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1 Executive summary

Comic Relief commissioned an exercise to map the current status of research in the area of Sport for Development (SfD). This consists of a ‘snapshot’ of research completed since 2005, an inventory of research planned or in progress, and an overview of the M&E toolkits which have been created. This exercise also included a review of the location and geographical focus of key researchers in SfD. Interviews were conducted with a selection of key informants to explore the perception of the current ‘evidence base’ for the impact of sport on development.

The results were considered within a ‘knowledge brokering’ framework, whereby issues and challenges were reviewed under the headings of problem identification, knowledge generation, and knowledge use.

Recommendations in the area of ‘problem identification’ included conducting fewer general reviews of ‘impact’ in favour of more detailed thematic reviews; differentiating between ‘monitoring’, ‘evaluation’ and ‘research’, and systematic sharing of research plans to reduce duplication.

Recommendations in the area of ‘knowledge generation’ included: improvement of research quality, improvement of research skills beyond ‘Northern’ based researchers, increased use of thematic experts, and expansion of the methods used, particularly in order to tackle harder questions of impact, such as community and societal impacts.

Recommendations in the area of ‘knowledge use’ included improving dissemination, including building in explicit dissemination budgets into research activities, and considering more creative dissemination approaches.

A particular area of interest was M&E toolkits, of which 15 were examined. At the moment, each toolkit serves slightly different functions, with no obvious overlaps recognised. It was decided that continued communication and collaboration will prevent duplication from occurring in the future. However, there is a risk that delivery organisations may be burdened by being required to use particular toolkits by their funders, and pressure on an organisation to use more than one toolkit should be avoided.

A literature search on SfD (academic and grey) since 2005 yielded 277 reports. These were examined in terms of the topic on which they concentrated, and the countries on which they were
focused. Most of the reports concentrated on an individual (rather than community or societal) level of analysis, and over half were focused on Northern countries. The vast majority of researchers were based in Northern countries.

This exercise has yielded substantial information in terms of the activities and focus of research in the SfD sector. It is apparent that there is scope for streamlining research activities in order to maximise the cost-effectiveness and impact of research in the sector. This is unlikely to be achievable by any one organisation on its own, but will rather emerge from continued collaboration at a strategic level within the SfD community.
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3 Introduction

3.1 Background and aims

As part of its 2010/2011 Sport for Change programme, Comic Relief undertook to commission a mapping exercise of research in the area of Sport for Development (SfD). At a meeting initiated by Myles Wickstead and convened by UK Sport in July 2010, the theme of understanding the nature of our evidence base, and reducing fragmentation/duplication of research effort emerged. Therefore this activity has been informed by, and will be shared with, other actors in this sector.

Previous research by Comic Relief, and the July 2010 discussions, made it clear that significant investment has been made within the sector by funders, network leaders and local organisations in developing an ‘evidence base’ to demonstrate the impact of sport. There is a perception that there is substantial overlap in terms of organisations involved, thematic areas of focus and use of data.

The aim of the current mapping exercise was therefore to establish a ‘baseline’ whereby potential research gaps, overlaps and opportunities for collaboration could be identified. The brief was to map the research looking at the impact of Sport for Development (SfD) programmes since 2005 by a selected group of organisations in the UK and internationally, and to catalogue the M&E toolkits and databases developed or under development.

3.2 What is ‘research’?

The ‘term’ research is used very loosely in this sector. A puritan’s definition of “research” is investigations which have some relevance beyond the particular situation being investigated, and which use formal scientific methods (though not necessarily just quantitative), i.e. they are hypothesis driven, sampling is systematic, methods are fit for purpose, data are quality assured, analysis is systematic, and conclusions are reliable and valid. An important feature of this approach is that ‘no impact’ or ‘negative impact’ are legitimate conclusions. However, within the sector, many individuals and organisations use the terms ‘research’ and ‘evaluation’ interchangeably, treating any form of data collection as research. The risk with confusing the two is that evaluations are often designed to gather merely supporting evidence e.g. positive case
studies; they are very specific to an organisation, they are often very poorly funded, and often the sample size is too small to draw generic conclusions. This is not to say that evaluation is not essential for organisational development. A “fit for purpose” evaluation must address the organisation’s learning needs, whereas “fit for purpose” research is likely to have more generic lessons for the sector, and, if it is conducted to appropriate quality standards, should provide compelling evidence for the impact of sport.

4 Methodology

4.1 Data collection

This report draws on 4 sources of data:
- Face to face and telephone interviews with 8 organisations (12 key informants)
- Completed Excel spreadsheet sent by individuals
- Searching of academic databases
- Internet search of key SfD databases and accessing organisations websites

4.2 Participants

Participants were identified via a ‘snowballing’ process whereby an initial list of participants was produced by Comic Relief, and then researchers were referred onwards by others in order to broaden the pool of organisations consulted. Logistical problems in the course of the research (transfer of the project to OCR due to the ill health of the initial researcher) meant that somewhat fewer participants were interviewed than was originally intended. However, this was partially compensated for by more extensive trawling of academic and publically available information.

Twelve individuals were interviewed from 8 organisations, and information was requested from 125 participants by email. Data were received, either by email or via an interview, from 60 participants.

A general list of organisations whose material has been included is available in appendix 1. However, organisations who responded to the request for interviews have been kept anonymous, in order to facilitate frank discussion.

4.3 Data analysis

Data analysis is described rather more exhaustively here than might be considered necessary or interesting on such a small-scale project. However, we considered it valuable to include it, as it illustrates a number of aspects of research quality, such as transparency, loyalty to the raw data,
thoroughness, as well as facilitating replicability of the research in the future. The data analysis also illustrates areas where time, and therefore cost, could be saved in further studies, through the use of relevant software, for example.

4.3.1 Interviews

Interviews were conducted in English, either face to face, by telephone or by VOIP (Skype), and were digitally recorded, either directly, by using built in Skype recording software (Pamela), or a phone mounted microphone. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and then imported into the qualitative data analysis software HyperResearch. The interviews were then ‘coded’ manually by a researcher. Coding involves the researcher breaking the text into segments which have a bearing on a particular research question, and attaching a theme to each of the segments. For example, a sentence “we usually design our research study in a very participative way, in consultation with the organisations on the ground” involves the researcher deciding what theme to assign to it, e.g. “collaboration”, and then highlighting the text and selecting the relevant code from a picklist which has been pre-defined. This ‘picklist’ evolves and is refined as each interview is coded. The system also permits additional researcher annotations, such as “this is a particularly good example of....” to facilitate later write-up.

Once all the interviews are ‘coded’ in this way, the software enables swift sorting of the text segments by the theme assigned. The researcher can then read all of the comments relating to a theme, and summarise them.

Use of the software described above did not in any way ‘automate’ the analysis, but rather enabled the organisation of the text to be mechanised so that the 100 pages of the interview text could be manipulated easily. An important feature of this approach is that it enables easy ‘track back’ from conclusions to raw data. In a more extensive research study, it also supports coding by a number of researchers, in order to reduce bias. Finally, should this piece of research be extended or replicated at a later date, it would be relatively easy to integrate new interviews into the existing analysis structure, in order to examine e.g. the evolution of the world of SfD over a longer period.

4.3.2 Excel spreadsheets

Excel spreadsheets were completed by individuals and returned to the researchers by email. They were then manually aggregated into a master matrix. A future improvement on this process would be to ensure that the blank matrices which were circulated were absolutely identical, and underpinned by Excel code, such that they could be aggregated automatically once they were received. An even more labour saving approach would be to make a single file publicly available and editable, via a ‘cloud’ technology such as DropBox or Google Docs, so that no further integration is necessary.
4.3.3 Literature search

In mapping the research, we surveyed both academic literature (by which we mean investigations which have been written up, subjected to peer review, and then published in academic journals), and the ‘grey’ literature (unpublished reports, including those made available on the internet). It is reasonable to assume that the findings reported in the academic literature may have some generic relevance to the sector: this is one of the criteria applied when a paper is being reviewed for publication. However, the ‘grey’ literature does not have that filter imposed on it. Nevertheless, this material was included in our search, for several reasons: some of the participants submitted such material as samples of their research; the time lag between reporting and publishing a piece of research can be several years, so excluding material ‘in preparation’ creates a ‘lag’ in the snapshot we are trying to create; and some research, and many evaluations, are never actually published in journals, as internet dissemination is considered sufficient.

Searching of the published academic literature in research journals was conducted by interrogating the ISI Web of Knowledge journal database with the search term “sport for development”. This search was supplemented by searching for citations of some of the key articles in the field. As ISI does not cover some of the smaller journals, these searches were supplemented by searching via Google Scholar.

In terms of the ‘grey’ literature, in addition to receiving reports from participants, the International Platform for Sport and Development, and other SfD knowledge bases were also searched for relevant material. See Appendix 2 for a complete list.

References were managed by importing them into the bibliographic database software Reference Manager. This has several advantages over a Word document, for example. These include: 1) references can be added to the database automatically once encountered (via an export button e.g. within Google Scholar), without having to re-type; 2) references can be searched, sorted and filtered in multiple ways, e.g. we only worked on material which was generated post 2005, despite maintaining a database which spans a longer time period than this; 3) reference lists and subject bibliographies can be generated automatically, thus saving time and promoting accuracy; 4) reference lists can be produced in any format e.g. some research journals require APA or Harvard formatting, whereas an unpublished report such as the present one can use the ‘house style’ of Comic Relief.
5 Results

5.1 Type of research usually undertaken

Organisations in general were fairly flexible in terms of the type of research they undertook, and how it was funded. Some organisations are approached by the wider SfD community and asked to solve a problem, e.g. to inform programming, or to influence policy; others conduct their own analysis of the research gaps and seek funding to conduct relevant research. There is also a substantial amount of ad hoc research, in particular, where masters or PhD students present a proposal which requires benefit in kind support such as access to grassroots organisations, or access to data and contacts, rather than requiring funding. Finally, donors and funders occasionally commission research either directly, or through intermediary organisations.

5.2 Definitions of ‘research’

Often, in the course of the interviews, questions arose about the definition of the term ‘research’ and the remit of this particular exercise, and this was apparent in some participants’ responses. For instance, an organisation conducting a capacity building exercise might consider itself to be doing, or at least, implementing the findings of, research. For example, Street Football World (SFW) have implemented a substantial initiative around building capacity in the area of M&E, which will deliver tailored support to network members. This in itself is not research; however, the SFW initiative draws on material generated by one of the partners (SAD), which itself emerged from research, so in that respect, it is a research-based output. Laureus is in a similar position: having funded a global research project, they are currently piloting training around a toolkit which explicitly emerged from that project.

5.3 Research quality

There was reasonable consensus that the quality of work labelled ‘research’ was highly variable. Features of ‘good quality’ research mentioned by informants included:

- Systematic collection of baseline information prior to a project commencing, in order to detect impact at the end
- Use of experts in the area we’re seeking to impact, as well as programming experts. For example, UNICEF’s swimming project used an expert in injury prevention with children to inform the design of their intervention. SAD brought in experts in conflict transformation to work on their Sri Lanka project, and Laureus contracted research experts in well-being, quality of life and adolescent psychology to design their global research study.
- Use of strong behavioural indicators. There is an emphasis in the SfD domain on
measurement of impact based on self-report. This is often a pragmatic decision, based on what it is feasible, but also on the length of time taken for tangible behavioural change to be visible. Some aims and interventions lend themselves to this more than others, e.g. the impact of the SafeSwim project was visible in a reduction of drowning accidents in national health and safety statistics. Some organisations (e.g. UNICEF) explicitly use a ‘knowledge, attitudes and practice’ approach to ensure that the behavioural element of impact is not neglected either in baseline or in impact research.

- Retention of data to enable cross-comparisons with other projects and countries.
- Collaboration with organisations where data collection is occurring so that they understand and feel a sense of ownership of the research. This can often include discussions at the design stage, and also training to enable the organisation to be involved in data collection. This participatory approach was mentioned by several organisations, but implicit in this discussion was a certain degree of ‘trade-off’ between “ethical quality” of research and “scientific quality”. The more focused a piece of research is on meeting a specific organisation’s needs, e.g. where the questions are defined by the organisation itself, the less likely it is that the results will be generalisable to other projects. Methodologically, if the research ‘instruments’ e.g. questionnaires, are highly customised for individual organisations, it is possible that the data will not then be comparable across organisations, even if it is very useful to the organisation concerned. This will be discussed further under ‘research challenges’.
- There was an element of pragmatism in the discussions of research quality: policy recommendations have to be based on extremely robust evidence, whereas individual evaluations have to be ‘good enough’ to be of use to the organisation concerned. This is where a clear understanding of whether ‘research’ or ‘evaluation’ is being conducted is important.
- Some organisations use baseline research as a way of identifying a problem and generating funding for interventions or further research.
- Use of external, academically oriented researchers who aim to publish their work in peer-reviewed journals is seen as one method of maintaining quality in the field.
- Good research makes links with existing research, e.g. using comparable methodology or instruments, in order to leverage existing knowledge and to enable comparability of the information.
- Carefully validated research tools, e.g. not assuming that questionnaires validated in the US will have global applicability.
- Participant-appropriate research tools, e.g. taking into account literacy, mother tongue, familiarity with scales (e.g. ‘agree/disagree’ or 10 point scales).
- In terms of research design, two organisations mentioned that it would be hugely valuable to do more ‘controlled’ trials, whereby interventions were compared with non-intervention, or more longitudinal work, where project participants were followed up to determine whether
any change was sustained in the longer term.

5.4 Research audience

Most organisations see their research partly as a way of informing and supporting grantees and practitioners, in order to improve programming, and partly as an advocacy tool for raising the profile (and presumably also funding) of SfD, e.g. “most of the research we commission, we’d like there to be a strong advocacy component behind it”, or “Everything we research should inform our practice, so 100% of the research should inform how we go about things, but actually, the purpose of a lot of the research is to influence ... to advocate or to influence policy”. Some organisations also support their grantees to use the research for their own advocacy and funding initiatives.

Another type of audience is donors and funders, to inform their own research and programming strategies. It is occasionally the case that research is conducted as a ‘meta-evaluation’ of a funding initiative, e.g. Football for Hope, so the findings are not always published, but are used internally to re-focus or improve programming.

Few organisations explicitly mentioned their dissemination strategies, but several mentioned that this was an area they were starting to examine internally, in terms of increasing the reach and impact of their research output, e.g. by communicating in more creative ways, e.g. using short videos, or by gathering grantees together, with knowledge and best practice sharing as part of the aims. Those who maintained, or were key stakeholders in, knowledge repositories such as the International Sport for Development Platform, or UNICEF’s reports database, mentioned that most research reports were uploaded there. In relation to research commissioned from academics, it appears to be up to the individual academic team to submit articles to research journals or present at conferences, and it seems rare to include a dissemination budget in the commissioning of the research.

Many organisations produce short summaries of research in addition to full reports and disseminate these in a variety of ways, e.g. on their own websites, within their own newsletters etc. One organisation, UNICEF, also maintains an internal database where its own SfD initiatives are reported across all 150 countries.

5.5 Funding

As mentioned above, research is used as a tool to lobby for increased investment for SfD. It was also acknowledged that though at a practical level, funders were relatively respectful of the independence of research, obtaining funding for research in the first place is dependent on
funder’s priorities, and therefore the topic of research is sometimes dictated by topical policy issues e.g. obesity, involvement of women in sport, etc. This can sometimes be an advantage, allowing SfD research initiatives to tap into funds which are not specifically earmarked for SfD, by linking to a broader policy objective, e.g. economic empowerment.

Some organisations identify a need for a piece of research required first, and then approach funders to ask them to get involved. Others are approached by funders, or by smaller organisations seeking support.

Occasionally, research funding is subsumed within capacity building funding, so research becomes one of the building blocks to deliver the required capacity building, e.g. training, toolkits.

5.6 Research challenges

Participants mentioned a wide variety of research challenges, ranging from strategic and policy level challenges through to the minutiae of conducting research in the field:

5.6.1 Strategic challenges

One challenge mentioned by several informants was the difficulty of accessing national level statistics against which impact can be compared. For example, a project which is successful in reducing re-offence rates has difficulty accessing government statistics on re-offending, partly because these figures are not tracked very accurately, and partly because the information is not always made available.

A second challenge mentioned was that organisations were often lacking a theory of change, such that it was difficult to establish what elements of a programme might deliver the intended impact. This makes it harder to conduct relevant and informative research in the first place. It also means that where no effect is detected (e.g. no increase in leadership skills), this may be because the intervention was not actually focused on delivering this in the first place.

A third challenge was the tendency of research to concentrate on what can be measured easily (e.g. self esteem), rather than developing methodologies to research ‘difficult’ areas, such as community cohesion.

5.6.2 Practical challenges

A prevalent challenge is the time and expense involved in translating research instruments and data e.g. questionnaires, interviews.

Local capacity limitations were mentioned: several organisations mentioned the necessity of
training local researchers, and ensuring that that resource is available for repeat data collection e.g. post intervention. Local organisational capacity e.g. in terms of managing paperwork or access to printing or photocopying facilities also poses practical limitations.

Some resistance to research at grassroots level was mentioned, for a variety of reasons:

- Research can be seen as onerous and time-consuming and not beneficial to the individual organisation (particularly if the organisation has had a bad experience in the past e.g. with not receiving their data back in a usable format, or not being able to access final reports because of limited bandwidth).
- Research can be seen as a luxury – a waste of limited funds
- The timescales within which research is conducted can make it seem irrelevant
- Research can be seen as esoteric and specialist, and not accessible in terms of participating in, producing or using the research.
- Research is not seen as meeting the needs of the organisation participating.
- Logistical or security issues e.g. transport to projects, security concerns

Cost of research was seen as a huge challenge. In particular, the cost of Northern researchers was seen as a limitation. In fact, this was not just an issue for Northern researchers – a reputable University researcher in South Africa was also seen as expensive. Cost can also be added to contracts e.g. by UK universities ‘full economic costing’, whereby substantial overhead charges are compulsorily embedded in the fee, or through complicated, cascaded relationships where value added tax has to be built in even if the end client is overseas. One organisation is seeking to overcome this challenge by making much more use of tendering processes, whereby cost, quality, expertise and capacities of tenderers can be optimised more systematically.

It is often cheaper, and more ethically appropriate, to contract local researchers, but local capacity (e.g. local universities or independent researchers) in terms of delivering high quality research was seen posing its own challenges. Two organisations mentioned having eschewed using reputable Northern researchers in favour of using cheaper local researchers and being disappointed in the outcome.

### 5.6.3 Quality & access challenges

A challenge more for SfD in general was a perception that there is quite a bit of poor quality research being conducted in the field, which can actually erode the evidence base rather than augment it, as it damages the credibility of the research. One organisation mentioned that there is also quite a bit of secondary analysis and writing based on poor quality data.

Several organisations mentioned that using masters and PhD students to conduct cheap or free
research brought advantages but also its own challenges, e.g. the timescales, particularly for PhDs, can be very long. Also, by their very nature, masters and PhD students are inexperienced in the field, and therefore their research is even more vulnerable to being delayed by logistical problems.

One informant also identified ‘political issues’, where research is initiated with a goal of ‘social change and improvement in the world’ but its impact is dulled by tension regarding who retains ownership. This informant felt that ‘open source’ was something that still isn’t fully established in this field.

No informant mentioned difficulties in accessing the academic literature, which is slightly surprising. Without having an association with a higher education establishment, it is difficult to gain access to academic journals. It was not clear to us whether this did not arise as a problem because material is being shared freely and therefore no-one encountered the problem, or whether there is a ‘blind spot’ in terms of access to this source of knowledge.

A challenge mentioned by several organisations, which relates to the definition of research discussed elsewhere, is the difficulty of finding indicators and methods which work across several heterogeneous organisations, and adapting them appropriately.

The fragmentation of research initiatives was also mentioned. Some organisations felt that there was excessive duplication of research initiatives.

Attribution of impact was identified as a challenge by many organisations. Even if an impact is detected, how can we say that this impact was attributable to our intervention?

Finding behavioural indicators and measuring behavioural adaptation was seen as very challenging, e.g. “we find it very hard to get proxy indicators that are going to give us real measures beyond self-reported behaviour, so I think that's an ongoing challenge across anything that we talk about, apart from the drowning example where it's a bit easier: The baseline: drop them in the water and they sank but after the training they swam - hooray!”

A challenge which was not referred to explicitly particularly often was that of choice of projects or programmes with which to work at a local level. Often, the selection of a project is dictated by organisations who provide a ‘pull’ for the research in the first place, or who express interest in it. However, it is possible that research which spans several projects is inclined to towards working with projects which have some experience of, and capacity in, research. This can result in ‘fatigue’ both at an organisational level, and at the level of respondents.
5.7 Research impact

This was not explored in much detail, but in general it appears that organisations are currently gearing up to do more, rather than less, research: there is a real commitment in the sector to ensuring a robust evidence base, to underpin advocacy, fundraising and programming.

Oddly enough, for a domain where evidence of impact is seen as critical, there was little spontaneous discussion of research impact evaluation. This is something which is being grappled with throughout academic institutions, in terms of assessing the nature of the publication outlet, number of times a particular article has been cited, but also how the findings of the research have been applied.

There was also a sense that there were grantees doing some good research locally which has broader relevance to the SfD community but that they needed support in terms of publishing and otherwise disseminating their material.

5.8 Collaborations

The network of collaborations within SfD is extremely complex, and we have not explored this in detail. A number of different models of collaboration which were evident:

- Consulting with a network of grantees to identify research questions, and then leading the research initiative (e.g. Laureus global network meetings)
- Forming collaborations with other research commissioners or researchers in order to reinforce funding applications (e.g. combined Laureus/SFW/University of Brunel/Royal Holloway application to Sport England)
- Practical collaborations to apply learning in the field (e.g. Laureus/SFW initiative to roll out M&E training and toolkits)
- Responding to a request from a particular researcher, PhD student or Masters student.
- Sending data to external organisations for data entry, data cleaning, secondary analysis or report writing. This is seen as something which can be expanded in relation to data produced by specific toolkits which are coming online e.g. the Laureus/SFW/Aqumen/Royal Holloway toolkit.
- One organisation aspired to thematic coalitions which would inevitably broaden the range of collaborators, whereby experts in a particular thematic area collaborate with SfD experts.

There was a slight concern in relation to collaborations that when it comes to commissioning research, there is an overdependence on a small number of Northern based researchers - the ‘usual suspects’. This was seen to be an advantage in terms of expertise and continuity, but a
disadvantage in terms of a) building local capacity and b) limiting the field in terms of innovative approaches to research, cost etc. Two organisations explicitly mentioned investigating ‘new’ researchers, both in the North and the South. One organisation mentioned a tendering process which increases the possibility of identifying new researchers.

There was little mention of fostering collaborations between independent and academic researchers. This might be seen to be the responsibility of researchers themselves, particularly those based within academia, but it should be remembered that for non-northern based researchers, and researchers not based in academia, attendance at networking meetings and conferences is a cost, and therefore unless it is built into research budgets, it should not be assumed that it will happen anyway.

### 5.9 Research gaps

- One organisation has identified **childhood obesity** as a strategic theme, and will be working on that next year.
- Several organisations mentioned that the gaps were not so much topic areas as **overlap and duplication**, so felt that they wished to be more cautious in commissioning new research before being aware of what has been done in the past and what is currently being done. They affirmed that there needs to be more discussion and coherence within the sector as a whole in terms of research strategies. It was felt that the perception of the lack of an evidence base is primarily due to this **fragmentation** rather than actual lack of work.
- One or two people mentioned a **lack of evidence based argumentation**, rather than a lack of an evidence base per se. By evidence-based argumentation, they meant using good quality data and research studies to back up their claims.
- Another organisation mentioned **quality assurance of research**, and a need for **critical analysis** of what is being done.
- Some organisations felt that the evidence for the value for SfD is already there, and that what is now needed is more information on **components of a good intervention**.
- One organisation felt it was inevitable that as a part of the ‘coming of age’ of SfD, there would always need to be some intervention research being conducted, i.e. the evidence base needs to be continually updated.
- Several people mentioned a need for a networked, ‘**meta-analysis**’ type approach, where a group identifies a topic and then trawls across organisations horizontally for relevant data.
- Two organisations mentioned that occasionally the need is to demonstrate ‘**why sport**’ rather than any other programmatic tool – almost a **cost-benefit analysis of sport versus other interventions** such as music, drama etc.
- Two organisations mentioned a need for more **action research**, and research using more
innovative methodologies which are potentially more sensitive to the needs of participants, e.g. ethnography.

- Very few specific thematic areas were mentioned as gaps, with the exception of the following:
  - Gender & sport
  - Gender based violence and sexual harassment
  - Economic empowerment & livelihoods work (both as directly addressed by projects, and as a side-effect of personal development in other areas)
  - Sport and reproductive health.
- As researchers, we found it surprising that there was little mention of a research gap in the area beyond the individual ‘level of analysis’, i.e. groups, communities, societies. For example, though many programmes have ambitions to create impact at community and societal levels, we have seen few examples of research that actually tries to address this using appropriate methods e.g. social network mapping.
- A gap which is currently being addressed is one which was mentioned in the ‘research challenges’ section earlier: endeavouring to find tools and instruments which can be applied generically across organisations such that organisations can conduct their own internal evaluations, but the data can be aggregated across organisations for research purposes. This is discussed in the ‘toolkits’ section below.

5.10 Research in field or planned

It is difficult to identify research in field or planned, as, of course, documentation is not necessarily available, and it can often only be obtained by personal communication. Therefore, this list in Table 1 is by no means exhaustive. Research planned is a mixture of detailed work within thematic areas, application work to transform research findings into usable best practice guidelines and tools, and broad ‘does sport work?’ activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Collaborators</th>
<th>Planned or in field</th>
<th>Date due to report</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Sport</td>
<td>Benefits of and barriers to investing in SfD</td>
<td>SportAccord; Kantar Media</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alex@benchmarksport.com">alex@benchmarksport.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureus</td>
<td>Pilot of M&amp;E Toolkit Rollout</td>
<td>Orla Cronin &amp; Alison Woodcock (Royal Holloway &amp; OCR)</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tom.Pitchon@Laureus.com">Tom.Pitchon@Laureus.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFW</td>
<td>Pilot of SFW/Aqumen/Laureus system</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>End 2011</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Hebel@streetfootballworld.org">Hebel@streetfootballworld.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving the Goalposts Kilifi</td>
<td>Follow up evaluation after 2008 baseline survey</td>
<td>Orla Cronin &amp; Alison Woodcock; funded by Laureus</td>
<td>Currently being written up</td>
<td>May 2011</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.woodcock@rhul.ac.uk">a.woodcock@rhul.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureus</td>
<td>Economic value of using sport to tackle youth crime</td>
<td>New Philanthropy Capital</td>
<td>In field</td>
<td>Autumn 2011</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tom.pitchon@laureus.com">Tom.pitchon@laureus.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGEI (United Nations Girls Education Initiative) with a number of other partners</td>
<td>Formative evaluation of the girls education initiative (establishing a baseline). Aims to establish how effective the institutional engagement of key UNGEI partners has been at the country, regional and global levels</td>
<td>TBC (tendering closed end Jan 2011). Partners include Beyond Sport, UNICEF, Cisco</td>
<td>In field</td>
<td>Reporting Q3 2011</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ungei.org">www.ungei.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Football World</td>
<td>Baseline evaluation of 5 football for hope projects</td>
<td>Street Football World</td>
<td>Report in progress</td>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hebel@sfw.org">hebel@sfw.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Football World</td>
<td>Football for Hope Festival Evaluation: Follow up to baseline assessment of Football for Hope Festival</td>
<td>Street Football World</td>
<td>Thesis in progress</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hebel@sfw.org">hebel@sfw.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Collaborators</td>
<td>Planned or in field</td>
<td>Date due to report</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired by Sport Foundation</td>
<td>Creating a Business Case for investment into Sport for Development Projects for Young People in Deprived Communities in the UK (covering Health.; Confidence and self-esteem, Life skills, Crime and anti-social behaviour, Community cohesion, Social inclusion, yielding a best practice toolkit for designing sport for change interventions (up to £250k funding)</td>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>In field</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td><a href="http://www.substance.coop">www.substance.coop</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Development Research Network</td>
<td>Cross cultures project association: Can grassroots sport contribute to peace and stability in post-conflict countries? Desk study of impact evaluation methodologies relevant for CCPA’s international operations within the field of Sport for Development including a review of CCPA’s current internal project monitoring and evaluation system. Key words: social capital, inter-community mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Posted as a thesis/dissertation topic September 2010</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ddrn.dk">www.ddrn.dk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India Development Foundation</td>
<td>Hypothesis: Sports has a positive impact on the personal and social development of the child/ youth. Research Question: What is the extent of the impact of sports on the development of the child/ youth? Collecting empirical evidence around this and devise tools to measure the impact both quantitatively and qualitatively. Sampling: Sampling shall be done from organizations in India practicing Sport for Development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rekhasdey@gmail.com">rekhasdey@gmail.com</a>; <a href="http://www.idfresearch.org">www.idfresearch.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Sports Commission</td>
<td>Development of M&amp;E tools for the ASC India programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned – ITT issued</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Collaborators</td>
<td>Planned or in field</td>
<td>Date due to report</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>Tests the hypothesis that ‘sport contributes to the personal development and well being of disadvantaged children and young people and brings wider benefits to the community’. 3 yr project, 6 SfD programmes.</td>
<td>Comic Relief Stirling University</td>
<td>Dissemination workshop in Cape Town held in November</td>
<td>Report available online Short publication June 2011</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joanna.knight@uksport.gov.uk">Joanna.knight@uksport.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>International community Coach Education Systems: understand coach education as complex service intervention and how it can be made to work most effectively.</td>
<td>Leeds Met</td>
<td>2 year project commenced in April (includes Masters Studentship) Document reviews and central project interviews commenced</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oliver.dudfield@uksport.gov.uk">oliver.dudfield@uksport.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>Sustainable Youth Leadership Development (linked to Beckworth International Leadership Development (BILD). Examines impact and sustainability of SFD programmes at policy organisational, community and individual levels.</td>
<td>Edge Hill University - UK, Monash University - Australia University of Development Studies, University of Ghana – Ghana University of Dar Es Salaam – Tanzania.</td>
<td>Proposal submitted to the Leverhulme Trust in September, second round in December and decision by the end of May 2011 Applying for 3 years of funding worth up to £100,000.</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Nick Pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>EduSport Foundation’s Go Sisters Research: Longitudinal study investigating impact of a girls empowerment programme</td>
<td>Brunel University</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joanna.knight@uksport.gov.uk">Joanna.knight@uksport.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Collaborators</td>
<td>Planned or in field</td>
<td>Date due to report</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>International Development Through Excellence and Leadership in Sport (IDEALS) student study: Investigation of cultural intelligence and increased employability of IDEALS participants</td>
<td>Northumbria University</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>October 2011</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joanna.knight@uksport.gov.uk">Joanna.knight@uksport.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>Child Friendly Sport: review of child friendly sport initiated with a view to building a case for a wider project focused on encouraging/supporting action within relevant government, civil society and academic institutions to develop policies, strategies and implementation programmes leading to child-friendly sport.</td>
<td>Brunel University Monash University</td>
<td>Write up phase</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:oliver.dudfield@uksport.gov.uk">oliver.dudfield@uksport.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>Theoretical review questioning the positioning and use of sport as a tool for social development, in particular within the international development sphere. Argue a constant negotiation between ‘sport’ and ‘development’ as well as ‘local’ and ‘global’ perspectives to propose an alternative model arguing for the interplay of sport and development to be understood as a continuum</td>
<td>University of Worcester</td>
<td>Write up phase</td>
<td>Aim for publication in Sport &amp; Social Issues</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oliver.dudfield@uksport.gov.uk">oliver.dudfield@uksport.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>Sport and Development Coaching: Research report focused on the role of the sport and development coach. Using narrative methodology and drawing on a global sport and development the sport and development coach is presented as a ‘negotiator’ between sport/development and local/global agendas.</td>
<td>University of Worcester</td>
<td>Write up phase</td>
<td>Aim for publication in Sport in Society</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oliver.dudfield@uksport.gov.uk">oliver.dudfield@uksport.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.11 Toolkits

There was some initial confusion regarding the definition of a ‘toolkit’ versus ‘guidelines’ or a ‘portfolio of methods’. We interpreted the term toolkits very broadly, meaning a resource to facilitate research or evaluation, but we restricted the review to toolkits primarily focused on monitoring and evaluation SfD projects.

The issues which emerged in relation to toolkits were as follows:

- Ownership or retention of copyright by funders, vs. open source availability.
- Developed collaboratively with user organisations vs. imposed from outside/‘above’ (e.g. by funders)
- Need for investment in training and support for organisations to use a toolkit (tailored support)
- Internet based materials: this can challenging for local projects due to limitations on bandwidth/computers/internet access
- General discussion of difference between guidelines (e.g. best practice), toolkit and portfolio of methodologies
- Balancing the need for generic materials on the one hand and tailored support for individuals on the other
- Evolution of toolkits – mechanisms for improving, feedback from organisation, requirement for centralised translations repository
- Need for toolkits to be holistic in terms of having organisations think about their strategy, the kind of impact they wish to have etc.
- Parallel development of different toolkits and systems by different funding bodies, such that organisations may have to meet a variety of different reporting requirements using different online systems.

As this report is aimed at examining research in the area of SfD, we concentrated on toolkits which have relevance for future research initiatives, i.e. M&E toolkits.

There is a perception that there has been a proliferation of overlapping/competing toolkits in circulation, and indeed, there was a reasonable number – 15 - for a relatively small sector.

However, interrogating the term further yielded the following kinds of ‘toolkit’:

- A stand-alone package of thematically focused step by step instructions, including complete questionnaires, which an organisation can use to implement their own evaluation without
further support. Examples of these are the Laureus/SFW/Aqumen system or the Laureus M&E toolkit. A completely stand-alone, downloadable package may currently be more an aspiration than reality, but some organisations (e.g. Laureus, SFW) feel that their packages, coupled with training and ongoing support, will enable organisations to run their own evaluations.

- A “toolkit” can sometimes refer to “what is in the expert’s briefcase”. These specialist and valuable research and evaluation methods which are unlikely to be implemented by projects themselves, but which have an important role to play in continuing to generate sound evidence for the sector. Only a few of these have been tabulated. They include examples such as S.Diat, Outcome Mapping, Social Network Mapping.

- It was also apparent that some toolkits mentioned in relation to evaluation were originally focused mainly on monitoring rather than evaluation, though they are now currently being populated with evaluation methods also. These include examples such as the Substance ‘View’ toolkit.

Table 2 illustrates the toolkits we catalogued. For the purposes of simplification, we have omitted certain columns in this illustration (authors, partners/stakeholders, target audience and funding, where in any case our data were rather sparse). The full Excel table will be made available separately by Comic Relief on publication of this report. We do not claim that this is an exhaustive list, and it is hoped that this will continue to be populated over time. Table 3 shows more detail of the toolkits in terms of how they are made available to users. Finally, Table 4 shows only the toolkits which contain theme-specific tools (e.g. a questionnaire focusing specifically on self-esteem). This distinction seemed important, as some toolkits consist of generic tools and a knowledge management platform, whereas others provide specific tools for particular topics.
## Table 2: M&E toolkits for SfD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toolkit name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dev. Date</th>
<th>Geographical Focus</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICES: International Community Coach Education Standards</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>The objective of the ICES project is to contribute to improving the sport and physical activity experience for children and young people. The project aims to achieve this by providing an international platform for advocacy, organisational support and quality assurance of the training and development of community level coaches.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uksport.gov.uk/pages/ices/">http://www.uksport.gov.uk/pages/ices/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYP: Positive Activities for young people International Platform on Sport and Development Tools</td>
<td>DFES Managed by SAD</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Collection of national monitoring &amp; outcome information related to the PAYP initiative. Contains a number of quantitative outcome KPIs</td>
<td><a href="http://tinyurl.com/6azzh78">http://tinyurl.com/6azzh78</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>variou s</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>A repository of tools and manuals for the SfD community.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sportanddev.org">www.sportanddev.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Diat (Sport Development Impact Assessment Tool)</td>
<td>University of Johannesburg</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>The Tool (S-DIAT) was specifically developed to measure social impact at different levels, namely the macro-, meso- and micro-level as manifested consequences of a particular programme or intervention according to a pre-post research design (Burnett &amp; Uys, 2000).</td>
<td>Burnett, C. &amp; Uys, T. (2000). Sport Development Impact Assessment: towards a rationale and tool. South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, 22(1): 27-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureus M&amp;E toolkit</td>
<td>Laureus &amp; Royal Holloway</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Customisable package of validated questionnaire tools for impact evaluation under specific themes</td>
<td>Currently being piloted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureus/SFW/Aquamen</td>
<td>Streetfootball World</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Integrated monitoring and evaluation system, with questionnaire based evaluation tools integrated from Laureus toolkit.</td>
<td>Currently being piloted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Dev. Date</td>
<td>Geographical Focus</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring tool</td>
<td>Street Games</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Online monitoring tool with KPIs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.streetgames.org">www.streetgames.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views</td>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Mainly an online monitoring &amp; knowledge system, but now starting to release paper and web-enabled evaluation tools e.g. Outcomes Star, SportEd, Pling (which incorporates feedback tools) and Ipadio (phonelogs)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.substance.coop">www.substance.coop</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InsightShare</td>
<td>Insightshare</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Specialises in participatory video (for evaluation, consultation, advocacy)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.footballfoundation.org.uk">www.footballfoundation.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Foundation</td>
<td>Football Foundation</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Online reporting of monitoring data, plus 2 additional possible M&amp;E stages: panel review (with thematic experts), and independent evaluation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.insightshare.org">www.insightshare.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the case</td>
<td>Women’s Funding Network</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>Embedding evaluation in the entire project cycle</td>
<td><a href="http://www.womensfundingnetwork.org/the-network/member-services/about-making-the-case">http://www.womensfundingnetwork.org/the-network/member-services/about-making-the-case</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicking Aids Out M&amp;E Toolkit</td>
<td>Kicking Aids Out</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>A tool to monitor organisational development, sports development and lifeskills development</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kickingaidsout@nif.idrett.no">kickingaidsout@nif.idrett.no</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Toolkit delivery style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toolkit name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Open source</th>
<th>Specific to SfD?</th>
<th>Online system</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Explicit tailored support</th>
<th>Training package</th>
<th>Centralised data management</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICES: International Community Coach Education Standards</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYP: Positive Activities for young people</td>
<td>DFES</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Platform on Sport &amp; Development Tools</td>
<td>Managed by SAD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport in Development: A Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Manual</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Diat (Sport Development Impact Assessment Tool)</td>
<td>University of Johannesburg</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Researcher-applied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureus M&amp;E toolkit</td>
<td>Laureus&amp;RHUL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureus/SFW/Aquemen</td>
<td>Streetfootball World</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for evaluating Girls Sports Projects</td>
<td>Women Win</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance on Measuring the Impact of Interventions for National Governing Bodies of Sport</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAP (Knowledge, attitudes, practices)</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring tool</td>
<td>Street Games</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>tbc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views</td>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>No (£50 licence fee)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InsightShare</td>
<td>Insightshare</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Foundation</td>
<td>Football Foundation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (stage 1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the Case</td>
<td>Women’s Funding Foundation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicking Aids Out M&amp;E Toolkit</td>
<td>Kicking Aids Out</td>
<td>No – except to network members</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Tbc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Toolkits containing theme-specific tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toolkit name</th>
<th>ICES: International Community Coach Education Standards</th>
<th>PAYP: Positive Activities for young people</th>
<th>Laureus M&amp;E toolkit</th>
<th>Laureus/SFW/Aqumen Guidelines for evaluating Girls Sports Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>UK Sport</td>
<td>DFES</td>
<td>Laureus &amp; Royal Holloway</td>
<td>Streetfootball World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender based violence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic empowerment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeskills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks &amp; relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/ alcohol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cohesion &amp; conflict resolution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our conclusions, from our brief review, is that there isn’t necessarily extreme duplication of toolkits ...yet. The compilers of the most extensive toolkits – Laureus, SFW, Aqumen and SAD are already in discussions with each other in terms of sharing materials and training, and keeping each other informed on progress. It has been pointed out that some of the ‘bigger’ toolkits being developed are particularly sparse in terms of thematic tools around gender based violence and reproductive health, and it is expected that as the toolkits are being improved and piloted, these gaps will be rectified by collaboration with organisations specialised in those areas, e.g. Women Win.

It is likely, though, that organisations with multiple funders will soon be faced with pressure to use that funder’s particular M&E system (just as at the moment, funders have different reporting requirements). In terms of collaboration around toolkits, it is imperative that there is enough compatibility of different toolkits and systems to enable projects to satisfy the requirements of all funders without having to move from one toolkit to another.

There is certainly a proliferation of research methodologies (as distinct from toolkits) available, and in terms of sensitivity to organisation’s needs, that is a desirable situation. In terms of research across the sector, though, we need to consider whether we are making enough use of leading edge methodologies. Projects on the ground should not have to be commissioning method development to solve their problems: this is likely to be far too expensive and risky for a small organisation, and is something which should be conducted at a more strategic level in the sector. Therefore, a much deeper analysis of whether the sector as a whole has access to the right methodological tools to address the really hard questions is warranted.

Increasingly in the sector we have seen collaborations between thematic experts and SfD professionals e.g. in the area of HIV/Aids interventions. As the sector matures, it is now timely to start (or continue) collaboration with research and evaluation experts in the wider international development and humanitarian aid world in order to take advantage of methodological innovations e.g. in the measurement of behaviour change, in modelling community and societal level changes, in conducting systematic observational research in order to reduce the dependency on self report, and in identifying appropriate technology solutions (e.g. mobile phones, open source software) to make research and evaluation more affordable.

Few of the toolkits or methods explored made reference to ‘external’ (to the sector) evaluation standards. A notable exception to this is SAD, who make explicit reference on their website to adopting the evaluation standards of DAC (Development Assistance Committee) of the OECD. An investigation of quality standards in Sport for Development among a selection of Dutch and Dutch funded organisations found that some organisations adopt ECHO (European Community
Humanitarian Office) quality standards.

Table 5 examines the M&E toolkits available in order to differentiate those which are a full ‘system’ and those which are essentially methodological guidelines. We have not differentiated between ‘open source’ and restricted toolkits here, because usage of some toolkits has been made conditional on attending training, in order to protect the integrity of the toolkit (i.e. to maintain data quality and credibility of the results), and others are still being piloted and are therefore not yet available as ‘open source’.
Table 5: Toolkits in relation to the M&E project cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toolkit name</th>
<th>Organisational strategy</th>
<th>M&amp;E Strategy</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Consultancy</th>
<th>Expert administered</th>
<th>Technology enabled</th>
<th>Generic tools</th>
<th>Theme specific tools</th>
<th>Aggregated data across organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laureus/SFW/Aqumen Views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Platform on Sport and Development Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport in Development: A Monitoring and Evaluation Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(stage 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICES: International Community Coach Education Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureus M&amp;E toolkit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYP: Positive Activities for young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for evaluating Girls Sports Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Diat (Sport Development Impact Assessment Tool)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InsightShare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance on Measuring the Impact of Interventions for National Governing Bodies of Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAP (Knowledge, attitudes, practices)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Foundation monitoring tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A final word on ‘toolkits’: among the 215 responses within the evaluation of the International Platform for Sport & Development website to the question “what are you looking for from SfD websites”, we learned that over half the respondents wanted examples of good practice, and academic articles. Almost 50% mentioned that they were looking for ‘toolkits and manuals’. Therefore, we can be confident that these toolkit initiatives are meeting a real need within the sector.

### 5.12 Academic research mapping

Figure 1 illustrates the geographical ‘home’ of academic researchers, based on a coded list of 96 academics specialising in the SfD field. What stands out immediately is the dearth of researchers based in Asia or South America, and, of course, the preponderance of ‘Northern’ researchers.

![Geographical location of academic researchers](image)

**Figure 1: Geographical location of academic researchers (N=157)**

The specialisms of this sample of academic researchers are depicted in Figure 2. The coding of these fields remains slightly coarse, and future iterations of this exercise will aim to code

---

1 With thanks to the International Sport for Development and Peace Association, Ben Weinberg & Eli Wolff, who kindly provided their substantial data, and elegant analyses as a starting point for this section.
‘sociocultural issues’, in particular, in finer detail. The area of ‘human rights and conflict resolution’ (orange shaded) is only represented by 4% of researchers, and as this is an explicit theme in the strategies of a number of grassroots organisations, this seems rather sparse, and may be an area in which the sector may wish to deploy additional research activity.

Figure 2: Specialisms of academic researchers

5.13 Geographical focus

Independently of the location of researchers, we were interested in the geographical focus of the research. The locations were coded on the basis of the location of any data collection mentioned. Where more than three countries were mentioned, and where these spanned at least two continents, these reports were coded as ‘international’. All other mentions of particular countries were coded individually. This led to a very slight inflation of the data, where a report e.g. spanning Ghana and Zambia, appears twice, once under Ghana and once under Zambia.

Figure 3 displays the geographical focus of the research, as a percentage of all the reports which report data (i.e. excluding theoretical reports). These data are broken down by country in Table 6.
We see from Figure 3 that data collected in Europe and North America is the focus of over half the reports. In terms of low income countries, the focus is primarily on Africa, with almost a fifth of reports focusing on African countries.

When we examine specific countries, we see that in Africa, much of the reporting is from South Africa, Kenya and Zambia, with 14, 12 and 10 reports respectively.

It is difficult to say what accounts for the unevenness of reporting, given that there are Sport for Development projects all over the world. Part of the issue may be the maturity of projects – the more mature a project is, the more it may be able to embrace research. Another issue may be presence of researchers interested in the topic in a particular country. For instance, of the 5 academic researchers listed in Africa in Weinberg and Wolff’s data, 3 of them are based in South Africa.

The paucity of reporting from South America is also surprising. Again, this may mirror the fact that only 1 academic researcher is listed in all of South America. In order to discount the possibility of language bias, a brief search of the academic literature was conducted in Spanish, but this did not yield any further articles.
Table 6: Number of reports per country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No of reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No of reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Caucasus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.14 Research & evaluation reports

In total, 267 individual articles or reports were identified between 2005-2011, including those currently ‘submitted’ or ‘in press’. 164 of these were academic journal articles or books/book chapters, and the remainder were “grey literature” non-peer reviewed reports, published electronically or otherwise circulated.

Classification of this material is a challenge. Any classification system tends to obscure some features of the data while highlighting others. After experimenting with different coding schemes, we decided to classify the documents by the main ‘level of analysis’, i.e. individual, community or society. We also identified strategic themes which cut across these levels. Of course, many reports focus on more than one topic, but in order to create an overview of the trends in the literature, each report was allocated a single code based on the main emphasis of the work. The
final categories were as follows:

- **Individual**: any claims made regarding individual behaviours, skills or psychological characteristics such as self-esteem or self-efficacy. This also includes physical and mental health.
- **Community level**: any claims regarding social capital or community development
- **Societal level**: claims made regarding peacebuilding, conflict resolution, economic impact.
- **Policy**: broad brush statements about sport for development, including theoretical overviews and critiques
- **Organisational development**: discussions of specific features of programmes
- **General**: where documents spanned a number of themes, or were reviews of the overall ‘impact’.
- **Specific focused themes included**: Crime, Gender, HIV/Aids and Disability

![Figure 4: Focus of SfD reports since 2005](image)

**Error! Reference source not found.** shows that research concentrating on individual level factors outweighs either community or societal level research, which is to be expected. There are a number of reasons for this. This individual level is the level at which most Sport for Development initiatives intervene, and it is the easiest level at which to collect data. As we progress through the levels of analysis, evidence of impact gets messier: we are often assuming a ‘ripple effect’ from improving individual’s skills or psychological characteristics, rather than being able to demonstrate impact on communities and societies, and we often do not have access to the large
scale datasets such as economic data or national crime data in order to conduct our research. Finally, it is at the individual level that we have most control in terms of the content of our programmes – as we escalate our search for impact up through the other levels, we start having to contend with the structural characteristics of society over which an individual SfD programme has no control.

We would strongly recommend that working groups be established within specific themes, particularly in relation to strategic themes, in order to analyse and select the one or two most powerful studies or metanalyses demonstrating impact within that theme.

It is interesting to compare the analysis of the research with the themes on which organisations are focusing their programmes. A survey of users of www.sportanddev.org, the International Platform for Sport and Development asked for their main area of thematic focus. Figure 5 illustrates the response from 246 respondents (the respondents were permitted to ‘choose’ more than one sector, and the data have been transformed in order to reflect ‘percentage of interest’).

A direct comparison is difficult, but we see that organisations, too, are focusing on individual level issues e.g. child development, physical health, mental health. There is potentially a slight discrepancy in the level of interest in disability (there is more interest than research) and crime. There is a slightly more marked discrepancy in the area of disability: there is more interest on the ground than is reflected in the research, and a slight discrepancy in the area of gender.
6 Conclusions and recommendations

As there are quite a number of issues emerging from this research mapping, it seems useful to consider them within a ‘knowledge brokering’ model. This approach considers the generation and dissemination of knowledge under the following headings:

- Problem definition
- Knowledge generation
- Knowledge use

6.1 Problem definition

The kinds of questions any sector needs to ask of itself in relation to problem definition are:

What is the problem, and at what level of analysis does it need to be addressed? For whom is it a problem? Are there any plans in place to address the problem?

This mapping exercise demonstrated that some actions may be needed at this stage. For example, there are many coarse grained reviews of impact, but rather fewer fine grained investigations of specific area of impact, particularly at the community and societal levels of analysis. There are also some instances of the “problem” (e.g. impact of SfD) being addressed repeatedly by different researchers.

Some recommendations in the area of problem scoping are:

- Research in the domain of SfD is increasing exponentially. It will become increasingly difficult as time goes on to produce ‘definitive’ reviews and mapping exercise, and such endeavours are likely to lead to diminishing returns as material is repeatedly summarised and compressed. We therefore suggest trying to dissuade funders of research from doing large spectrum overall “reviews of the evidence” for SfD. There are already quite a number of these in existence, and therefore effort would be better spent in focusing on the detailed evidence base for specific claims.
- We need to be clear as a sector what we mean by ‘monitoring’, ‘evaluation’ and ‘research’. Different quality standards apply to each of these, and they have different audiences and functions.
- Where research activities are likely to be relevant to the sector as a whole, it would be valuable to have a ‘research planned’ and ‘research in progress’ forum, because duplication is most likely to occur when one initiative starts before another has been reported.
6.2 Knowledge generation

The kinds of questions which arise here are: does capacity to create this knowledge need to be increased? What are the most appropriate ways to generate this knowledge? What constitutes ‘knowledge’, and how can the quality of it be evaluated?

There are a number of recommendations in the area of knowledge generation.

- In order to facilitate augmentation of the evidence base in the future, it would be extremely valuable if research questions could be made available to prospective masters/PhD students, again via a central forum, similar to the ‘science shop’ of the Danish Development Research Network\(^2\)

- Research quality: a number of challenges were identified by participants in relation to research quality, and many of the recommendations are of the ‘just do it’ or ‘continue to do it’ form, e.g. continue efforts to use cross-culturally validated questionnaires, continue to work sensitively with local organisations and consider their needs as well as the needs of the wider community, try to ensure that every project collects baseline data when the project commences, i.e. embed evaluation much earlier in the programme design.

Some of them challenges are more difficult to address, and are certainly more difficult for individual researchers, and warrant strategic action for the whole sector:

- Expand collaborations with thematic experts outside the SfD field
- Systematically collect baseline data when projects commence
- Continue to work with experts and academics to identify behavioural indicators, in order to reduce our dependence on self-report.
- Consider the creation of data repositories (similar to the ESRC qualitative data repository) to facilitate secondary analysis of project data. It may be possible to find a ‘corner’ of an existing repository rather than creating one ourselves.
- Improve research quality in the sector as a whole. This is the area where there is most scope for intervention at a strategic level. If the SfD sector can agree on some benchmark criteria for ‘good’ research, e.g. use of baselines, behavioural indicators, validated (quantitative) instruments, appropriate standards for qualitative research etc, we can ensure that new research really does add to the evidence base. However, many of these criteria are very burdensome when an individual project is being evaluated, and therefore differentiating between ‘research’ and ‘evaluation’ becomes even more important.
- Tendering processes may help to ensure research quality, by enabling the very best proposals and researchers to be selected. However, it is important to notice that tendering can have a number of unintended side effects.

o Often only bigger organisations have the time to monitor and tender for projects, and therefore proposals won’t necessarily be received from the researchers best placed to do the work.
o Elaborate tender processes and long proposals place a time, and therefore a cost burden on the tenderers. This eventually becomes a hidden cost which will be passed onto the organisations issuing the tender.
o Tendering processes which do not provide feedback are unfair, bordering on the unethical, and mean an opportunity is lost to help shape the quality of future tenders.
o It may be desirable to have a sector wide ‘pre qualification’ process to reduce the time burden involved in each individual Invitation to Tender.
o A positive ‘side effect’ may be that the tendering process can be used to influence capacity building, by encouraging local collaborations between northern and southern researchers.
o A particular challenge mentioned is local capacity (both of university researchers and private organisations) in terms of the experience and skills to conduct large scale and high quality research. This is something which could be addressed strategically by the SfD sector by joining forces with more general development researchers and submitting ‘capacity building’ bids for research skills and methods seminars in order to improve local research capacity (e.g. via the EU or DFID).

• In relation to the detail of how knowledge is produced, there is scope to expand the methods used in the sector in order to tackle the more ‘difficult to research’ topics such as community and societal level impacts.

### 6.3 Knowledge use

Some of the questions which arise in relation to usage of knowledge are: who has the power to use a specific piece of knowledge? Does capacity to access and use this knowledge need to be increased? What specific activities are needed to translate this knowledge into action? Does this knowledge need to be managed in a particular way? How will it be shared? What practical limitations may affect the way in which the knowledge is used?

Some recommendations in this area are:

• In order to maintain visibility and accessibility of future research, we suggest maintaining ‘completed research’ and ‘research in progress’ databases on a readily accessible site such as www.sportanddev.org, perhaps using one page templates and a picklist of agreed thematic codes, in order to facilitate sourcing of research and enable researchers to remain up to date. This is particularly important in the case of the 50% of research articles that do not appear in formal academic bibliographic databases, and which therefore are
very easily ‘lost’ to the sector. An example of such a model has been implemented in the international development sector in general as part of the DAC Evaluation Standards System, which makes a 2 page abstract proforma summarising planned or completed research part of the TORs when specifying research. These are then uploaded to the DAC Evaluation Reports Inventory\(^3\).

- It may be useful to make a distinction between ‘impact’ research and ‘application’ research. A certain amount of activity, particularly in relation to toolkits, relates to implementing findings within programmes, and this is an important activity which is critical to demonstrate the impact of research.
- It is easy when conducting a mapping exercise such as this to repeat the platitude ‘we must communicate better’. However, this is, of course, the case. There are some organisations experimenting with engaging ways of communication e.g. videos, but as a sector we are still quite dependent on either individual documents or face-to-face conferences. We seldom hear of creative ways of engaging geographically remote sector participants, e.g. via webcasting, large scale ‘virtual’ conferencing, or use of online focus group methodology to facilitate intensive virtual workshops or working groups. Granted, these methods are heavily dependent on the availability of reasonable bandwidth, but there are cases where bandwidth is not a barrier but travel budgets are restricted. This is not just the case for Southern NGOs – it applies to interaction between all researchers within the sector.
- Dissemination of research should ideally be budgeted and planned as part of the initial research brief, in order to include conference attendance, preparation of journal articles and leaflets, and other more creative forms of dissemination.

### 6.3.1 Toolkits

A particular area of application of knowledge is that of toolkits. On reviewing the available toolkits, we concluded that they were meeting a real need in the sector. There is not enormous overlap yet in terms of toolkits intended to be used by individual projects. However, it is imperative that the SfD community continues to collaborate in this area to prevent organisations being confused by a wide and undifferentiated menu of ‘tools’.

It is particularly important in the development and delivery of applications (e.g. M&E toolkits, organisational development process, programme delivery guidelines etc) that rather than just proliferating these organisation by organisation, there is some means (e.g. a decision tree) to enable organisations to differentiate and choose between them. An ideal scenario would be the establish working groups within different application areas (M&E, organisational development,

---

\(^3\) http://minweb.idrc.ca/daclog.htm
programme design) in order to facilitate communication between the different stakeholders in these areas and to minimise overlap and duplication between applications.

There was a request for such toolkits to be made ‘open source’ as soon as possible. However, the logic behind making the availability of toolkits contingent on training or consultancy is not necessarily only, or primarily, for competitive or business reasons. It is here that we must differentiate between ‘guidelines’ and real toolkits. Once a toolkit is made open source, quality control becomes very difficult. It is difficult to fix bugs, gather feedback on which elements are more or less useful, integrate new translations and make them available to other organisations, or update it with new elements, as existing versions cannot be ‘recalled’ in any way. If the virtue of a toolkit is that it provides a validated set of tools, then casual application of the toolkit will eventually undermine the quality of the data collected, and therefore the credibility of any results. Finally, organisations who have invested in the development of a toolkit may need to be able to demonstrate ‘return on investment’, e.g. by keeping track of how many organisations have used it, or may need to evaluate the usefulness of it. A completely anonymous download system does not permit this kind of tracking. This does not mean that toolkits will not be free; rather, it means that some level of free licensing may need to be adopted.

This exercise has yielded substantial information in terms of the activities and focus of research in the SfD sector. It is apparent that there is scope for streamlining research activities in order to maximise the cost-effectiveness and impact of research in the sector. This is unlikely to be achievable by any one organisation on its own, but will rather emerge from continued collaboration at a strategic level within the sector.
7 Appendix 1: Contributors

Organisations consulted (website, email or telephone)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicking Aids Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Futures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Football World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Academy for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...and 60 academic and independent researchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Appendix 2: List of web sources consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Danish Development Research Network (<a href="http://www.ddrn.dk">www.ddrn.dk</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agence pour l’Education par la Sport (APELS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch NCDO Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots Soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicking Aids Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and Collaborative Development Network (<a href="http://www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org">www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport for Social Change Network (<a href="http://sscn-global.ning.com/">http://sscn-global.ning.com/</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Doing Good Blog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Football World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://footballoutreach.com">www.footballoutreach.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://icsspe.org">www.icsspe.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://peace-sport.org">www.peace-sport.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://sportdevelopment.org.uk">www.sportdevelopment.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://sportrelief.com">www.sportrelief.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.sportsandsocialchange.org">www.sportsandsocialchange.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://streetgames.org">www.streetgames.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://toolkitsportdevelopment.org">www.toolkitsportdevelopment.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Sport for Development and Peace Association (ISPDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://listserv.brown.edu/?A0=ISDPA">http://listserv.brown.edu/?A0=ISDPA</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Appendix 3: Subject bibliography

9.1 Community


Retrieved from


Sherry, E. (2010). (Re) engaging marginalized groups through sport: The Homeless World Cup. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 45*(1), 59.


9.2 Crime


**9.3 Disability**


**9.4 Gender**


9.5 General


### 9.6 HIV/AIDS


**9.7 Individual**


Light, R. L. (2010). Children's social and personal development through sport: a case study of an 

Lindsey, I., & Grattan, A. (2011). An 'international movement'? Decentering sport-for-development 

MacDonald, D. J., Cote, J., & Deakin, J. (2010). The impact of coach training on personal 

short and very short form of the physical self-inventory for adolescents: Development and 
factor validity. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 9(6), 830-847.

and psychosocial development in a group of young black adults. South African Journal of 
Psychology, 37 (1), 188-206.

Memmert, D. (2007). Can creativity be improved by an attention-broadening training program ? 


capacity sport program (Research in progress - unpublished).


sporting organisations for increasing participation in sport. Cochrane Database of Systematic 
Reviews,(3), CD004812.

Retrieved from http://www.righttoplay.com/International/our-
impact/Documents/Final_Report_Chapter_2.pdf

Rosewater, A. (2009). Learning to play and playing to learn: Organised sports and educational 
outcomes. Team-Up for Youth. Retrieved from 


### 9.8 Organisational development


**9.9 Policy**


9.10 Society


utility of sport for international development. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 27*(1), 54-75.

Gannett, K. (2011). *Bridging national and cultural differences through sport: The case of the 2010 Football for Hope Festival (report in progress).*


10 Appendix 4: Alphabetical bibliography


Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Patterns of Representations and Marginalization (pp. 63).
Dakar, Senegal: Codesria


Garcia-Naveira, A., Barquin, R. R., & Pujals, C. (2011). Personality differences according to participation in or abstention from sport, competition level and age category in football


Hartmann, D., & Massoglia, M. (2007). Reassessing the relationship between schools sports


Hughes, J., & Donnelly, C. (2006). Contact as a policy mechanism for promoting better relations in integrated schools in Northern Ireland and bilingual/bi-national schools in Israel. *Journal of*
Peace Education, 3(1), 79-97.


Keim, M. (2005). Sport as opportunity for community development and peace building in South


resolution, reconciliation or reconstruction? (, MA thesis, University of Sussex).


community schools through sport and physical education programmes: an analysis of the contextual realities of programme participants (, Masters Thesis: Oslo University College).


Wallis, J. (2007). From Armageddon to Um al Fahem. In J. Sugden & J. Wallis (Eds.), *Football for*


