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ABSTRACT

Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) has gained substantial global interest in recent years among researchers, governmental and intergovernmental organizations, development workers, corporations, not-for-profits and community-based organizations, and activists. The rise of this field has drawn criticism from scholars who are concerned about the rigor of program assessment methods and the potential for neo-colonial paternalism, among other issues. While these complaints are valid and to a large degree accurate, the potential for SDP as a development tool is great and should be considered worthy of further exploration by researchers and practitioners. This paper focuses on the fifth SDP sub-area: sport and peace. It acknowledges that sport and peace is the most tenuous sub-area to sustain and quantify success (hence it’s “slow child” status), but it also proposes that sport and peace offers the greatest opportunity for sport to find a worthwhile place in the development sphere and claim a legacy for sport in the 21st century that is markedly different from previous roles that sport has occupied. This paper provides an overview and timeline of the evolution of SDP, explores in detail the vital (if slow-developing) place of sport and peace within SDP, including theoretical frameworks that guide, or should guide, sport and peace. This is followed by a brief literature review and exemplars of sport and peace initiatives, and a summary of best practices for sport and peace success. A final analysis section synthesizes the criticism aimed at SDP with the rather impressive maturation of sport and peace initiatives to confidently suggest a way forward to achieve a lasting legacy for sport as a meaningful peace-building site.
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CHAPTER 1

THE GROWTH OF SPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE

The past decade has seen a dramatic growth in the research and practice of what is generally called, in its broadest label, sport for development and peace (SDP). The definitions of SDP are simple enough. SDP refers to “the use of sport as a tool for development and peace (International Platform on Sport and Development, What is sport and development?). Slightly more specific, SDP can be said to be “the intentional use of sport, physical activity, and play to attain specific development and peace objectives, most notably, the Millennium Development Goals,” which we will discuss shortly (SDP IWG, 2008, p. 3). Within these simple definitions, however, are embedded many questions about SDP’s efficacy, its role, its methods, and its motives.

A variety of conditions have led to its growth in the past generation, and especially since the turn of the millennium. The rise of globalization, faster and more efficient communication structures, a more transparent flow of information, and the opening up of even the remotest regions, are common “world-flattening” reasons that apply here, as they do in many fields of study and industries during this period of great transition. Perhaps the greatest reason for SDP’s rise – not separate from these other factors – is the growth of opportunities within the evolution of sport. As sport has gained unquestioned economic and social influence, and as our understanding of development has become more sophisticated to mean something more holistically human and not merely a dynamic linear process (Levermore & Beacom, 2009, p. 257), sport has also garnered more attention from scholars and policy-makers. As sport has become increasingly more visible, fans’ and athletes’ views have diversified, or at least found more opportunities for those views to find common ground and momentum for change. Sport
certainly has a long and ambivalent history of being tied into broader movements for social justice, human rights, and policy-making agendas around the world. In that sense, SDP is a new label on an old idea. However, the conditions that have led to the current growth are substantially different:

The current manifestation is different in the rapid explosion of agencies and organisations that are involved, the tremendous appeal that it has for youth volunteering, the financial support it enjoys from the powerful international sports federations and the extent to which it has been championed by the United Nations, its agencies and significant partners (Kidd, 2008).

See Figure 1 for a timeline of significant events in recent years that have contributed to SDP’s influence. The milestones represent a convergence of global recognition, easier transnational connections, and increased research interest.
CHAPTER 2

SDP AND THE ‘SLOW CHILD’: SPORT AND PEACE

This lofty goal of using sport as a tool for development and peace does not always include governmental involvement, but clearly the acceptance of sport and physical activity as universal constructs and human rights by international organizations has helped fuel those efforts. The United Nations (UN) developed its Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP), with goals of advocacy and guidance, and facilitation and coordination “in harnessing the potential of sport as a force for good” (United Nations, a). The Special Advisor to the UN Secretary-General on SDP has the three-fold mandate of advocate, facilitator, and representative in sport-based initiatives (United Nations, b). Further, the SDP International Working Group (SDP IWG) has been created specifically to promote SDP policy recommendations into national governments’ development strategies that are designed to meet the UN’s eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (United Nations, c). See Table 1 for an overview of suggested contributions to be made by sport.

Although Giulianotti (2011) has suggested that emphasis on social justice issues would be preferable to the obsession with the MDGs, clearly such recognition by a global entity as the UN is a clear indicator of how important governmental efforts are seen in being able to achieve SDP goals.

SDP can be construed so broadly as to be considered meaningless, “a vague and weakly theorized banner” (Coalter, 2010) that is sometimes criticized for being run by pollyannish functionalists, not tying into more established development literature, and not conducting sufficient research into the efficacy of SDP programs. This frustration is understandable, and at
this early stage is not an unjustified arrow to sling. However, it is helpful to note just how much
the definitions have developed over the past decade, which in turn should lead to more
contextualized program offerings and specific research data. We still hear a plethora of terms for
SDP: development through sport (Houlihan & White, 2002; Levermore, 2008a), sport for
development (Coalter & Taylor, 2010; Giulianiotti, 2010; Sugden, 2010), sport in/and
international development (Darnell, 2012; Levermore, 2008b), sport for peace (Ali, 2009), sport
and social change (Lytras & Welty Peachey, 2011), and sport plus versus plus sport (Coalter,
2009) are among the most common. We necessarily distinguish the broader societal goals of
sport for development from the insular goals of sport and development. Sport and development
traditionally refers to the means by which institutions create policies that help them fulfill the
goals of their organizations (e.g., increase membership, win gold medals, develop successful
athletes/human beings, be financially solvent or valuable). Plus sport is contrasted with sport
plus. The former connotes that the focus is primarily on social and occasionally economic
development, with sport assisting in some capacity. The latter is primarily focused on enhancing
the traditional sport development goals, with the tangential possibility of some social
development benefits (Coalter, 2009).

Under the umbrella term SDP, the SDP IWG defined five thematic sub-areas with
working groups (see Figure 2).

The rest of this paper is concerned with only the fifth of these sub-areas. Although there
will be overlap among all of these (e.g., women and persons with disabilities are
disproportionately affected in war-torn regions), their respective goals and issues are distinct
enough that scholars can critique them on their own merits. Indeed, that has been done in recent
years, another sign that the SDP field is growing more sophisticated, more specialized, as any
maturing field of study does. That analysis is why it is appropriate for this paper to focus exclusively on what we still need to achieve in the sport and peace sub-area, in research and practice. The thoroughly researched Literature Reviews on Sport for Development and Peace report from 2007 states explicitly that there is “little published, peer-reviewed literature about sport for peace,” and “further research in the area of sport for peace is needed to guide or shape programming” (SDP IWG, 2007a, p. 184). There are two reasons sport for peace has lagged behind the other four SDP sub-areas and become its “slow child”:

1) Based on my research, sport, exercise, and physical activity are far from an intuitive fit with peace studies, reconciliation, and mediation. Sport, exercise, and physical activity have always been connected in some way with health and youth development, and we have strong supporting evidence in many areas of health and wellness that gives us direction on how to make progress. Women (e.g., Cahn, 1998) and persons with disabilities (e.g., Thomas & Smith, 2009) have sadly been historically disenfranchised in sport settings, but the knowledge base is growing rapidly that brings them into the fold. The mechanisms to build those lines of research are not hard to imagine, and the resolve to do so is undoubtedly in place. In the sport for peace area, its researchers and advocates may not even be aware of other knowledge bases.

Research should bring in theories and frameworks from peace studies (SDP IWG, 2007a), not just to learn from them but also to avoid the mistakes made by them. One needs look no further than the UN’s MDGs list in Table 1. One could see sport as playing a direct policy role in child health and perhaps maternal health. It could exert influence in building financial and social capital for campaigns dealing with poverty, education,
gender equality, disease awareness, and the environment. But global partnership is the MDG that is the closest fit to sport and peace among the eight. Although Table 1 infers that the connection is a good one for sport to prosper, the UN’s objectives for achieving that goal are mostly structured around trade, debt, and technology (United Nations, d). If sport is a “force for good” that the UN claims to want to harness, peace-building does not appear to be in the best position to play a leadership role.

2) Peace, to put it mildly, is an elusive construct. It is a difficult, maddening goal in the best of circumstances, and the process to achieve it is even more problematic. As Sugden said, peace ‘processes’ are messy affairs: hugely complex enterprises that move forwards or backwards according to conditions prevalent in the transcending social and political order … The challenge for peace activists is to discover ways to join up specific grassroots, civil society, interventions with more broadly influential policy communities and those elements of political society that hold the keys to peace (2010, p. 268).

By contrast, when it comes to promoting health or fostering development for certain populations, there may be disagreement about the programmatic goals, but the desired messages are usually quite clear, and the likelihood for truly hostile reception is much less.

And yet, isn’t sport in the service of peace-building and mediation the most audacious of SDP’s goals? If SDP is to succeed, however we may choose to define that, this fifth sub-area is the most controversial and uncertain. It is arguably the most substantial SDP theme, in terms of political prominence (as seen with the UN) and the global scale of projects (Giulianotti, 2010). Most organizations and projects are concerned with individual and community development [as emphasized in the first four sub-areas], rather than the “rather amorphous and ill-defined goal of
‘peace’” (Coalter, 2010, p. 297). In any of these sub-areas, causation must be cautiously applied. But in the fifth sub-area especially, even in the best of scenarios, success will be achieved in methodical steps, and no one is suggesting sport for peace will get anywhere on its own. It is destined to be SDP’s slow child. This thesis will help to answer the question of whether it should be considered part of the SDP realm at all when voluminous priorities are planned and limited resources are allotted.

Now that we have distinguished sport and peace from its SDP brethren, I will provide our current conceptualizations, models, and increasingly nuanced definitions of sport and peace. I have already suggested there are skeptical voices in the sport for peace area, and I will build on those points in the Theoretical Frameworks for Sport and Peace section below, as those critiques are vital in determining whether sport for peace has the intellectual heft and the ability to survive in practice. Following a review of theoretical frameworks, I will provide some exemplars of sport for peace initiatives and a word about their overall growth before closing with comments on best practices and a closing analysis.

In setting the stage for this contentious discussion, it is helpful to listen to John Sugden, who was on the ground floor of the long-lasting Football 4 Peace initiative in Northern Ireland and Israel, and as a respected sociologist has taken a practical yet critical approach to achieving something substantial in the SDP field. In his inspiring 2010 International Review for the Sociology of Sport article, he advocates for the “mobilization of an engaged sociological imagination in the context of a broader human rights agenda” for sport-based peace-building initiatives. He closes with a practical, yet hopeful, message that points toward listening to the critics while continuing to push forward in the face of uncertainty:
Drawing from experience in the field and ongoing critical self-reflection, this article has attempted to provide a way of thinking about, planning, and doing sport for development work that is neither idealistic nor simplistic: one that is justified from a humanitarian perspective; accounts fully for the local context; engages with and empowers local actors and partners; and connects with wider national and regional policy processes. Further to this I have attempted to show how a fully informed ‘sociological imagination’, in combination with practical engagement and local contextual emersion, work best together in strategic planning and project implementation – even in the most adverse situations when rockets rain down, tanks move in and all sides go back to the trenches claiming right along with God is with them. To invoke the words attributed to the 18th-century political philosopher Edmund Burke, ‘the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing’. It is to be hoped that the adoption of a critical left-realist approach to sport for development work can provide activists – including sociologists – with both reason and method for doing something positive. (Sugden, 2010, p. 270)
CHAPTER 3

DEFINING SPORT AND PEACE

The International Platform for Sport and Development calls sport in peace-building “one of the most hotly-debated areas in Sport & Development” (International Platform on Sport and Development, Sport and Peace-Building). Still, it is important to remember that the “slow child” is not the youngest in the litter. The UN International Labour Organization and the International Olympic Committee (IOC) signed an agreement to collaborate back in 1922, and UN humanitarian aid workers have used sport in trying to comfort victims of conflict and natural disasters for years (United Nations, e). By that time, the IOC and the intrepid founder of the modern Olympic Movement, Pierre de Coubertin, had already been preaching the sport-peace connection for more than two decades:

It was with these thoughts in mind that I sought to revive the Olympic games. I have succeeded after many efforts. Should the institution prosper, as I am persuaded, all civilized nations aiding, that it will, it may be a potent, if indirect, factor in securing universal peace. Wars break out because nations misunderstand each other. We shall not have peace until the prejudices which now separate the different races shall have been outlived. To attain this end, what better means than to bring the youth of all countries periodically together for amicable trials of muscular strength and agility? The Olympic games, with the ancients, controlled athletics and promoted peace. It is not visionary to look to them for similar benefactions in the future (Coubertin, 1896).

To this day, the Olympic Charter is replete with Coubertin’s enthusiasm, and the UN and IOC have only solidified their relationship as it pertains to the alleged power of sport with declarations and joint statements and initiatives. The Charter itself has long been the object of in-depth critique when it fails to live up to its espoused ideals (see Guttmann, 2002, e.g.), but for purposes here it is sufficient to simply acknowledge how clearly stated peace and development
initiatives are within the Charter. Of the IOC’s seven Fundamental Principles in its Charter, Article 2 states that “the goal of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity.” Article 3 emphasizes its global reach, and Article 4 emphasizes sport as a human right (IOC, 2011, p 10). Sport as ad-hoc bridge-builder is a common theme historically, whether the ping-pong diplomacy between the United States and China, Nelson Mandela’s conscious attempt to heal post-apartheid South Africa through rugby, or any number of Cold War sporting exchanges.

So why the controversy in promoting sport as a means toward achieving something greater than sport itself? Modern critics are less blunt than George Orwell’s famous words that sport is a haven for jealousy, boastfulness, and violence – “war minus the shooting” (Orwell, 1936). But the concerns are real and must be addressed. Some argue that the SDP movement has been “institutionalized,” with the UN as the most striking evidence. As a result of this, a top-down approach to development occurs that even in a post-colonial world leave SDP susceptible to “colonial residue”, the same excesses and flawed approaches of other development efforts where an attitude of colonization is unavoidable. Specifically, the voices of local people are overlooked, modernization is enforced, and the assumption of a universal such as sport overcoming existing cultural norms and inequalities (Darnell & Hayhurst 2011; Tiessen, 2011). This is no small charge, since the rise of SDP has occurred in the global North, where the history of hegemony in the name of development and civilizing of remote regions of the world is still a fresh wound. Taken to its extreme, this argument suggests that SDP efforts are illegitimate unless dictated and planned by locals rather than international groups. However, this cautionary article comes with hope to decolonize SDP. The nature of sport, despite its hegemonic popularity in
some forms, is not politically fixed in its organization or implementation. It can be engaged in as a direct challenge to the establishment. An in-depth look at the resistance movements within sport settings over the past two decades reveals that, although there is little empirical evidence to suggest that action on the part of sport organizations has resulted in long-lasting socially progressive change, the alterglobalization movement has had an increasing role in the sporting world (Harvey et al., 2009), and if we heed Jarvie’s (2007) call for a publicly engaged intellectual who engages in a total commitment to political action beyond the comforts of academia, such momentum can continue. Further, SDP initiatives are often led by volunteers who can have their views on sport challenged, and the critical interest in the field by sport studies scholars provides an opportunity to advocate for appropriate interventions (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011).

Prioritizing sport in the name of true development can also be a problematic task. While a few countries, including Canada, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Norway, have funded sport-for-development projects as part of broader diplomatic efforts, the reliance on a purely human-rights-based argument to secure funding has left many programs to struggle in the neoliberal global environment. Leaders of those programs must seek funding from non-sport benefactors, and then convince them of the value of sport to the benefactors’ goals (Coalter, 2010). In any of the SDP sub-areas, this is not a sustainable system. The constant desperation doesn’t lend itself to clear definitions and goals for the field.

If we consider how sport and peace-building might align, we gain greater insight as to why today’s SDP’s researchers and practitioners are not doomed to fail in using sport in the service of something deemed altruistic. Nor are they necessarily being foolishly optimistic about
how much sport can accomplish. A contemporary understanding of peace-building and an appreciation for sport’s uniqueness provide the background.

Defining Peace-Building

Just as we now benefit from a more nuanced understanding of development (that takes into account not just economic status but also health and knowledge) and sport (that takes into account not just formalized competitions but also other forms of physical activity that contribute to fitness, well-being, and social interaction), we also now see peace-building as a more holistic process. Such distinctions help us to temper the human tendency to simplistically judge an endeavor as either positive or negative. Kidd warned never to “essentialize” sport (2008) and consider it apart from the cultural context in which it is being conducted. The same also must be said for development, as well as peace-building. When UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali released his Agenda for Peace in the early 1990s, he named 1) preventive diplomacy, 2) peace-making, 3) peace-keeping, and 4) peace-building as four distinct areas, with peace-building considered exclusively a post-conflict activity focused on peace accords and rebuilding war-ravaged societies (SDP IWG, 2007a). Lederach, one of the leading voices in the peace-building movement, takes a much broader approach to the term “peace-building” that occurs over a much larger period of time and covers a much more ambitious agenda. Peace-building is “a comprehensive concept that encompasses, generates, and sustains the full array of processes, approaches, and stages needed to transform conflict toward more sustainable, peaceful relationships…activities that both preceded and follow peace accords” (Lederach, 1997, p.20). Building on that definition, the term “conflict transformation” has been introduced as a companion to the longer-standing “conflict resolution”. Conflict transformation refers to efforts
that “address the wider social and political source of a conflict and seek to transform the negative energy of war into positive social and political change,” whereas conflict resolution refers to strategies specifically designed to end open, violent conflict (Fisher, Abdi, Ludin, Smith, Williams, & Williams, 2000, pp. 217–218).

This understanding of peace-building makes even more sense when we consider how often conflicts develop, or fester, among rival groups for land or sovereignty rather than a distinctly ideological divide. Fostering relationships and trust over a long period of time, in a variety of settings with many individuals, and on a local level rather than a federal/state level, becomes a critical strategy toward peace. Within this structure, sport’s role in peace-building and conflict transformation has great potential to build relationships at many societal levels and complement strategies from other SDP sub-areas. This is illustrated in figure 3, as sport’s strength as a conflict transformation vehicle (or a peace-building vehicle, using Lederach’s definition) is great, and becomes less so as we move toward conflict resolution and peace-keeping, which are more likely to be aggressive and top-down in their enactment.

Peace-building is still a young field, but there is growing agreement that certain principles are essential to peace-building processes across contexts. These include:

- **Specificity of peace building**: because each context is unique and stages of conflict are non-linear, peace building strategies have to be context-specific and address the sources of conflict.
- **Holistic approach**: peace building encompasses multiple dimensions including security, socio-economic development, political stability, rule of law, human rights, and humanitarian assistance.
National ownership: the primary responsibility for peace building rests with national actors.

Role of external actors: given the legacy of conflict and weakened national capacities, external actors can contribute in important ways to peace building.

Coordination and mutual accountability: national and international actors need to act in a coherent manner and share mutual accountability.

Importance of monitoring, evaluation and continual learning: as a relatively new field involving constant experimentation and innovation, peace building requires cumulative and comparative learning from successes as well as failures (Tschirgi, 2011).

It is no mistake that these attributes mesh with peace-building efforts in sporting contexts. The next section considers how unique sport is toward addressing peace-building goals.

Understanding the Uniqueness of Sport

Sport has many attributes that contemporary peace-builders, or conflict transformers, want to leverage. It fosters social integration. It requires, in most cases, direct physical contact or at least direct communication. It can be, and often is, a collective experience. It can (depending on the context) transcend class divisions, either in the act of participating or watching (International Platform on Sport and Development, 2009). Lederach has suggested a “web approach” to peace-building that creates interdependent connections that strengthen and can withstand isolated breaches at other points on the web. National governing organizations and other agencies of development are well-suited to weave these webs (SDP IWG, 2008a). Sport has a checkered history as being considered either valuable preparation for war or a socially acceptable alternative to war. However, if administered well, the cooperative aspects of sport
(e.g., teamwork, agreement with an opponent as to the rules) and the competitive aspects (e.g., appealing to aggressive tendencies in a controlled setting) can be enormous benefits to improving hostile attitudes. Sport/physical activity isn’t the only domain where these elements are at play, but the combination of these elements along with the great interest in sport and play by most populations and media are indicators of why sport in a peace-building role has gained traction. This combination of seeing peace-building as a broad-based effort, and looking for multi-faceted solutions to lessening conflict rather than a panacea, further illuminates sport as an influential domain to seek conflict transformation. It is easy to put sport front and center of such efforts, especially when the media get interested. But researchers and SDP program developers and implementers should not be lulled into overstating the importance of sport initiatives. Sport’s value in peace-building, like a key player coming off the bench, is linked to knowing your limitations – and your potential to contribute. To date, in my opinion, evaluation measures have too often been limited to descriptive accounts, resulting in a lack of acceptance for sport-based initiatives by the wider development field. SDP should be considered in a nuanced manner as part of a larger strategy, and evaluated based on performance compared to other development tools (Levermore, 2008a).

Reintegrating child soldiers into their old communities or new ones is one of the specific goals where sport and peace-building is considered a candidate to play a meaningful part. This population, estimated to be in the tens of thousands over the past 30 years by the UN Study on the Impact of Armed Conflict on Children (Machel, 1996), is difficult to reintegrate because of distrust among other societal members and the deep trauma they experience. The hope is that sport provides new normalizing structures in education and other opportunities. But even among those who have researched such efforts and advocate for them, they caution against expectations
that are too high and acknowledge that sport programs’ effectiveness is speculative (Richards, 1997, in Sierra Leone; Armstrong, 2004, in Liberia, e.g.).
CHAPTER 4
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR SPORT AND PEACE

A review of the academic literature in SDP is destined to be short, at least at this point in time. The number of articles is growing at a steady clip, and there is a tantalizing amount of discussion about theoretical frameworks, the need for proper evaluation of programs, and case studies of how programs are implemented. But confident findings are virtually nonexistent. One serious problem is that studies often are not grounded in the peace studies literature. Since sport studies and peace studies don’t use the same language or models, that knowledge is not easily transferred into meaningful research. It also creates a content gap, as peace-studies literature emphasizes the inclusion of women and girls in the peace-building process, and to date most studies deal with men and boys (SDP IWG, 2007a). When sport studies scholars refer to interdisciplinary subject matter, they usually mean crossing over into other sport and exercise science subdisciplines, not peace studies or development literature. This must be addressed if the field is to gain acceptance in the academy and provide rigorous studies that stakeholders can trust. A cautious optimism pervades many of the articles that do exist – an optimism that this whole SDP endeavor, and specifically sport and peace, is not a waste of time, but research has yet to back that up to any considerable degree. This section attempts to describe the theoretical frameworks that have been developed in SDP that have direct relevance to sport and peace.

A rare study that does employ a peace-studies framework is Lea-Howarth’s assessment of sport-for-peace programming in the Middle East, Africa, and Eastern Europe. He uses Galtung’s (1998) ‘3 Rs’ of reconstruction (of people and places after the direct violence), resolution (of underlying issues and animosities), and reconciliation (of relationships), as an acknowledged
simplified framework to understand how team sports offer opportunities for social networks, an apolitical environment, and teachable moments that can be one part of a larger, long-term, peace-building effort. It cannot, however, be expected to be the primary focus of reconciliation or structural change (Lea-Howarth, 2006). Baker and Esherick (2009) provide an excellent overview of why sport has a role to play in peace-based initiatives. In particular, they reference the contact hypothesis, which states that contact must be meaningful, interactive, and not superficial if real resolution is to occur (Allport, 1954). This feature is at the core of what sport brings to communities in conflict. The authors place sport squarely into the peace-building literature by providing this overview in a book dedicated to cross-disciplinary perspectives, thus performing an important service.

One of the most ambitious efforts to date toward laying out a working SDP framework comes from Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011). The authors posit several important guidelines in developing sport for development theory (SFDT) that will help silence the critics of the existing research. First, because sport is such a complex social phenomenon, they suggest combining different theoretical frameworks, such as resource dependence theory, institutional theory, organizational culture theory, and transformational leadership theory. The second and perhaps greatest contribution of this theorizing can be found in Table 2, which includes five theoretical building blocks for developing an SFDT-based intervention program (impacts assessment, sport/physical activity, organizational, educational, and cultural enrichment). SFDT has been used by researchers to evaluate SDP programs in the US and Europe, though the author cautions that it is only a set of guidelines and must be adapted to local conditions and encourage equal involvement by local stakeholders (Lyras, 2007).
Lyra and Welty Peachey (2011) emphasize the social and psychological benefits that sport and physical activity initiatives offer participants. They acknowledge that the devastating societal conditions in which SDP workers attempt to enact change are usually complex and entrenched. If sport reaches people on a Maslowian hierarchical level, those seeds can reap greater benefits down the road as individuals become open to change and break down barriers. “SFDT advances that it is important to understand and consider the individual, psychological dimensions of change in order to leverage the effectiveness of SFD interventions on a broader scale (p. 14).” This approach should simultaneously be humbling and invigorating for sport-for-peace researchers and activists, who must understand sport’s limited power to enact change, but also the importance of moderate, localized progress in the often ambiguous, sluggish, demoralizing process of forging peace. While SDP’s other sub-areas are more clearly aligned with an individualized focus, according to this framework sport-for-peace initiatives must constantly strive for this in order to achieve success.

In attempting to place SDP into a manageable framework for study, Giulianotti (pp. 213-223, 2010) identified three ideal SDP models, from most conservative to most progressive:

1) Technical (which tend to be hierarchical, accepting of donor demands, more rigid in goals and timeframe, utilizing established sports, and preferring to use external parties to solve problems since they are not directly immersed in the problems)

2) Dialogical (which recognize that strained relationships require SDP agencies to facilitate renewed, sustainable contact between adversaries, and renovate stories and myths; training the trainers is critical to obtaining desired outcomes; sports can be modified to
accommodate inclusive goals, with mixed teams being a good example; donors’ involvement varies from dictatorial to hands-off)

3) Critical (pursues transformations in relationships between divided communities and in how SDP work is conducted; more local control – and autonomy from donors – to identify needs and intervention strategies, which means SDP leaders must understand local conflict dynamics; projects consciously try to immerse sport with other cultural practices that engender renewed contact; new games that lack the cultural baggage of established sports are encouraged; extensive social exchanges are planned, with participants returning to tell their people about the experience; evaluation is reflexive for the SDP agency)

My shorthand explanation of Giulionnati’s rich article provides an excellent framework to understand how sport-for-peace initiatives can best find success. As peace-building depends on understanding and presumably re-framing, long-standing conflict, as it is almost always faced with complex factors that require multi-faceted interventions, and as leaders of competing factions need to (re)generate trust in order to become transformational, it should be no surprise that a critical approach is generally preferred. This can be found clearly in examples in Sri Lanka and West Africa, where grassroots nongovernmental organizations have used sport in a peacemaking capacity, using invitations from local communities and extensive consultations. In these regions, as well as in the Middle East and the Balkans, neutral locations, new games, and exchange-visits with the strong support of both communities all have been received successfully in setting the stage for wider peace-making projects (Giulianotti, 2010). The need for this heavy
investment in planning and resources is summed up nicely in this quote from an official at a small European SDP agency:

You have to look at the overall peace architectures, and in this you have to play a certain role. There are a lot of actors and you can’t play all the roles, it makes no sense … You have to discuss your role, otherwise you don’t contribute. (Giulianotti, p. 222, 2010)

This section has attempted to show the theoretical framework needed in SDP as a whole, and sport for peace specifically, as intervention programs are conceptualized and put into practice. A great deal of additional research is still needed to lend rigor to these early efforts, but an acceptance that a critical, interdisciplinary theoretical stance is needed is a meaningful start. The SDP IWG (2008) key questions to be answered in additional sport-for-peace research include:

1. What factors (dis)allow for the transcendence of relationships beyond the field of sport?
2. Focusing on sport as a relationship building tool, how would it fit into a larger reconciliation, reconstruction and rehabilitation framework?
3. Is there an appropriate time frame for sport-for-peace projects in the conflict cycle?
4. What are the context-specific influences guiding those recommendations?
5. In terms of financial cost, how do sport initiatives compare to other peace-building initiatives?
CHAPTER 5
SPORT-FOR-PEACE EXEMPLARS

There is no shortage of sport-for-peace initiatives around the world over the past decade. Some of the most successful examples are summarized in this section for the purposes of explaining where best practices have been identified. Though these initiatives are set all over the world, and take a variety of approaches, it is valuable to note two issues: the appeal of football (or soccer, as it is known in the United States), and the uncertainty of programs because of world events. As the World’s Game and as a relatively inexpensive activity to implement, football being used as a vehicle to encourage peace is not surprising. Indeed, many of the most well-known peace-building efforts in sport start with football. However, two recent Soccer & Society journal articles point out that the sport’s beneficial role is not certain. An analysis of a program in Liberia suggested more research is needed to find out whether football, an invasion game, might reinforce warfare concepts rather than mitigate them (Rookwood & Palmer, 2011). A study in Nigeria questioned participants about the sport’s ability to transform behavior. The author found that football’s capacity to connect people in conflict was high, but if not controlled could produce another form of ethnic conflict. They recommended tolerance education for football fans (Majaro-Majesty, 2011), and presumably program developers as well.

As this paper was being drafted, Libyan rebels moved into Tripoli in their months-long campaign to oust Moammar Gadhafi. Libya is a country where Score for Peace, an initiative of the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD), had been making inroads for four years via a football exchange. IMTD is not a sport-specific organization, but has had four-year football initiatives in Colombia and Liberia that emphasizes vocational training and personal contacts.
With the 2011 Libyan civil war, progress there has come to a halt. The IMTD’s 2010 annual report provides a sidebox: “Update: *Score for Peace* and IMTD would like to express their heartfelt wishes for a nonviolent resolution of the current troubles in Libya, and we hope that our work with our Libyan partners can continue in the future (p. 8).” This is a reminder of how peace-building programs using sport are always in jeopardy, subject to the whims of current unplanned events that mark the world community. All sub-areas of SDP can be affected by this reality; given its contexts of engagement, peace-building is even more vulnerable to it.

Table 3 offers a brief look at the different stakeholders that get involved with SDP as donors or implementers. In this simple table, one immediately sees the cross-cultural nature of SDP programs, the potentially conflicting motives among partners, and why communication, diplomacy, and an understanding of policy are essential attributes to negotiating a successful program.

That background information paves the way for looking at some specific exemplars in sport for peace. By no means is this list of sport and peace-building cases complete. In fact, I want to consciously avoid Giulianotti’s criticism that sport for peace researchers have yet to move beyond case studies and “produce more analytical and generalized work” (2010, p. 208). Rather, Table 4 attempts to provide a sample that can make two valuable points:

1. Sport for peace work, while still relatively new and fighting charges of unsophistication, has started to become more varied in its approaches, more rigorous in its evaluations, and more broad in its locations,
2. Because of the acknowledged success of numerous programs, best practices have begun to emerge and be identified by SDP-active organizations. Those best practices will close out this chapter.

Sport for peace goals are multi-faceted, complement other peace-building strategies, and sometimes complement other SDP sub-area goals. See figure 4 for an overview of peace-building goals, whether in or out of sport. The still-developing potential for reaching many populations in varied settings through sport for peace-building strategies should be clear. As we turn to best practices that have been identified to date, we should consider specifically how these interventions can be met through imaginative, research-based programming.
The most prominent sport for peace organizations have published best practices and/or guidelines. This includes the UN; Toronto-based Right to Play, which served as Secretariat for the SDP International Working Group until 2008; and the International Platform for Sport and Development. Such efforts are ongoing. The International Olympic Truce Centre has announced that it soon plans to publish a Best Practices Guide that explores the determining role of sports in peace-keeping operations (International Platform on Sport and Development, 2012). This section attempts to cull down those somewhat extensive lists into the most salient practices that are identified by most if not all of these organizations. In tandem with the research recommendations listed in the previous section, the hope is that sport for peace will continually strengthen its research and practice.

Holistic Approach to Peace-Building

Sport on its own cannot solve the complex problems that create conflicts. However, because it offers opportunities for social networking and relationship building, it can complement peace-building strategies based on relational spaces (SDP IWG, 2008a). Sport in itself cannot solve conflicts, but should be used as a tool for preventing violence, ethnic and regional tensions, and war (Vasili, 2010, p. 28).

Perseverance and Training
As with any program that is intended to last for the long haul, and will include personnel turnover, the proper training of staff and a commitment (financial and philosophical) to the local community are essential if the program is to be sustained. In a volatile environment that is a given when sport-for-peace programs are implemented, including child soldiers and other traumatized populations, these requirements are even more essential. Research has shown that committed and trained volunteers and staff, as well as strong community networks in which the staff operates, are keys to success (SDF IWG, 2008). Staff should know how to handle acute conflicts within a community, and how to handle differences in groups and perceive those differences as an asset (SDP IWG, 2008b).

Sensitivity/Local, Local, Local

The most essential guideline is being sensitive to the local population, and allowing that local population to guide the long-term process. Sport is a social construct, and thus the context it is introduced into must be understood. Some of the criticism leveled at SDP programs that was outlined earlier in this document shows how perception has real consequences to a person or community’s investment in a process. If a program even mimics, let alone replicates, unfortunate past colonial practices, then the program will have failed. Worse, it will have breached the “do no harm” principle that must guide any peace-building initiative. External actors must always be aware of their “outsider” status and the accompanying dynamics. Programs should avoid “parachuting” workers, volunteers, and even celebrities into conflict situations, which can exacerbate problems. Informed consent of participants – not just their representatives – is also essential (Sport for Development Platform, 2009).
A culturally sensitive approach prompted Levermore and Beacom to state that when it comes to evaluation of SDP programs, a multi-dimensional approach – one that is at once process-based/participatory as well as outcome-based/quantitative – is required (2009, p. 257). An evaluation that doesn’t account for culturally specific conditions can fail to incorporate the most important factors and goals. “Basing research inquiry on an implicit model of Western scientific rationality carries the danger of dismissing – and perhaps just missing – authentic local voices” (Kay, 2009), p. 1188f).

Research has shown that negative impacts of peace projects fall into six main categories. Adopting a “do no harm” principle can help peace project actors give systematic attention to issues and avoid making harmful mistakes:

1.) Worsening divisions between conflicting groups,
2.) Increasing danger for participants in peace activities,
3.) Reinforcing structural or overt violence
4.) Diverting resources from productive peace activities,
5.) Increasing cynicism, and
6.) Disempowering local people (SDP IWG, 2008a).

Accessibility

A corollary to the Sensitivity guideline is that of accessibility. All groups in the affected community must have access to the program and its infrastructure, including potentially more isolated individuals such as women, more vulnerable individuals such as the disabled or children, and more discriminated-against individuals such as targeted racial or ethnic groups. Access
refers to play spaces and equipment, transportation to and from play areas, as well as appropriately timing the program to all people, and creating a welcoming environment to even the most isolated people (Sport and Development Platform, 2009). Outsiders must constantly be aware of the distribution of services across conflicting lines, where perceived one-sided support might result in more conflict rather than reducing conflict (SDP IWG, 2007). Accessibility also requires an understanding of the barriers to interaction, so that appropriate and beneficial activities can be planned, and perhaps adapted with a flexible approach, as conditions evolve. For example, direct physical contact between participants has been cited as a tool to actively encourage intensive relationships, and traditional games and dance were found to help overcome initial obstacles between groups (International Sport and Development Platform, 2009).

These four guidelines encompass much more nuanced concepts, terms, and emphases that appear in longer documents. But in simple terms, implementers of programs who take these guidelines into account have a greater chance of success. However, what we have not addressed is how to select an initiative that puts these guidelines into action. The SDP IWG (2008, p. 180) established the following list of criteria to be considered by program administrators when determining what program to implement:

1.) Scale – i.e., the size and sustainability of the program
2.) How it addresses barriers
3.) Justification – what were the criteria for establishing the program?
4.) Culturally specific (needs based)? Is the program sensitive to specific local needs?
5.) Any evidence of mainstreaming
6.) Evidence/published material? Availability of appropriate evidence?
7.) Gender – is the program open, and sensitive to gender issues?

8.) Disability – is the program open to and adapted for persons with a disability?

In looking at this list, particularly #3 and #6, we are confronted with the perpetual concern of SDP in general, and sport for peace in particular. The potential of sport to play a significant role in lessening conflict *seems* real and significant. But there seems little proof that theoretical guidelines have been transferred effectively into practice yet (Biermann, 2011). Coalter has been a critical voice for advancing research methodology in SDP for better practical ends. His main appeal in his Sport-for-Development Impact Study with Taylor (2010) is the “need for programme providers and funders to develop *programme theories* and to articulate *how* programmes are meant to work. A programme theory details the components, mechanisms, relationships and sequences of causes and effects which are presumed to lead to desired outcomes (which are also a subject for analysis and clarification)” (emphases are Coalter’s) (p. xii). As it pertains to sport and peace-building, is progress being made in heeding Coalter’s demand for clarity of purpose, effective planning and training for implementation, and measurable, rigorous evaluation? That is a vital question to analyze in determining if peace-building is a realistic and worthwhile endeavor.
CHAPTER 7
A FINAL ANALYSIS

Can, as the title of this thesis suggests, peace-building be “sport’s next great legacy”? For that matter, what is sport’s current legacy? When Alexander Wolff wrote an expansive feature article in the world’s most popular sports magazine, *Sports Illustrated* (*SI*), it was a major source of publicity for SDP, a field whose researchers and practitioners have toiled under the radar for many years. As a gold-medal winner who gained fame and an SI Sportsman of the Year award for donating his bonus money to Olympic Aid, Johann Olav-Koss, President and CEO of Right to Play (the renamed version of Olympic Aid), has been one of the few prominent faces devoted to the fledgling movement. According to Wolff, using Koss as his example and his source of information, “sport is doing nothing less than trying to save the world.” Wolff proceeded to share examples from a yearlong question to discover whether that is indeed true. He covered programs in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; to Port Elizabeth, South Africa; to the West Bank. He gave five entrepreneurial examples of individuals who had made an impact with their visions, including two (Spirit of Soccer and Fútbol para la Paz) that have direct sport for peace-building objectives (Wolff, 2011).

So, what is sport’s next great legacy? When one of the most mainstream magazines in the world devotes more than 5,000 words to a movement, it should be cause for taking notice that SDP is in the running for that title. However, Wolff’s reporting was necessarily only a snapshot and a seemingly positive shot in the arm. The effort needed to realize that legacy is still very much a work in progress.

What are sport’s current and past legacies? Surveying those questions can help us understand how we reached the nexus we are at now, where conditions and broad-based interest
converge to make the possibilities seem endless. It is a place where a transformative movement can blossom. Giulianotti (2010) identified three historical stages (see Figure 5) in modern sport’s development “as a highly important socio-cultural and political-ideological tool in shaping Global North-South relations, particularly in circumstances defined by immense power inequalities” (p. 209):

Despite some optimistic developments over time, Giulianotti does not take an entirely positive view of SDP work to date. However, his timeline does include a few clues that are worth pointing out regarding sport’s place in peace-building. I break down Giulianotti’s time periods into these shorthand “legacy words,” for simplicity’s sake: Controlling, Contested, Birth of SDP, Childhood of SDP. Sport’s role as an instrument of colonialism to one of being an ally for progressive change in the larger development sector is not neat and tidy, but the arc is in a conciliatory direction. Some have suggested that the current drivers of SDP, plus sport’s past baggage in the service of suspicious goals, dooms SDP to a neo-colonial status that cannot be overcome. I would suggest that SDP is still discovering what its role is, and that the temper of the times is such that sport’s next legacy is still very much in flux. The researchers and practitioners who undertake development work with a sport-specific emphasis will determine the result. As these time periods illustrate, and as our modern experience shows us, change occurs rapidly. Just look at the 3.2 period (Maturation of SDP). Following 3.1 (Birth of SDP), researchers quickly identified flaws in SDP work, and the potential repeat of past mistakes. In less than a decade, “SDP agencies have tended to have more definitive objectives, such as peacemaking within specific communities” (Giulianotti, 2010, p. 211). One could say that the audacious goals we associate with sport for peace-building are in fact not so impossible to conceive, but rather quite achievable if the programs target specific tasks to help specific
communities and individuals (as the other SDP sub-areas do), and avoid the flawed assumption that sport can solve greater societal ills all on its own.

Giulianotti, whose work was of obvious importance in my own research, suggests that the SDP field needs to continue to be innovative and develop the critical model further to put a greater focus on social justice. The result would be the next stage, Sport/Global Society 3.3. For legacy’s sake, I will call it Maturation of SDP. And note that it relies heavily on the sport and peace-building sub-area to achieve success. Giulianotti suggests that four developments need to occur to encourage that transition toward more critical, more reflexive action:

1) Agencies running peacemaking projects must engage more consistently with new social movements and relatively radical nongovernmental and community-based organizations, particularly Global South institutions based in conflict or post-conflict zones.

2) Peacemaking agencies should emphasize sustained relationships with donors, in particular intergovernmental organizations, in order to achieve long-term goals without being distracted by deadlines and short-term targets.

3) Peacemaking SDP agencies need to emphasize self-transformation.

4) SDP agencies need to carefully consider the role of communities in defining their needs and setting their goals.

The projects will be more costly, and more time-consuming to implement, but the result will be more robust, practical strategies for building resilient, peaceful communities where strife has been the overarching theme. “It would register too a progressive transition in the historical sport-global society interface, and enable the peacemaking SDP sector to mark out a progressive,
justice-based path that other agencies within global civil society might follow” (Giulianotti, 2010, p. 225).

While Giulianotti’s recommendations suggest important points for practical implementation of programs for greatest chance of success in planning and partnership-building, the role of the academic community in researching, evaluating, and taking part in the process on the ground is just as important. As Kurt Lewin, a researcher sometimes called the founder of social psychology, said,

[Advances in knowledge] can be accomplished … if the theorist does not look toward applied problems with highbrow aversion or with a fear of social problems, and if the applied psychologist realizes that there is nothing so practical as a good theory (1951, p. 169).

Such bi-directional thinking is essential for progress in any field of endeavor, whether the well-established psychology, or the emergent SDP, as Boyer, an educator, (1990) makes clear:

It would be misleading to suggest knowledge is first discovered and then applied … the process if far more dynamic … New understandings can arise out of the very act of application—whether in medical diagnosis, serving clients, shaping public policy, or working with the public schools. In activities such as these, theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other (p. 23).
There are many examples developing along this theory-practice continuum, suggesting that parts of the academic community are taking SDP seriously. New conferences, journals, journal articles, journal special issues (e.g., *Third World Quarterly*, 32:3, 2011), and social media discussions related explicitly or indirectly to SDP seem to arise with increasing regularity. In delivering the prestigious Earle F. Zeigler lecture to her sport management colleagues, Hums suggests that sport managers on the ground must take a broader view to include human rights (which may include corporate social responsibility, disaster relief, and helping refugees, among other issues), ethical and environmental concerns, as well as business success. In other words, managers should become the “conscience and commerce” of sport management (Hums 2010, p. 7). Donnelly’s team issues a similar plea for their sociology colleagues to use a public sociology perspective to engage with practitioners for critical and constructive analyses of work in the field (Donnelly, Atkinson, Boyle, & Szto, 2011). The peer-reviewed, open-access *Journal of Sport for Development*, based in South Africa, is scheduled for its first volume in 2012. Its mission, as stated on its website (http://jsfd.org/) “is to advance, examine and disseminate evidence and best practices for programmes and interventions that use sport to promote development, health and/or peace.” Other journals, some with a more practical orientation and some with a more academic orientation, could be important catalysts for advancing the knowledge base, especially in cross-disciplinary research, where, for example, sport scientists and conflict resolution researchers could better speak the same language. Lyras called for development of a dynamic database of SDP programs, a Sport for Development Global Initiative, where researchers and practitioners could connect more efficiently as part of an emergent SDP organization (Lyras, Wolff, Hancock, & Selvaraju, 2009). The International Platform for Sport for Development is already serving a vital role as a clearinghouse of information on events, scholarly work, jobs, and news in the SDP
field. Still to be determined is what methods SDP researchers and practitioners might use to effectively develop their research and programs. One approach that is taking hold in the social sciences is concept mapping. I believe that it may hold promise in SDP for its ability to collate substantial qualitative data into graphic data for broad understanding that can be instructive for long-term action planning and creating buy-in by potential donors.

Dr. Robert Henley of the Swiss Academy for Development summed up the power of sport in peace building, its limitations, and the collaboration of academic and ground-level interests:

Sport, in its traditional form, is not a conflict preventative instrument. On the contrary, the nature of sport is exactly the opposite "a physical contest between people or teams with different goals". For us to be able to effectively use sport as a peace building tool and to control the results and impact we must know what we are doing. The implementation and how sport is being preserved is the key, not sport alone. The balance between developing sport in its traditional form and using sport to achieve peaceful coexistence can only be managed by conscious and planned implementation, increased research, concept development and understanding and increased training of field implementers. (Toolkit Sport for Development)

The possibilities for the field of SDP really are endless. How effective it is in improving policy and improving lives depends on the researchers and practitioners with the creativity and foresight to shape it. Which brings us back to the aforementioned Sugden plea to use a sociological imagination in peace-building efforts, Jarvie’s plea for an engaged intellectual, and Koss’ vision and hyperbole. The doubts that SDP currently faces from many sides are real, but so is Sugden’s cautious optimism. Peace-building should be considered a cornerstone in SDP’s growth, and this can’t happen without researchers and practitioners becoming heavily involved with the populations they study and serve. If done well, the results can be the transformation of sport’s legacy into something less Orwellian and more human.
CHAPTER 8

FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1. Timeline of Key SDP Milestones

1978 – UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation) General Conference adopts the International Charter of Physical Education and Sport

1992—Olympic Aid, a precursor to Right to Play, is conceived by the Lillehammer Olympic Organizing Committee, to show support for people in areas of distress.

1994—The UN declares 1994 as the “International Year of Sport and the Olympic Ideal.” General Secretary Boutros Boutros-Ghali emphasizes the close connection between the Olympic ethos and the fundamental principles of the UN.

1994—Norwegian gold-medal speed skater Johann Olav-Koss donates his bonus money to Olympic Aid, which later is renamed Right to Play.

1995—An IOC President (Juan Antonio Samaranch) speaks before the General Assembly of the UN for the first time in the history of the Olympic Movement.

1997 – Heads of State and Government of the European Commission focus special attention on sport during the Amsterdam treaty negotiations, during which it was stated that “the Conference emphasises the social significance of sport, in particular its role in forging identity and bringing people together.”

2001 – UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan appoints Mr. Adolf Ogi (former President of the Swiss Confederation) as the first Special Adviser on Sport for Development and Peace to enhance the network of relations between UN organizations and the sports sector.

2002 – The UN Secretary-General convenes the UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace to review activities that involve sport within the UN system.

2002 – First International Conference on Sport & Development, Magglingen, Switzerland. The conference was the first international, high-level event on Sport & Development, involving participants from sports federations, governments, UN agencies, the media, athletes, business and civil society.

2003 – First Next Step conference: “International Expert Meeting on Development in and through Sport,” Amsterdam, the Netherlands. On a different level to the Magglingen conference series, the Next Step conference was established to target practitioners, mostly at the grassroots level, to share experiences and best practices in Sport & Development.
Figure 1 (cont.)


2004 – Roundtable forum: Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace, Athens, Greece. The roundtable forum was hosted during the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens and brought together political leaders and experts in development to discuss the potential of sport in achieving development goals. The roundtable forum laid the cornerstones for establishing the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG) creating a new policy framework for the use of sport for development and peace.

2004 – The Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG) is formed, with representatives from Ministers of Sport, Youth and Development from 15 countries, directors of UN agencies, and NGOs in the field of Sport for Development and Peace.


2005 – Second Magglingen Conference on Sport & Development, Magglingen, Switzerland.


2007 – European Commission publishes a White Paper on Sport stating it will promote the use of sport as a tool for development in international development policy.

2008 – IOC and the UN agree on an expanded framework for action to use sport to reach the goals of the UN.

2008 – UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon appoints Mr. Wilfried Lemke as the new Special Adviser on Sport for Development and Peace, after Mr. Adolf Ogi steps down.

2008—Publication of final report of the SDPIWG, titled “Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments.”

2010—The first joint forum between the UN and the IOC held in Lausanne, Switzerland, titled “The Importance of Partnership.”

2011—Second International Forum on Sport, Peace, and Development held in Geneva, Switzerland.
Figure 1 (cont.)

2011—Sport as a Mediator between Cultures Conference held in Israel, a joint effort between the International Congress of Sport Science and Physical Education, the Wingate Institute and Zinman College in cooperation with the Ministry of Regional Cooperation, Israel, and the Federal Institute of Sport Science, Germany.
**Figure 2. SDP IWG Sub-Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.) Sport and Health</th>
<th>2.) Sport and Child &amp; Youth Development</th>
<th>3.) Sport and Gender</th>
<th>4.) Sport and Persons with Disabilities</th>
<th>5.) Sport and Peace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

--Adapted from SDP IWG, 2008a, p. i
Figure 3. Evolution of Peace Studies Within Sport.

Figure 4. Peace-Building Interventions.

Security
- Humanitarian mine action
- Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of adult combatants
- Security sector reform
- Small arms and light weapons reduction

Socio-economic Foundations
- Physical reconstruction
- Economic infrastructure
- Health and education infrastructure
- Repatriation and return of refugees and internally displaced persons
- Food security

Political Framework
- Democratization (parties, media, NGOs, democratic culture)
- Strengthening governance (accountability, rule of law, justice system)
- Institution building
- Human rights enforcement (monitoring laws, justice system)

Reconciliation and Justice
- Dialogue between leaders of opposing groups
- Grassroots dialogue
- Other bridge-building activities
- Truth and reconciliation commissions
- Trauma therapy and healing

Source: Adapted from The Peace-Building Palette (Utstein Report). Appeared in SDP IWG 2008a.
Figure 5. Sport/Global Society timeline, with legacy buzzwords.

- Sport/Global Society 1.0: Sport, Colonization and “Civilization”, late 18th to mid-20th century. Sport was used by European colonizers to control indigenous populations, considered civilizing instruments in the service of social, political, and ideological goals, resulting in local games being eradicated in favor of codified imports from colonizers. We’ll call this Controlling, for legacy purposes.

- Sport/Global Society 2.0: Sport, Nationalism, Post-Colonialism and Development, 1940s-1990s. Sport as a highly contested field, especially in post-colonial contexts with immense symbolic importance riding on outcomes. As nations gained independence, they were integrated into global sport governance structures, and the global development of sport mirrored modernization policies of other international bodies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Developing nations receive some funding for sport capital projects and voting blocs ensue. We’ll call this Contested, for legacy purposes.

- Sport/Global Society 3.0: Sport, Development and Peace, mid-1990s to present. SDP ethos and sector fully emerge. Partnerships grow between sport and wider development sector, and involvement by UN, IOC, and other transcontinental entities are prevalent.
  - Sport/Global Society 3.1, mid-1990s to 2005. This sub-period includes SDP’s sudden expansion, culminating in the UN’s commitment to sport in 2005. This period featured “many short-term SDP projects with relatively little focus on sustainability, monitoring, and evaluation of work, international coordination, or knowledge transfer” (p. 211). We’ll call this Birth of SDP, for legacy purposes.
  - Sport/Global Society 3.2, 2005 to present. Projects feature more nuances, more reflexivity, more networking, and more coordination across the SDP sector, with the result being more definitive and targeted objectives, better monitoring, knowledge of local settings, and guidance from experienced development agencies. Also, there is more knowledge transfer and more engagement with donors. We’ll call this Childhood of SDP, for legacy purposes.
  - Sport/Global Society 3.3? Maturation of SDP?

Adapted from Giulianotti, 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDG</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger</td>
<td>Life skills development, community networking, health care burden and reduced stigma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achieving universal primary education</td>
<td>Increased attendance and attention, informal education, role models and reduced stigma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promoting gender equality and empower</td>
<td>Empowerment through increased health, fitness, self esteem, confidence, networks, opportunities for leadership and shifts in gender norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reducing child mortality</td>
<td>Health education for young mothers, reduced adolescent pregnancy and promoting vaccination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improving maternal health</td>
<td>Access to reproductive health information and services and increased fitness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Combating HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other</td>
<td>Prevention through awareness and peer education, reduced stigma, inclusive activities and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diseases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ensuring environmental sustainability</td>
<td>Sport–based awareness campaigns and mobilization of community participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Global partnership for development</td>
<td>Sport as a neutral space for connecting communities and forming global partnerships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Global Focus Aotearoa, 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts assessment</th>
<th>Organizational</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Cultural enrichment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply scientific monitoring &amp; evaluation methodology (validated instruments, detached data analysis, objective interpretation)</td>
<td>Increase social capital through ongoing training of all engaged stakeholders</td>
<td>Apply sport practices based on moral values and principles (existence of vision and philosophy)</td>
<td>Create child-oriented conditions for positive learning experiences</td>
<td>Enrich sport intervention curricula with cultural activities (e.g., arts, music, dance, theatre, poetry, short movie making)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the impact of SFD programs and policy across time and space</td>
<td>Build the capacity of and empower local stakeholders based on their needs and unique potential</td>
<td>Create inclusive mixed teams (ethnicity, gender, competence level)</td>
<td>Create reward system to reinforce positive attitudes, thoughts and behaviors (Social Cognitive Theory, role playing, cognitive and behavioral approaches, positive role models)</td>
<td>Apply multidisciplinary framework with global and local issues (e.g., human rights, global environment, international relations, peace and cross-cultural understanding, technological literacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize mixed methods approach and collect data from multiple sources of information (triangulation, reports, pre-post questionnaires, audiovisual data, journals, focus groups)</td>
<td>Foster an inclusive, collaborative environment (e.g., inter-group contact principles: equal status, potential friendship, common goals, institutional support, intergroup corporation)</td>
<td>Merge traditional with non-traditional sports and physical activities (e.g., soccer, treasure hunt, martial arts)</td>
<td>Facilitate conditions for optimal engagement in every sport and non-sport activity (flow and peak experiences)</td>
<td>Make mental and practical associations between sports and real life experiences (e.g., human rights, environmental issues, community-based initiatives, life skills, spirituality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess organizational components and identify attributes that leverage positive outcomes</td>
<td>Promote the development of innovative SFD programs, products, and services (changes within)</td>
<td>Provide a variety of sport and physical activities to attract and sustain a more representative population</td>
<td>Use real life sport and non-sport challenges to achieve educational objectives (Constructivist Pedagogy &amp; Problem-Based Learning)</td>
<td>Create clusters to initiate community based creative engagement and participation (e.g., community-based sport &amp; non-sport initiatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify organizational components that hinder positive change and development</td>
<td>Facilitate transformational leadership</td>
<td>Utilize the principles of the educational component (Sport-for-Development Theory)</td>
<td>Create groups with similar interests</td>
<td>Utilize Olympism as a framework of inclusion, inspiration and engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and assess FD related social, psychological and societal indicators</td>
<td>Ensure sustainable resources and institutionalize innovative organizational culture</td>
<td>Encourage coaches and instructors to serve as educators, positive role models and agents of positive change</td>
<td>Empower individuals by assigning preference and interest based roles</td>
<td>Create positive entertaining experiences &amp; facilitate innovation &amp; outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply research ethics at all stages and respect local sensitivities (conflict, political complexity and implications)</td>
<td>Build local and global platforms to establish synergies with local and international SFD stakeholders (e.g., universities, NGOs, policymakers, practitioners) Utilize inclusive decision making to promote individual &amp; collective actions</td>
<td>Facilitate conditions for optimal engagement (flow and peak experiences) by keeping a balance between skills and challenge</td>
<td>Promote empathy, care, &amp; creative thoughts &amp; actions in every sport &amp; non-sport activity</td>
<td>Embrace local culture &amp; promote global perspective and appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>World view/Motive</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational corporations, corporate social responsibility</td>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td>Nike, Coca-Cola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental and intergovernmental organizations</td>
<td>Governance/developmentalist</td>
<td>UN, UNESCO, UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental organizations/community-based organizations</td>
<td>Programme implementation</td>
<td>Right to Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New social movements and radical nongovernmental organizations</td>
<td>Social justice</td>
<td>Clean Clothes Campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information adapted from Giulianotti, 2010.
Table 4. Sport for Peace Exemplars

Note: These are only a sampling of Sport for Peace initiatives that have been implemented in recent years. No claim is made that these are the most successful or most ambitious or most rigorous. Much effort has gone into, and continues to be done, to determine what programs work best for different populations. This table is simply intended to show some prominent and/or long-lasting programs to provide an understanding of the breadth of vision and globe-spanning scope of peace-building attempts using sport as the vehicle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Country(ies)</th>
<th>Implementing Organization</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football 4 Peace</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Israel, Palestine, Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Football 4 Peace</td>
<td>One of the early success stories in SDP, emphasis is on local buy-in, trained volunteers, culturally-sensitive programming where conflicts are entrenched.</td>
<td>Sugden 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SportWorks Chad</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Right to Play</td>
<td>Activities focus on teamwork, fair play, and inclusion, especially for refugees from Darfur, Sudan. Coach training of locals is crucial component.</td>
<td>SDP IWG 2007b (pp. 84-86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight for Peace</td>
<td>Boxing</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Fight for Peace</td>
<td>Targeted to youth in drug-trafficking areas of Rio de Janeiro as an alternative to the violence among three drug factions all around them.</td>
<td>SDP IWG 2007b (pp. 93-95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids League</td>
<td>Football, netball</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Kids League</td>
<td>Works with internally displaced people in northern Uganda and provide mixed-sex open-access 6-7 week programs for 12-15 year-olds. Before and after surveys as part of an extensive six-initiative research project is a good example of evaluation of peace-building programs.</td>
<td>Coalter &amp; Taylor, 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Fun Football Schools</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Balkans, South Caucuses, Middle East</td>
<td>Cross Cultures Project Association</td>
<td>More than 700 multi-ethnic football schools implemented with more than 2,300 local football clubs and 1,600 municipalities, OFFS teaches local volunteers about how to impart principles of non-discrimination, tolerance and equality to people living in divided communities.</td>
<td>International Platform 2009, and Gasser and Levinsen 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country of South Africa</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>The country of South Africa</td>
<td>The country of South Africa, with multiple partners.</td>
<td>South Africa “has made deliberate efforts to transform the sports sector through national development programs. The government has explicitly linked sports to development and reconciliation, a stated goal in the 1994 Reconstruction and Development Programme. There have also been initiatives by local and international NGOs to build capacity at the community level” (pp. 806-807).</td>
<td>Höglund &amp; Sundberg 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseil Internationale du Sport Militaire (CISM)</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Military World Games organized every 4 years at selected site; other activities such as Race of Hope (sport and cultural centers for African war orphans) are held by 127-nation CISM.</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>Not a typical example, CISM promotes physical &amp; sports to military peacekeepers in conflict areas. CISM may be “the best transnational agency if the SDP sector is to extend its activities and supporting institutions by engaging with peacekeepers” (p. 390).</td>
<td>Giulianotti &amp; Armstrong, 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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