Improvements in self-esteem through sport participation may be enhanced by feelings of accomplishment and perceptions of improved physical appearance, as well as demonstrating a high degree of commitment to exercise.

Evidence is provided which supports the role of sport and physical activity participation in enhancing self-esteem of girls and women, or associated constructs such as self-perception, self-worth, self-efficacy, and self-empowerment, and enhanced personal freedom (Eickoff, Thorland, & Ansorge, 1983; Kenen, 1987; Warrick & Tinning, 1989; Markula, 1993). For example, they report higher self-esteem, confidence, and body image (Young, 1997) or enhanced levels of confidence,
success, and mastery. ‘A feeling of belongingness’ and a sense of being seen and confirmed were also reported (Lindgren et al., 2002). Notably, non-participation had a negative impact on self-esteem (Richman & Shaffer, 2000). A study to assess the relationship between athletic participation by adolescent girls in the United States and incidents of forced sexual victimization also noted a negative association between these two variables, suggesting that sport participation may offer some protective effect against sexual victimization (Fasting et al., 2008).

For many girls, self-esteem decreases during adolescence, and this period of transition is often characterized by reduced physical activity and sport participation, as well as increasingly restrictive gender roles (Richman & Shaffer, 2000; Brady, 2005). If there are potential benefits from maintaining and enhancing girls’ and women’s self-esteem, then sport participation seems to be one of the key components in achieving this.

Most of the before mentioned studies were conducted in high-income countries. Fewer research exist that studied sport for development projects in developing counties. Findings from the Ishraq- and MYSA-projects suggest that sport for girls plays a significant role in enhancing self-empowerment, self-esteem, and personal freedom (Brady & Banu-Khan, 2002; Brady, 2005). In addition, qualitative research on female participants in “Moving the Goal Posts, Kilifi Kenya,” indicates that participation in football has significantly increased levels of self-esteem (Belewa, 2005).

Although most of the data have been produced in high-income countries, we can conclude that girls who participate in sport and physical activity are more likely to experience increased self-esteem and feelings of self-empowerment. Of course, this outcome can only be reached when sport is offered in the ‘right’ way.

**Challenging and transforming gender norms**

Nearly all of the sport studies document or suggest the transformative potential of sport to challenge gender norms. Most researchers suggest that, while gender equality in sport remains an elusive goal, the continued participation of girls and women has made great strides towards achieving gender equality in certain contexts. After all, steps are being taken towards “leveling the playing field“ and decreasing the restrictive nature of conventional gender roles. However, it is important to note that, in certain studies, changing gender roles for girls and women is more based on personal experiences and anecdotes, rather than scientific research.

A few researchers from high-income countries have considered how sport serves as a site for the continual renegotiation and construction of gendered norms and roles. Sometimes, sport serves as a place to create awareness of the gendered nature of sport participation, and an understanding among female participants that girls often participate in sports on boys’ terms and standards (Lindgren et al., 2002). Participation in the MYSA girls’ program in Kenya is associated with knowledge and awareness of gendered norms; the girls are clearly aware that male players have better access to coaches, equipment, playing times, and facilities (Brady & Banu-Khan, 2002). SfD programs see this awareness as a first step towards behavior change, in line with Fishbein & Azjen’s (1975) theory of planned behavior.

Therefore, sport for development projects do not only create awareness about the different gendered norms and roles, but also try to challenge these terms and standards. For instance,
participation in ice hockey gives female players in Canada a necessary forum in which they actively contest and challenge conventional notions of gendered play (Theberge, 2003), and girls can act as agents who actively negotiate gender in sport as they choose, or resist, participation in certain athletic activities (Azzarito et al., 2006). This can be translated to the ‘outer world’: Garret (2004) suggests that an active lifestyle allows girls to resist the restrictive, traditional discourses of femininity; and, in a retrospective study, Richman & Shaffer (2000) found that young women who participated in sport before going to university displayed a higher degree of gender flexibility.

However, the increase of awareness is not always a step towards development. Awareness can lead to frustration if nothing changes in the environment. Therefore, approaches that focus on awareness are not uncontested. Some organizations focus on empowerment and the creation of awareness by women only. Scientists like Misener & Mason (2010) warn that this might lead to very negative reactions from their environment, which sometimes puts the women in an even more restricted situation. Awareness and a change in perception should not only be created by girls or women, but also by the boys and men who surround them. Gender is a relational construct; the meanings of feminine attributes are often defined only in relation or opposition to characteristics of masculinity and a change of norms and values should therefore be created at both sides.

Some evidence underpins the possibilities of SfD projects in this respect: a “sport for peace” program for disengaged youth had the effect of boys demonstrating a greater willingness to allow girls to take ownership of the program (Ennis, 1999). Research findings from lower and middle income countries also suggest that participation in sport and physical activity plays a significant role in dismantling gender barriers and norms. Results from the MYSA program are the most telling: the boys in the program have adopted favorable and supportive attitudes towards girls’ involvement, and they “watch out” for MYSA girls in the slums of Nairobi and the broader community. Furthermore, despite significant barriers to access, such as lack of transport, financial constraints and residual gender binaries, Fabrizio-Pelak (2005) and Hargreaves (1997) suggest that, although football has traditionally functioned as an all-male “flagship” or preserve in South Africa, female players are actively renegotiating both material and ideological constraints. They are forging new gendered identities as female footballers in post-apartheid South Africa.

Based on these studies, it can be argued that sport participation creates the possibility for less restrictive and conventional gender roles. However, it is important to note that, despite their contribution to decreased gender inequalities, sport and development programs are usually run for and by men (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007), and few are designed for women alone. In some cases, a safe environment for women and girls means an environment without men. In other situations, emancipation has gone further and the goal in these situations is to create a space where men and women can interact. Therefore, once again, the organization of an SfD project should be appropriate for the context in which it takes place and should pay attention to the accepted level of freedom for women and the norms and values in the area.

Leadership and achievement opportunities

Some studies have found evidence in lower and middle income countries that SfD programs provide women with access to leadership and career opportunities. For example, the Moving the Goal Posts Kilifi football program in Kenya has successfully created opportunities for self-governance. The
girls’ committee members organize and participate in the program at all levels of its organizational structure. For example, all matches are led by female referees (Belewa, 2005).

Data from participants in the MYSA girls’ football program in Kenya illustrates the benefits of participation in providing important venues for leadership development and personal and professional growth. The girls value the opportunity for specialized training and development in the areas of coaching, refereeing, training, organizing the league, and the peer and health education that MYSA has provided. The girls from this program that were able to participate in the Norway Cup international football competition were also positive about the public recognition, international travel opportunities, athletic opportunities, leadership, and success (Brady & Banu-Khan, 2002).

### 4.3.2 Conditions

Several conditions that will support the delivery of the above-mentioned intermediate outcomes can be determined. Recommendations from sport and gender programs suggest that the results of the program depend on supporting conditions, such as girls’ participation through program design, and encouraging girls’ leadership, development, and safety once they are involved. Brady & Banu-Khan (2002) outlined a number of important recommendations for planning and implementing sport and gender programs in developing countries. These include:

- **Retaining girls in the program, and setting the terms for participation**: program facilitators must allow girls to enter, exit, and re-enter the program with ease.
- **Identifying measures that will ensure the safety of girls in the program, and protect their reputations**: these include safe walking, adult chaperoning, transport, and playing games before dark.
- **Providing girls with female role models and mentors in the community**: this includes access to guidance, assistance, and problem-solving within the community.
- **Encouraging girls’ self-expression, decision-making, and leadership**: in physically active settings, girls may dramatically readjust their behavior in the presence of boys; they may retreat, avoid situations, or display inhibited behaviors (Brady & Banu-Khan, 2002). For this reason, it is essential to provide girls with access to single-sex activities and “girl only” spaces in certain athletic situations.
- **Encourage boys to be more respectful**: it has been proposed that when girls succeed or take on new and unconventional roles, boys’ perceptions of them change favorably, and there are opportunities for boys to adopt enlightened views regarding the place of girls in sport.

Hargreaves (1997) adds that at all stages, women from lower and middle income countries should have direct involvement in program design, implementation, and the organizational structure, in order to ensure their active leadership and role in decision-making processes. Gender-based SfD programs, like programs on sexual education, should assess the health-related needs of a particular region and incorporate messages that pertain to these issues into the program design. Where local and regional concerns act as structural barriers to participation, it is crucial that such factors are taken into account in the planning and design of gender-based SfD programs (Brady, 2005). As a consequence, efforts must be made to understand the meaning and purpose of sport and physical activity in the lives of girls and women in particular local contexts, so that programming reflects the diverse needs, perspectives, and motives of participants, and captures the nuances and subtleties of girls and women’s involvement in such sport programs.
Besides, Valois et al. (2004) suggest that the positive psychological outcomes of psychical activity can depend on gender, and therefore SfD programs should allow for differences in the ways sport is offered to boys and girls. Women are supposed to be more in need of intimate interpersonal relations, which amounts to organizing more team sports. Men experience positive psychological benefits from physical activity in a variety of sports, including individual sports, and not just from sports that are characterized by cooperation and interpersonal relations, like team sports. However, most other scientists don’t mention this condition in the organization of the sport (Van den Heuvel et al., 2007).
Figure 10: The relation chain of sport and gender equality and girls and women empowerment
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4.4 Peace-building and conflict resolution

The literature review shows a growing number of studies of programs aiming to promote peace, reconciliation, and development in conflict-ridden regions, notably the Balkans, the Middle East, West and Central Africa, Sri Lanka, and South America (Giulianotti, 2011). Despite the academic interest in sport for peace and reconciliation, the role of sport in post-conflict peace building remains poorly understood (Dyck, 2011). It is reported that participants highly value these programs, but very few programs have been critically monitored (Giulianotti, 2011) and few studies about sport for peace are published in peer-reviewed magazines.

Since peace building, as a field of study, lends itself to practical approaches that seek to address underlying sources of violent conflict, it is surprising that it has largely neglected to take an interest in sport, especially its grassroots models. Moreover, few of the studies on sport for peace are grounded in peace-building theory or frameworks. While, at times, authors refer to key concepts or ideas that overlap with peace studies, the sport-for-peace literature does not employ the same language, models or frames that would allow the two areas to interact as well as build upon their respective bodies of knowledge.

This is surprising, because there are high expectations of the power of sport for peace building and conflict resolution. On the one hand, sport has been regarded as an instrument or ‘universal language’ for peaceful communication. Therefore, sport is seen as a tool for (re)building relationships between antagonistic groups. In Africa, football in particular has a strong appeal because of its popularity and ability to mobilize individuals and communities (Dyck, 2011). On the other hand, sport has been associated with differences, inequality and conflict. Illustrative is George Orwell’s often quoted sentiment that sport is ‘war minus the shooting’ (Orwell, 1970: 63). Although modern sports are regarded as less violent, contradictions remain and some scholars see sport as strategy of imperialism and conquest (cf. Darnell et al, 2011; Tiessen, 2011).

Scholars warn for false and elaborate expectations associated with the programs (Keim, 2006; SDP IWG, 2007), because the problems are multidimensional and cannot be solved by sport alone (Armstrong, 2004a). The SDP IWG report mentions for example a lack of employment, access to land, egalitarian distribution of income, elementary health provision, affordable housing, educational opportunities and clean water, problematic political structures and AIDS as problems that form the context of a sport for peace program. Armstrong (2004b, p. 498) summarized this as: “Rehabilitation and reintegration projects are doomed to fail if there is no better life offered to the disaffected de-militarized”. However, there is something that can be done via sport for development programs. A SfD project will probably not stop a war, but there are several intermediate outcomes that can be reached. Sport can be regarded as one tool in an orchestra of multi-level peace-building efforts required to produce harmonious peace.
4.4.1 Intermediate outcomes

Several authors (e.g. Sugden, 2010; Dyck, 2011; Lyras & Welthy Peachey, 2011) argue that under carefully managed circumstances, sport can make a positive, but modest contribution to peace building. Sugden (2010) argues that sport is intrinsically valued as neutral, which is important in a conflict situation.

The most important value of sport for peace might be the opportunity to make the contact. If that contact is meaningful, interactive and not superficial, resolution might occur (Baker & Esherick, 2009). Interpersonal dialogue can lead to a reduction of negative biases and a breakdown of stereotypes (Höglund & Sundberg, 2008). The claims on the possible positive outcomes of sport-for-peace programs can be categorized into three groups: 1) (re)building of relationships, 2) reintegration of soldiers, and 3) reconciliation.

Relationship (re)building

Sport for development programs offer a site for relationship building (SDP IWG, 2007). According to Lederach (2005), sport programs may be crucial in creating opportunities for social interaction that have long been suppressed. He stresses the importance of creating safe and accessible social spaces or relational spaces. Sport can be seen as such a safe and supportive space for relationship building across wide and diverse populations (Keim, 2003). Because everybody enjoys sport, regardless of their background, age, economic prosperity or religion (Richards, 1997), in these spaces, people can meet each other in a natural way. Therefore, sport offers important opportunities for social networking and relationship building, it may complement peace-building strategies based on relational spaces (Lederach, 2005). Keim (2003) also shows that more intercultural friendships grows in school when children were doing sports in an integrated team.

Reintegration of soldiers

After a war, soldiers go home. Some of them are well-trained young men, but others are child soldiers. Especially for them, a successful reintegration into a community can be hard. They struggle with their past and the community can be unwelcoming (SDP IWG, 2007). Sport can help them to understand a more nuanced form of violence and add to the healing among youth combatants during their reintegration process (Dyck, 2011). Sport, in particular football, has proven to offer a possibility to reintegrate, because sport is ‘neutral’; while playing, someone’s background or past actions are not important (Richards, 1997; Sugden, 2010). Moreover, the organization of a football competition might help to strengthen relationships (Armstrong, 2002). However, so far very little studies have been executed that focus on this integration and most of the ‘evidence’ is more based on common sense than on empirical findings.

Reconciliation

Reconciliation arises from relationship (re)building, but is broader than that. It also includes components of truth and justice (SDP IWG, 2007). Sport might add to reconciliation by linking with advocacy groups and recruiting popular stars as advocates for peace. However, most scholars state the value of sport for reconciliation is contestable (Höglund & Sundberg, 2008). For instance, Lea-Howarth (2006) states that sport programs are incapable of playing a role in reconciliation and that sport cannot address structural violence and the urgent tasks of environmental reconstruction, such as removal of landmines.
However, several negative outcomes are also possible. Drawing on a large and growing body of literature on global citizenship and post-structuralism, and on post-colonial critiques, Tiessen (2011) argues that SfD narratives have the potential to reinforce the 'othering' of community members in developing countries. Divisions between confliction groups can be worsened, sport can lead to exclusion of others because of a stronger 'group' feeling. Besides, it may also contribute to paternalistic conceptions of development assistance (Tiessen, 2011). This might lead to more cynicism and a disempowerment of local people (SDP IWG, 2007). Ennis (1999) points at the fact that sport encourages dominant behavior, either via highly skilled or via aggressive game behavior. This aggression does not match with sport for peace goals and can reinforce violence. Ennis (1999) also mentions the fact that low-skilled players might not be engaged and their ability might not be improved, even when taught by competent, committed leaders. Finally, the added value of sport for peace projects could be considered modest when compared to other sport for development programs. A sport for peace project can divert resources from more productive activities, either from peace activities or other SfD projects (Schrag, 2012).

4.4.2 Conditions

It is important to keep in mind that sport is a social construct and its role and function depends largely on what we make of it and how it is consumed (Sugden, 2005; Sugden, 2010). While sportspersons often assume that the activities they organize constitute a universal language, Sugden (2006: 221) warns against the over-essentializing of sport: “If projects...are locally grounded, carefully thought out, and professionally managed, they can make a modest contribution to wider efforts to promote conflict resolution and peaceful co-existence”. This statement raises questions about which conditions exactly should be met, and how sport can be constructed to meet peace-building needs.

Thoughtful and committed volunteers and coaches

The first condition is the availability of thoughtful and committed volunteers and coaches. Several authors highlight the importance of training and the selection of the volunteers or coaches that run the programs. Peace building is a complex process and demands highly skilled peace-builders (Keim, 2003; Armstrong, 2002, 2004a & 2004b; Gasser & Levinson, 2004; Sugden, 2006; SDP IWG, 2007). As Sugden (2006) notes: "The most successful 'off-pitch' programs were those led by knowledgeable, sympathetic and skilled facilitators and tended to be activity rather than classroom based" (Sugden, 2006, p.228). Nearly all research confirms the importance of selection and training, and committed volunteers, who are culturally aware and sensitive (Keim, 2003; Donald & Coakley, 2002; Sugden, 2006; Gasser & Levinson, 2004). They conclude that current and future programming must invest in and value program leaders, who are in key and demanding positions.

Part of a long term program

A second condition is that an SfD project should be part of a long term program. Playing a game in the midst of conflict is unlikely to have a long lasting impact on peace (Lea-Howarth, 2006; Lambert, 2007). To make a project meaningful, it has to be a series of carefully structured sporting experiences. If other conditions are taken into account, and if the project is accompanied by a wide variety of cultural, educational, economic and political interventions that for instance deal with social inequality and social exclusion, it might make contribution to the peace process (Donald & Coakley, 2002; Lea-Howarth, 2006)
Community-based approach

A third condition is a community-based approach. External agencies should be aware of their role in "insider-outsider" power dynamics. Therefore, they should focus on supporting and collaborating with the initiatives of the local community as well as recognizing and building upon the communities’ assets. As outsiders, they must build relationships with locals in order to properly understand and value the cultural context of the community in which they are working, so that the program thrives from the valued local knowledge (Sugden, 2006). In situations where outside groups either establish a program, or are influential in the program due to their donor positions, it is essential that they are guided by community-development approaches. Outside groups must avoid creating donor-client relationships (Hognestad, 2006) or 'parachuting' outsiders in a conflict situation (Schrag, 2012). Instead, organizations should work as 'allies' and support and provide space for community-owned initiatives. Local partners that are community-wide recruited should be involved in all important evaluations, decision making, planning and implementing processes (Donnelly & Coakley, 2002; Sugden, 2006). External agencies must be empowering in all of their practices and inclusive of participatory decision-making at all decision levels (Boutlier, Cleverly & Labonte, 2000). Donnelly & Coakley (2002) also stress the importance of 'agency' in programs, referring to the ability of an individual to be involved in creating and transforming the nature of their physical activity. While these recommendations are relevant in all SfD programs, they are especially relevant in sport-for-peace work involving an intra-state form of conflict. Very important is also the involvement of parents. They are the ones that invested most in the welfare of their children, and as community members and constituents, parents are an important vector for every program’s impact on the community. They too are drawn across lines when they come to watch their children play and have fun; once there, they find themselves cheering with former enemies who have children playing for the same team (Gasser & Levinsen, 2004).

Access to safe sport facilities

A fourth condition is the access to safe sports spaces. As mentioned before in the chapter on gender equality, it is important to pay attention to the quality and quantity of sports spaces (SDP IWG, 2007). Political, economic, and social conditions can make children hesitant of participating in joint or multi-cultural sport activities (Keim, 2003). Facilities have to be safe and accessible: Keim’s study in South Africa showed that affordable and safe transport is also of crucial importance to the success of these programs. This condition is especially true for sport for peace projects, because remainders of the war (for instance, land mines) can be a serious danger. Part of accessibility is also that all groups in the community have equal access to the project, including more vulnerable groups like children or the disabled, and also including targeted racial or ethnic groups (SDP IWG, 2007).

No emphasis on scoreboard outcome

A fifth condition is that there should be no emphasis on scoreboard outcome. Lea-Howarth (2006) places value on the conflicting moments that can occur in sport. Leaders skilled in peace-building can use these moments to educate the participants. Such transformation of a conflict requires well-trained and capable facilitators, as we have stressed in the first condition, but the sport programming should avoid emphasizing the scoreboard outcome; instead, it should focus on the continued process of participation and utilize these teachable moments.
Interconnection with other organizations in society

A sixth condition is an interconnection with other organizations in society. Sport programming seems to show success when it interconnects with other layers and levels of society, rather than functioning in isolation. Sport is a first step in establishing new contacts and relationships between people, but for real reconciliation, these contacts should be transferred into the ordinary life. Therefore, cooperation with other societal organizations like schools, churches and businesses is necessary. As middle-level actors, Lederach (2005) notes, sport for development organizations occupy key strategic positions to build cross-sectional relationships. Several sport-for-peace projects were able to show success by interconnecting with other partners in their community. Giulianotti & Armstrong (2011) studied how SfD projects work in a context with a military presence. They suggest that sport-based peacemaking interventions provide the military with a new kind of institutional function, and fresh ways of building positive social links to civilian populations. They stress the importance of engagement between civilians and peacekeeping, which can be enforced via sports.
Figure 11: The relation chain of sport and peace-building and conflict resolution
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5 Conclusion and next steps

In this chapter, the central question of this review will be answered: What is the potential of sport as a tool for development and how to benefit from that in the best possible way? First, the main findings of the literature review will be summarized. Then, Dutch SfD policy and practice will be outlined, focusing on the specific characteristics of Dutch policy and programs. Finally, valuable next steps will be proposed, related to the challenges and opportunities in front of the SfD sector.

5.1 Sport’s potential to contribute to development

Sport has some unique features to contribute to development, especially in comparison with other interventions. Individuals and groups all over the world are interested in sports, regardless of background, age, race, religion, gender or status. Therefore, sport can attract target groups who are usually hard to reach. They can easily be involved, sport is visible and accessible, sport offers role models and contains intrinsic values that play an important role in society. Particular sport activities and social processes of participation can be key to reach certain development goals. The unique features have been acknowledged in various policies, internationally and in the Netherlands.

5.1.1 Claims vs. empirical research

Nevertheless, many claims of the power of sport in policy and practice cannot be met according to empirical research. Research analysis has made clear that sport has the potential to contribute to development goals, but sport does not necessarily lead to the desired developmental outcomes. According to the academic literature, health is the only overarching outcome that shows a direct relationship with physical activity. For all other overarching development outcomes it is hard to prove a direct causal relation between sport and development. This also counts for ‘youth and education’, ‘gender equality’ and ‘peace and reconciliation’ - development goals that are foci in Dutch SfD programs.

At the same time, academic research offers handles to use sport as a vehicle to contribute to these goals. It is important to approach sport as ‘a site for socialization experiences’, not as a cause of socialization outcomes. It is not sport in itself which leads automatically to development. Sport takes place in a complex social context in which various factors influence the final outcomes of a sport for development program. To provide insight in the potential of sport for development and to be able to contribute to development in the best possible way, we developed a basic SfD model. This model takes into account that the relation between sport and development often is indirect and that the outcomes of SfD programs depend on a number of, sometimes hard to affect, variables. The model starts with sport as a site for socialization experience and then distinguishes ‘necessary conditions’, ‘supporting conditions’, ‘the moment of truth’, ‘intermediate outcomes’ and ‘overarching outcomes’, taking external variables into account as well. A necessary condition for any outcome is participation in sport. Supporting conditions refer to the processes and organizational and program components that should lead to the achievement of desired outcomes. Frequently mentioned supporting conditions are related to the organization of programs and activities, the role of coaches or leaders and the social environment in which the activities take place. Some conditions are general and apply to almost every SfD project, while others are more
context specific. If conditions are met, sport may lead to intermediate outcomes. Examples of intermediate outcomes are the development of ‘life skills’, increased social interaction, but also development of leadership and community building. These intermediate outcomes, often referred to as (aspects of) social capital, are an essential element in the achievement of the overarching developmental outcomes like child and youth development, gender equality, conflict resolution and peace. At the same time, it should be noted that intermediate outcomes are not always desired or positive outcomes. Sport can lead to injuries, to exclusion and to anti-social behavior.

The exact mechanisms during ‘the moment of truth’, which result in either positive or negative outcomes, are still unclear, including the best way for SfD organizations to facilitate ‘the moment of truth’. What is required is a developmental approach based on a realistic view on the meaning of sport, and a concentration on understanding the social processes and mechanisms that might lead to desired outcomes for some participants or some organizations in certain circumstances (Pawson, 2006). From this perspective, monitoring and evaluation need to pursue understanding via participatory, process-centered and formative evaluation (Shah et al., 2004; Coalter, 2006, 2007).

5.1.2 Dutch policy and practice

The review of Dutch and international policies makes clear that Dutch SfD policies and programs have been influential and have had impact, both at policy level and in practice, but fluctuated over the years. This can be traced back to several factors, such as the varying political attention and resources. The current SfD program allows a limited number of experienced implementing partners and local embassies to deliver context specific SfD interventions. The current implementing partners of the Dutch SFD program, i.e. NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play, have played an important role in the continuity of Dutch contributions to SFD, in and outside the Netherlands.

These organizations have used their extensive experience in SfD to contribute to overarching development goals. The organizations differ in the way they want to contribute to development – working with different approaches, different target groups, and in different countries. This fits within SfD policy in the Netherlands since 1998, which can be characterized as decentralized and open towards diversity. As a consequence, a distinct ‘Dutch approach’ does not exist. However, there are similarities in the approaches of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, NSA International, KNVB and Right To Play. First, they all focus on transfer of knowledge and skills. This is done by developing curricula, training courses and manuals, by setting up local networks and by increasing the capacity of local people and organizations. Second, local coaches and leaders are essential as role models and educators. Third, programs aim to connect the grass roots operations (micro level) with local organizations (meso level) and national and international advocacy efforts (macro level) level. The programs are based on needs and context, tailor-made and cohesive. This is in line with scientific
research indicating that the involvement of local leaders and local capacity building and the use of local leaders as role models are keys to achieve desired outcomes.

5.2 **Valuable next steps for Dutch SfD organizations**

The following question is: How can Dutch SfD organizations use the potential of sport in the best possible way, taking into account their own expertise and experience, Dutch SfD policy and programs, and evidence and lessons learned from empirical studies?

The academic literature learns that, to maximize the outcomes, SfD organizations should accept that a direct relationship between sport and development is hard to prove and that they should focus on intermediate outcomes instead. According to the presented SfD basic mode, SfD organizations should make sure that the necessary and supporting conditions are met to increase the chance on the delivery of the desired outcomes. In the years to come one of the main challenges for the SfD sector in general is to invest in quality of programs and sustainability of results.

Dutch organizations can play a valuable role in dealing with these challenges, making use of the findings and recommendations of this review. They can increase their impact using sport for development by a stronger focus on:

1. **Facilitating the moment of truth**
   
   The interaction between the sport coach and participant is decisive for the outcomes of a program. The three Dutch SfD organizations have a strong focus on the education of sport coaches and community leaders and thus have a direct impact on the moment of truth. They can increase the impact of their programs by a stronger focus on facilitating the moment of truth. Important aspects of facilitating the moment of truth are:
   
   • Background analyses and needs assessments of participants and local contexts
   • Precise selection of coaches and leaders by qualitative entry requirements
   • Tailored education programs for coaches and leaders
   • Sharing best practices among coaches and leaders
   • Establishing peer reviews of coaches and leaders
   • Supervision and follow-up programs for coaches and participants

   In general, ‘facilitating the moment of truth’ means that SfD organizations operate from a service management perspective, facilitating all participants during the moment of truth in the best possible way.

2. **Investing in local involvement, organizational capacity and partnerships**

   One of the important supporting conditions for outcomes and impact is the involvement of local beneficiaries themselves and their communities. It is strongly recommended to also involve local civil society organizations, i.e. sport organizations and/or other organizations that can support the moment of truth as well. Further investment in organizational capacity and in local partnerships is crucial to deliver sustainable programs which have an impact in the long term.
3. Programs at micro level, structurally supported at meso and macro level
In the field of sport for development, organizations work in a complex environment in which a variety of stakeholders is engaged, from local organizations to national governments to international sport organizations to donors. All these actors influence, directly or indirectly, the actual delivery of SfD programs. The SfD organizations – either local or foreign - have to structurally cooperate with civil society organizations to also make sure that relations with governments, multilateral institutions and (i)NGOs, are supportive for the SfD programs at grassroots level.

4. Integration of practice, policy and research
The more is known about the mechanisms during the 'moment of truth' - which determines the aspired outcomes at the end of the day - the better organizations are able to make a difference with the use of sport for development. Programs can be improved if systematic cooperation between SfD organizations and local partners and academic institutions is stimulated and facilitated. This cooperation should, besides monitoring and evaluation, lead to smart integration of scientific research and innovation within SfD programs, especially with regard to the organization of partnership and capacity building. In doing so, Dutch funded SfD programs can be further improved, increase impact in the field and contribute to the SfD sector internationally.
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