

Strengthening Sport for Development and Peace

National Policies and Strategies

Edited by Oliver Dudfield



The Commonwealth

Strengthening Sport for Development and Peace

National Policies and Strategies

Edited by Oliver Dudfield

Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport and
Commonwealth Secretariat



The Commonwealth

Commonwealth Secretariat
Marlborough House
Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5HX
United Kingdom

© Commonwealth Secretariat 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or otherwise without the permission of the publisher.

Published by the Commonwealth Secretariat
Edited by: editors4change Limited
Typeset by Cenvo Publisher Services
Cover design by Rory Seaford Design
Printed by Hobbs the Printers, Totton, Hampshire

Views and opinions expressed in this publication are the responsibility of the authors and should in no way be attributed to the institutions to which they are affiliated or to the Commonwealth Secretariat.

Wherever possible, the Commonwealth Secretariat uses paper sourced from sustainable forests or from sources that minimise a destructive impact on the environment.

Copies of this publication may be obtained from

Publications Section
Commonwealth Secretariat
Marlborough House
Pall Mall
London SW1Y 5HX
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)20 7747 6534
Fax: +44 (0)20 7839 9081
Email: publications@commonwealth.int
Web: www.thecommonwealth.org/publications

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN (paperback): 978-1-84929-118-7
ISBN (e-book): 978-1-84859-912-3

Preface

The Commonwealth Secretariat, working closely with the Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport (CABOS), has become an important site of expertise, leadership and co-ordination on sport for development and peace (SDP). SDP brings the power of sport to the solution of some of the most difficult challenges of humankind, such as the realisation of the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals. The Commonwealth Secretariat now contributes to the formulation, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of government policy related to SDP. It has published surveys of the most important interventions, no mean contribution in a rapidly emerging field with a variety of causes, approaches and organisations; catalogued and publicised examples of 'best practice'; convened consultations of experts and practitioners; and communicated its findings to international forums, not the least of which have been the regular meetings of the Commonwealth sport and youth ministers.¹

During the last five years, the Secretariat's primary activities have advanced from advocacy – making the case for SDP as an effective tool of development – to research-based policy development, to policy implementation. For example, in July of 2012, at the Commonwealth Sports Ministers Meeting in London on the eve of the Olympic Games, it issued guidelines for policy and programme development that incorporated the most up-to-date research from scholars and programme assessments from around the world.² In 2012, it began working with selected Commonwealth governments on SDP policy and strategy development, with a view to assisting with the incorporation of the guidelines into appropriate national policies. In the coming months, this work will be extended to other Commonwealth governments.

In a community of 53 nations devoted to 'development, democracy and diversity', the systematic, policy-based recruitment of sport – arguably the Commonwealth's most visible cultural expression – to the betterment of peoples, especially their health, education, safety and equity within their societies, is an encouraging step. It has come about as a result of the eloquent, persistent advocacy of Commonwealth leaders, especially Secretary-General Kamallesh Sharma, the heart-warming example of the hundreds of young sportswomen and

sportsmen from different parts of the Commonwealth who have initiated and served in SDP programmes, and the effectiveness of the most prominent government and non-government organisation (NGO) programmes, such as the UK's International Inspiration, the Australian Sport Outreach Program and India's Magic Bus. In 2011, the force of these arguments was recognised in the recommendations of the Eminent Persons Group (EPG) charged with the responsibility of recommending a strategy for renewing the Commonwealth, and then given the full weight of policy by the Commonwealth Heads of Government in their meeting in Perth, Australia. Among other steps, the EPG recommended that:

The Secretariat should be authorised to play a co-ordinating role through policy analysis, training and development, data collection, monitoring and evaluation, to help Commonwealth member states develop 'Sport for Peace and Development' initiatives.³

That is the work now underway.

This collection of papers, commissioned and edited by the Commonwealth Secretariat, was prepared to inform and enrich the deliberations of CABOS and the work of the Secretariat. It reflects the most critical thinking and most urgent debates among leading scholars and practitioners. It is now being published in its own right as a contribution to the knowledge of everyone with an interest in sport for development and peace – policy-makers, scholars, practitioners, sports leaders, students, youth leaders and corporate sponsors – as the international community prepares to develop new overarching goals for development post-2015, including the challenge of reducing the escalating increase in non-communicable diseases.

Today, there is an urgent need to go beyond the confident platitudes and develop a much more careful understanding of what works and what does not work in SDP. The research makes clear that sport by itself is insufficient to make beneficial change, but that a well-co-ordinated multi-sectoral approach is necessary. Since sport can harm as well as empower, it is important to ensure the safety and security of participants, especially girls and women, at all times. Most of all, the research tells us that both policy and programme planning, no matter how well intentioned or generous, must begin with the aspirations, needs and strengths of

the intended beneficiaries, and engage them directly in the design of programmes and the monitoring and evaluation of results.

These papers offer a challenging, illuminating contribution to our knowledge, underscoring not only the significant benefits of SDP, but the difficult questions policy-makers and professionals must address. I hope it becomes the first in a series of such annual publications.

Professor Bruce Kidd

University of Toronto

Former Chair of Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport

Notes

1. See, for example, the CABOS reports to the Commonwealth Sports Ministers Meetings of 2006 (Melbourne), 2008 (Beijing), 2010 (Delhi) and 2012 (London).
2. These have now been published as T Kay and O Dudfield (2013), *The Commonwealth Guide to Advancing Development through Sport*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.
3. Report of the Eminent Persons Group to Commonwealth Heads of Government (2011), *A Commonwealth of the People: Time for Urgent Reform*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London, 149.

Contents

Preface	iii
Abbreviations and acronyms	viii
1. Sport for Development and Peace: Opportunities, Challenges and the Commonwealth's Response	1
<i>Oliver Dudfield, Commonwealth Secretariat</i>	
1.1 The growth of sport for development and peace within international development efforts	2
1.2 Commonwealth sport for development and peace policy instruments	3
1.3 Commonwealth sport for development and peace guidelines and framework	5
1.4 Challenges and issues in strengthening sport for development and peace in the Commonwealth	6
1.5 Conclusion	8
Annex 1.1 Commonwealth Framework and Guidelines on Sport for Development and Peace	9
References	11
2. Sport for Development and Peace Policy Options in the Commonwealth	13
<i>Professor Dr Richard Giulianotti, Loughborough University</i>	
2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Sport for development and peace stakeholders and policies	15
2.3 Future sport for development and peace sector issues and challenges	18
2.4 Conclusion: potential Commonwealth policy responses	19
References	24
3. Critical Considerations for Sport for Development and Peace Policy Development	25
<i>Dr Simon Darnell, Durham University</i>	
3.1 Introduction and background	25
3.2 Critical considerations	26
3.3 Conclusion	28
References	29

4. Safeguarding Children and Young People in Sport for Development and Peace Programmes	30
<i>Liz Twyford, UNICEF UK</i>	
4.1 Introduction	31
4.2 The Safeguarding Children in Sport Working Group	32
4.3 Safeguarding standards research	33
4.4 Building the capacity for safeguarding in sport	34
4.5 Conclusions	34
Reference	34
Annex 4.1 Overview of the standards	35
5. Maximising Action Sports for Development	40
<i>Dr Holly Thorpe, University of Waikato</i>	
5.1 Introduction	41
5.2 Beyond football: action sports for development and peace building	44
5.3 Value of action sports for development and peace building	46
5.4 Action sports: the potential for risk	48
5.5 Conclusion	51
References	57
6. Using Sport and Play to Achieve Educational Objectives	63
<i>Kathryn McCracken and Emma Colucci, Right to Play</i>	
6.1 Introduction	64
6.2 Purpose of this chapter	65
6.3 Achieving education objectives through sport and play	65
6.3.1 Increased engagement in learning, attendance and retention	65
6.3.2 Increased academic achievement	66
6.4 How are governments using sport and play to contribute to education objectives?	67
6.5 Methodology	68
6.6 Recommendations	69
References	73
7. Evaluating the Contribution Sport Makes to Development Objectives in the Pacific	76
<i>Dr Allison Simons</i>	
7.1 Introduction and background	76
7.2 Impact of the ASOP Pacific Country Programs	77
7.3 Conclusion	83
References	83

Abbreviations and acronyms

ASC	Australian Sports Commission
ASDP	action sports for development and peace building
ASOP	Australian Sports Outreach Program
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CABOS	Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport
CHOGM	Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting
CSMM	Commonwealth Sports Ministers Meeting
EPG	Eminent Persons Group
MOE	Ministry of Education
NGO	non-governmental organisation
SDP	sport for development and peace
SDP IWG	Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group
UNESCO	UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
UNOSDP	UN Office on Sport for Development and Peace

Chapter 1

Sport for Development and Peace: Opportunities, Challenges and the Commonwealth's Response

Oliver Dudfield, Commonwealth Secretariat

This chapter provides a context for the Commonwealth's engagement with sport for development and peace (SDP) by briefly charting the growth of the sector from the perspective of the intergovernmental SDP policy development and the establishment of pan-Commonwealth SDP policy instruments and support mechanisms. In particular, relevant resolutions at Commonwealth Heads of Government Meetings (CHOGMs), Commonwealth Sport Ministers Meetings (CSMMs) and in other relevant pan-Commonwealth forums are highlighted.

The paper introduces key challenges in working to strengthen SDP policy within Commonwealth member countries, in particular:

- limited policy instruments, support mechanisms, delivery programming and/or resourcing to scale SDP initiatives;
- concerns voiced by development actors that many sport stakeholders over-simplify contextual variance and the development challenges sport claims to address;
- the close alignment of sport and issues associated with globalisation;
- pronounced inequity in the distribution of resources within the broader sport sector – in particular when considered through a gender, geographical or participatory lens; and
- the hesitation among some development actors to engage with/ resource SDP, borne out of cautiousness that SDP is geared as much to the promotion of elite sport as it is to contributing to broad human and social development objectives.

The chapter concludes by asking that as SDP is now established within international development discourse, do SDP stakeholders consider responding to these issues as having equal importance to, or even superseding, continued advocacy efforts.

1.1 The growth of sport for development and peace within international development efforts

Recognition of the contribution sport-based approaches can make to development and peace-building objectives has grown markedly over the last ten years. The United Nations General Assembly support for Resolution 66/7, promoting the contribution sport can make to international development goals, marks the tenth consecutive year that the assembly has passed a resolution recognising the interplay of sport, development and peace-building.¹ In that time the number of agencies using sport as a key strategy in development work has grown more than five-fold (Kay 2010), most notably in work taking place at the community level. Equally a significant number of sport stakeholders, including national and international federations, have established partnerships with development actors and integrated development messaging into their communication and growth strategies.²

Within the international community the use of sport in the development efforts of the United Nations and inter-governmental system has also expanded (UNOSDP 2012). Recognising the growing importance of the SDP sector, the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP) was established in 2005 to co-ordinate this sector, in particular within the United Nations system. The UNOSDP also co-ordinates the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG), whose aim is to promote the integration of sport for development and peace (SDP) policy recommendations into the development strategies of governments. This group's landmark report, *Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments*, promoted the potential contribution of sport to development and peace, and has acted as a key reference document for international efforts to strengthen SDP (SDP IWG 2008).

Following the lead of the United Nations, a range of intergovernmental bodies, most notably the Council of Europe, Africa Union Commission and Caribbean Community Secretariat (CARICOM), have considered the policy implications of the interplay between sport and social development issues in more detail.³

Through this growth period Commonwealth stakeholders have played an important role in the international SDP community. Commonwealth governments are among the leading advocates for SDP and many have integrated sport-based approaches within domestic and international development policy and strategies (CABOS 2010). Additionally, many Commonwealth-based agencies are consistently cited as leading examples of SDP good practice in international meetings and platforms.

1.2 Commonwealth sport for development and peace policy instruments

The Commonwealth is a voluntary association of 53 countries that support one another and work together towards shared goals in democracy and development. Commonwealth members are united through the association's values of: democracy, freedom, peace, the rule of law and opportunity for all.⁴ In support of their association, Commonwealth Heads of Government and ministers responsible for key policy areas meet regularly. This ensures that Commonwealth policies and programmes represent views of members and gives governments a better understanding of one another's goals.

There are three intergovernmental organisations supporting the Commonwealth and delivering on the outcomes of these meetings: the Commonwealth Secretariat, charged with executing the plans agreed by Commonwealth Heads of Government and ministers through technical assistance, advice and policy development; the Commonwealth Foundation, which works with civil society organisations to promote democracy, development and cultural understanding; and the Commonwealth of Learning, which encourages the development and sharing of open learning and distance education. In addition, the Commonwealth boasts a worldwide network of around 90 professional and advocacy organisations. They work at the local, national, regional and/or international levels and play crucial roles in policy, political or social aspects of Commonwealth life. Due to its role overseeing the Commonwealth Games, a unique,

world class, multi-sports event, the Commonwealth Games Federation (CGF) is one of highest profile of these organisations. It has a well-established role in Heads of Government forums and is the key Commonwealth organisation interfacing with the sport movement.

Within this context, Commonwealth leaders have consistently endorsed the role SDP can play in development and peace work, in particular in the domain of youth engagement and empowerment. Commonwealth Heads of Government reinforced this commitment during their 2011 meeting, and in doing so endorsed the observations of the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group (EPG) of the need for Commonwealth governments and sport stakeholders alike, including the Commonwealth Games movement, to intensify efforts to use sport as a platform to promote peace and development. Included in these recommendations was an endorsement that the Commonwealth Secretariat be mandated to play ‘a co-ordinating role to support member countries strengthen SDP initiatives’ (CHOGM 2011).

The CHOGM resolutions were particularly significant for two reasons. First, they marked the first time official Commonwealth organisations had been specifically requested to support SDP by CHOGM, the highest decision-making body in the Commonwealth. Second, they recognised and, through the EPG report, formally referenced the work the Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport (CABOS) has done analysing the significance of SDP in the Commonwealth and framing how formal Commonwealth organisations should respond (CABOS 2010). The endorsement by Heads of Government that the Commonwealth Secretariat play a co-ordinating role to support SDP also reinforced decisions of consecutive Commonwealth Sports Ministers Meetings, which highlighted the important interplay of sport, development and peace and the need for increased attention across the Commonwealth (CSMM 2012).

Both sports ministers and CABOS have been consistent in identifying that the Commonwealth Secretariat can best contribute to strengthening SDP through a targeted focus in two areas. First, working with members countries to strengthen national SDP policy mechanisms and, second, promoting further collaboration among Commonwealth governments and with other relevant international organisations in the area of SDP.

This direction recognised both the scope of the Secretariat's resources, the role played by other stakeholders and that for SDP initiatives to be sustainable, resourcing must come from national structures or long-term partnerships.

1.3 Commonwealth sport for development and peace guidelines and framework

Based on key Commonwealth policy instruments highlighted above, the Commonwealth Secretariat supports SDP in the Commonwealth through:

- promoting SDP as a focus area for Commonwealth meetings and platforms in relevant policy domains; namely, the Commonwealth Sports Ministers Meeting, Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport, within the Commonwealth's youth networks where appropriate and within other Commonwealth policy domains such as social transformation and human rights; and
- providing technical assistance to a small number of identified member governments to develop national action plans focused on strengthening SDP policy, strategy and support mechanisms.

To provide a structure for this work the Commonwealth Secretariat, in collaboration with CABOS and proactive member countries, developed a framework and guidelines for Commonwealth countries seeking to strengthen the sports contribution to development and peace efforts. The framework and guidelines form a resource under the title *The Commonwealth Guide to Advancing Development through Sport* (Kay and Dudfield 2013). The preparation of this guide was specifically requested by ministers at the Fifth Commonwealth Sports Ministers Meeting in Delhi, India, to build on the work of the UN International Working Group on Sport for Development and Peace (SDP IWG 2008). *The Commonwealth Guide* was developed following a considered consultation process and in collaboration with representatives of Commonwealth governments, sport for development and peace (SDP) experts and leading non-government agencies. The guidelines and framework provide a model for member countries to identify where sport is being used, or could be used, to strengthen development work, and the key stakeholders to drive this. The framework also sets out key

principles for strengthening SDP in the Commonwealth, as endorsed by sport ministers, and detailed indicators to analyse the status of policy, strategy and support mechanisms. A description of headline principles and indicators are provided in Annex 1.1. The Sixth Commonwealth Sports Ministers Meeting, held in London in 2012, endorsed the guide and requested the Commonwealth Secretariat to work with identified member countries to utilise the Commonwealth framework, and other key international policy documents, as a basis for national action planning projects (CSMM 2012).

1.4 Challenges and issues in strengthening sport for development and peace in the Commonwealth

In considering the growth of SDP over the past decade and the Commonwealth's response, key issues affecting the interplay of sport and development should also be noted.

While numerous international and Commonwealth policy declarations and publications have supported the principle of SDP, insufficient support mechanisms, delivery instruments and resourcing currently exist in many member countries to fully scale SDP initiatives. A contributing factor is that in many countries SDP is delegated to sport ministries and sport stakeholders. While many of these actors are highly supportive of SDP, they have to balance elite sport and sport development priorities with investment in SDP drawing from an already over-stretched resource pool.

Limited resource investment in SDP initiatives is also exacerbated by a perception among some development actors that the sport sector has access to substantial corporate resources and revenue from major events. While some areas of elite sport, in some contexts, enjoy access to a substantial resource pool, even a cursory analysis reveals a pronounced inequity in the distribution of these resources; if considered through a gender, class, able-bodied/disabled, geographical or participation lens, that inequity is even more pronounced. As such, in many Commonwealth countries both the total pool of resources within sport, and its prioritisation, is insufficient to scale sport-for-all or SDP initiatives.

Additionally, given the high profile of sport as a cultural phenomenon in many Commonwealth countries, other development actors can be hesitant to engage with SDP out of

concern that this profile, often borne out of a focus on elite and high-performance sport, will overshadow broader development goals. While the Commonwealth's SDP guidelines emphasise that effective SDP policy, strategy and delivery should be centred on development goals (CSMM 2012), many actors in the broader development sector remain cautious that SDP is geared as much to the promotion of elite sport as it is to contributing to broad human and social development objectives.

Finally, the close alignment between sport and issues associated with globalisation, along with concerns that many sport stakeholders over-simplify development challenges, should be noted. Academics and development professionals alike have cautioned that the SDP sector may underestimate the scope of the development challenges they claim to address and the complexity of working in these areas.⁵ Impacting on this dynamic is a considerable push to promote sport as an intrinsic force for good, often at the expense of recognising and addressing challenges to the integrity of sport or the contextual variation in the social, cultural and economic impact sport makes. While in many contexts sport-linked approaches have made a positive contribution to development, this is far from being universal. There have been instances both within and beyond the Commonwealth where sport has been poorly planned, overly aligned to extremist nationalist, political or economic motives or beset by doping and corruption scandals such that a negative impact on human and social development could be argued. Given this dynamic, advocates who overstate the impact of sport-linked approaches may well contribute to the scepticism among some development actors as to the role sport can play, and so weaken gains made positioning SDP as a credible approach.

Given these challenges, the Commonwealth has adopted a measured approach to SDP. CABOS advises that sport should not be positioned as a panacea for all development challenges. Instead it highlights that sport is best utilised as one tool within broader development efforts and strategies. Further, sport can be utilised most effectively when well planned, managed appropriately and in responding to the needs and dynamics of the context within which it is being used. CABOS provides a concise definition of this position in framing sport for development and peace (SDP), as 'the intentional use of sport, play and physical activity as a viable, practical and effective tool

to contribute to development and peace goals' (CABOS 2010). In this sense the Commonwealth promotes a position that SDP is part of, but can be distinguished from, sport development, and in many cases 'seeks out those not already involved in sport' (Kidd 2008). This position clarifies that within SDP approaches identified human and social development aims are paramount, and it is recommended these aims frame SDP policy and programming.

1.5 Conclusion

Sport for development and peace (SDP) has grown significantly in the Commonwealth over the past decade. While community-based efforts have been critical to this growth, many Commonwealth governments have also played an important role. However, in many contexts competing priorities, a disconnect from other development actors, under-developed policy frameworks and limited resources prevent scalable SDP programming. As SDP is now established within international development discourse, it may be timely for SDP stakeholders to consider responding to these issues as having equal importance to, or even superseding, continued advocacy efforts.

Annex 1.1 Commonwealth Framework and Guidelines on Sport for Development and Peace

The *Commonwealth Guide to Advancing Development through Sport* was developed by the Commonwealth Secretariat at the request of Commonwealth Sport Ministers. The framework provides a practical tool to support co-ordination, analysis and action planning; to assist countries to strengthen policy environments; and to support mechanisms for Sport for Development and Peace (SDP).

The framework is intended to support the following functions:

Analysis

Officials can use the framework to conduct a baseline analysis of the national SDP policy environment, strategy and support mechanisms. The indicators within the framework can be used as the criteria for analysis. This process assists in both the identification of good practice and areas that could potentially be strengthened.

Planning

The analysis process helps to identify good practice and areas to be strengthened. This provides information that can support a more systematic approach to planning how to develop and strengthen SDP, and utilised to guide prioritisation and investment.

Monitoring

Subsequently the framework can be utilised as a monitoring tool by undertaking periodic analysis of the SDP policy environment, strategy and support mechanisms and reviewing this against initial baseline analysis.

Reference points and indicators

Principles	Indicators of established policy, strategy and support mechanisms
1. SDP must be explicitly linked to the Commonwealth's shared values and commitment to promoting development, democracy and diversity.	1.1 The commitment of sport and development stakeholders to SDP 1.2 Policy frameworks for SDP 1.3 Integrity, governance and administration guidelines, co-ordination and support for sport organisations

(Continued)

<p>2. SDP should leverage sustainable, quality and ongoing sport activity and be intentionally planned to realise specific developmental goals.</p>	<p>2.1 Resource mobilisation and allocation for SDP</p> <p>2.2 SDP planning, risk management and monitoring and evaluation systems</p> <p>2.3 SDP capacity building offers</p> <p>2.4 Development messaging integrated into major sporting events and further promotion through sporting role models</p> <p>2.5 Development legacy programmes incorporated into major sporting events and championships</p> <p>2.6 SDP networks, forums and symposiums</p>
<p>3. SDP is most effective when integrated within the development sector in support of national, regional, and local development priorities.</p>	<p>3.1 References to the value and contribution of sport in non-sport policy frameworks and strategies</p> <p>3.2 The alignment of SDP structures with youth engagement, education and health provision structures</p> <p>3.3 The inclusion of SDP stakeholders in multi-sector and cross-departmental initiatives</p> <p>3.4 Resources invested in SDP initiatives by non-sport actors</p>
<p>4. Fully accessible programming that ensures leaders and participants are safeguarded at all times, in particular children and those vulnerable to gender based violence.</p>	<p>4.1 Focus on safeguarding and protection of children and vulnerable adults in sport policy and within broader legislation, policy and mechanisms</p> <p>4.2 Guidelines and resources to support safeguarding and protection in sport (inclusive of designated SDP initiatives)</p> <p>4.3 Designated authorities responsible for safeguarding and protection in sport (inclusive of designated SDP initiatives)</p> <p>4.4 Focus on equality and inclusion within sport policy and broader legislation, policy and mechanisms</p> <p>4.5 Guidelines and resources to support equality and inclusion in sport (inclusive of designated SDP initiatives)</p> <p>4.6 Designated authorities responsible for strengthening equality and inclusion in sport (inclusive of designated SDP initiatives)</p>

(Continued)

<p>5. Decentralised programming that involves intended beneficiaries and their communities in the planning process, and takes local needs and assets into consideration.</p>	<p>5.1 Decentralised co-ordination, strategies and funding mechanisms for increasing sport participation and strengthening SDP programming</p> <p>5.2 Opportunities for participatory SDP policy development and programme design</p> <p>5.3 Platforms for community-based SDP stakeholders to network</p> <p>5.4 Resources, reward and recognition for community-based SDP initiatives</p>
<p>6. Programming designed on the basis of evidence-based models, and conducted with systematic measurement of progress and appropriate monitoring and evaluation.</p>	<p>6.1 SDP research projects and initiatives backed by a commitment from the higher education sector</p> <p>6.2 Monitoring and evaluation of sport participation</p> <p>6.3 Monitoring and evaluation of the contribution made by sport-based interventions to development objectives</p>

Notes

- 1 See: www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/home (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 2 See, for example: www.sportaccord.com/en/what-we-do/sports-social-responsibility (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 3 See, for example: www.coe.int/EPAS (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 4 Set down by all Commonwealth Heads of Government at their biannual meetings (known as CHOGMs) in Singapore in 1971 and reaffirmed in Harare in 1991.
- 5 See, for example, Darnell 2012; Hartman and Kwauk 2011; and Levermore and Beacom 2009.

References

- Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport (CABOS) (2010), *Development through sport*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.
- Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) (2011), *CHOGM 2011 Communiqué*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.

- Commonwealth Sports Ministers Meeting (CSMM) (2012), *6CSMM Meeting Communiqué*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.
- Darnell, S (2012), *Sport for Development and Peace: A Critical Sociology*, Bloomsbury, London.
- Hartman, D and C Kwauk (2011), 'Sport and Development: An Overview, Critique, and Reconstruction', *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, Vol. 35 No. 3, 284–305.
- Kay, T (2010), 'Development through sport? Sport in support of female empowerment in Delhi, India', in B Houlihan and M Green, *Handbook of Sport Development*, Routledge, London.
- Kay, T and O Dudfield (2013), *The Commonwealth Guide to Advancing Development through Sport*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.
- Kidd, B (2008), 'A New Social Movement: Sport for Development and Peace', *Sport in Society*, Vol. 11 No. 4, 370–380.
- Levermore, R and A Beacom (Eds.) (2009), *Sport and International Development*, Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG) (2008), *Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments*, Right to Play, Toronto, available at: www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/sport/shared/sport/pdfs/SDP%20IWG/Final%20SDP%20IWG%20Report.pdf (accessed 19 November 2013).
- United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP) (2012), *Annual Report 2011: Ten Years of Action*, United Nations, Geneva, available at: www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/sport/shared/sport/pdfs/Reports/UNOSDP_Annual-Report_2011_FINAL_web_single-pages.pdf (accessed 19 November 2013).

Chapter 2

Sport for Development and Peace Policy Options in the Commonwealth

Professor Dr Richard Giulianotti, Loughborough University

The sport for development and peace (SDP) sector has grown rapidly in recent years, and is increasingly prominent across Commonwealth countries. The SDP sector is moving into a new phase of development, and this is now an appropriate point for Commonwealth policy-makers to examine their future roles and contributions.

A critical issue regarding the future of the SDP sector concerns the interrelations of the different stakeholders. Four categories of stakeholder, and their associated policies on SDP, are identified here:

- i. governmental organisations;
- ii. non-governmental organisations (NGOs);
- iii. private sector institutions and private donors; and
- iv. campaign groups and social movements.

The paper highlights that a substantial volume of SDP activity involves partnerships between i), ii) and iii).

Finally three future policy options are briefly outlined, setting out different potential levels of involvement by Commonwealth countries and the Commonwealth *per se* within the SDP sector. These options are *minimalist*, *active* and *leading* levels of engagement.

If the active or leading options are preferred, then further issues need to be considered in regard to:

- widening the range of organisations which participate within SDP;
- enhancing the role of national governments in SDP activity; and,
- working more closely with local user groups in planning and implementing SDP activities.

2.1 Introduction

The ‘sport for development and peace’ movement or sector uses sport as a tool of social intervention in order to achieve non-sport goals. These goals include promoting health and fighting disease; advancing the education, training and employment of young people; reducing crime and violence; empowering key social groups, such as women, ethnic minorities and people with disabilities; building peaceful relations in divided societies; promoting civil and human rights; and raising awareness of these and other social issues.¹ The sector has grown exponentially since the early 1990s, and there are now many hundreds of SDP stakeholder organisations, projects, campaigns and initiatives in Commonwealth countries and globally, which operate at local, national and international levels.

The global importance of the sport for development and peace (or SDP) sector has been recognised and driven by national and international institutions over the past decade. In 2003, the United Nations passed Resolution 58/5, which recognised ‘the role of sport and physical education as a means to promote education, health, development and peace’; these themes were central to United Nations activity when it established the year 2005 as its International Year of Sport and Physical Education.² The significance of SDP work has also been recognised by the Commonwealth Secretariat, and many national governmental organisations and agencies throughout the Commonwealth.

Most SDP work is conducted in developing nations, notably sub-Saharan Africa. However, it should be appreciated that sport-based social interventions are a worldwide phenomena; thus, the SDP sector should be understood as encompassing all Commonwealth nations.³

Commonwealth countries have been in the vanguard of the SDP sector’s long-term development. SDP work in countries such as

Kenya, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Zambia inter alia has gained world recognition and renown. Commonwealth countries such as Australia, Canada and the UK are also among the world's leading nations in providing international SDP work, and in conducting research into SDP.⁴

The sector will continue to grow rapidly in terms of its volume and types of activity, number of organisations, and the diversity of locations in which it operates. *The SDP sector is moving into a new phase, and we are at an appropriate point for Commonwealth policy-makers to examine their future roles and contributions.* In addressing this latter issue, it is critical that we examine the organisational stakeholders within the SDP sector: their policies, roles and interrelations.

2.2 Sport for development and peace stakeholders and policies

SDP organisations vary substantially in their policies, practices, scales and locations of activity. These organisations and policies may be differentiated into four broad categories. The future shape and focus of the SDP sector will be largely determined by the development and interrelations of these four categories.⁵ The four categories are as follows:

- (i) **Governmental organisations**, which tend to facilitate and oversee SDP campaigns and projects, act as key advocates for SDP work and assist project implementation. These organisations include:
 - Intergovernmental organisations and agencies such as the Commonwealth Secretariat, the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace, the European Commission and various UN agencies.⁶
 - National governments, such as ministries of sport, youth, education and the interior/home affairs; also state-funded sport, cultural and humanitarian agencies such as the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), the British Council, Canadian Heritage and UK Sport.⁷
 - Local or supranational government, such as at the state, county or regional levels, which support SDP work.

- Sport governing bodies, which are increasingly involved in SDP work. These include, for example, the International Olympics Committee (IOC), the *Fédération Internationale de Football Association* (FIFA), the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA), the International Cricket Council (ICC), *Fédération Internationale de Volleyball* (FIVB) and SportAccord (international sport federations).⁸

These organisations tend to advocate *strategic developmental* policies, which include, in the long-term, pursuing specific development goals and assisting the overall development of the SDP sector as a whole. SDP work with links to the United Nations has focused particularly on pursuing the Millennium Development Goals, which run until 2015 (UN Inter-Agency Taskforce on Sport for Development and Peace 2003). Strategic developmental policies provide the basis on which Commonwealth countries and the Commonwealth as a whole engage with the SDP sector.

(ii) ***Non-governmental, non-profit organisations***, which facilitate and/or implement SDP projects and campaigns. These NGOs come in many shapes and sizes, and include:

- International NGOs which tend to pursue project funding from international supporters, co-ordinate SDP projects and build SDP networks. For example, Kicking AIDS Out, Right to Play and street football world.⁹
- National-level NGOs that implement SDP projects and campaigns, such as NOWSPAR in Zambia, Sierra Leone Youth Football Development Centre, Sport for Peace for Children in Northern Uganda, sitting volleyball projects in Sri Lanka, and Street League in the UK. Many of these projects combine the development *of* sport (such as sport coaching sessions) with sport *for* development work (such as education on health, reducing crime and violence, and gender empowerment).¹⁰
- Community-based organisations that are well embedded locally, and which are particularly effective in identifying community needs in their activities. For example, Mathare Youth Sports Association (Kenya) and Football United for refugees in Sydney.¹¹

- Development NGOs that use sport-based activities e.g. Comic Relief, the Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD) and Christian Aid.¹²

Most NGOs are primarily pragmatic and tend to advocate particular *developmental interventionist* policies and practices, which target the practical benefits and rewards of specific sport-based interventions. Most NGOs are heavily reliant on continuous external funding; hence they have to ensure that their projects and campaigns are in line with their financial partners' aims and objectives.

(iii) ***Private sector institutions and private donors.*** These contributors include:

- Large private organisations that fund SDP activity, either directly in links to NGOs or in wider partnership on specific SDP projects or campaigns. Examples here include sport merchandise corporations such as Nike, Adidas and Reebok, as well as soft drinks and fast food retailers such as Coca-Cola and McDonalds. In addition, the Laureus organisation, which includes an SDP foundation, is funded by various corporations such as Vodafone, Daimler and Mercedes-Benz.¹⁴
- Private donors who contribute funds to both small and large NGOs.

Larger corporations often run their SDP activities as part of a 'corporate social responsibility' (CSR) portfolio, which is underpinned by a relatively *free-market, philanthropic* model of intervention.

(iv) ***Campaign groups and social movements,*** These contributors include:

- Campaigning sport-focused NGOs, which focus on civil rights issues relating to discrimination and intolerance. For example, the 'Football Against Racism in Europe' (FARE) network.¹⁵
- Sport-focused NGOs which pursue political, governmental and associated human rights issues. For example, the Play the Game organisation in Denmark, which advocates good governance, transparency and media freedom in sport.¹⁶

- Campaigning movements that promote broader civil and human rights issues in sport. For example, campaigns on the rights of sport merchandise workers by the Clean Clothes Campaign and War on Want.¹⁷

SDP campaign groups and social movements tend to pursue *social justice* issues, such as with regard to full human development, human rights, and more egalitarian social relations.

Substantial co-operative work occurs across the first three categories: that is, among NGOs, governmental agencies, sport governing bodies and institutions, and transnational corporations (TNCs). For example, the ninemillion programme, run by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), features SDP work supported by Nike, Microsoft, Barcelona Football Club, the SDP NGOs Right to Play and Grassroots Soccer, and the International Olympic Committee and International Volleyball Federation.¹⁸ Elsewhere, in Sri Lanka, the UN Development Programme (UNDP) worked with national sport federations and local authorities to facilitate ‘sport and peace’ projects. This engagement and dialogue across the first three categories is further evidenced at major international SDP conferences and symposia.

Governmental organisations play critical roles in maximising these interrelationships and partnerships across the sector. The UN’s many agencies have been particularly prominent in recent years, but the crucial contributions of the Commonwealth *per se* and Commonwealth governments (such as ministries for sport, education and development) also need to be recognised, in facilitating networks and partnerships, identifying needs, and enabling SDP projects to be established.

As noted, the future development of the SDP sector will be largely determined by these four categories of SDP organisation and SDP policy. These organisational and policy issues provide the crucial context with regard to how Commonwealth countries engage with the sector.

2.3 Future sport for development and peace sector issues and challenges

Following on from the above, the SDP sector faces four main interrelated issues and challenges over the next few years that are particularly relevant for Commonwealth countries.

Future roles and influences of SDP policies: Three main SDP policies were identified, centring on strategic development, developmental interventionism, free-market philanthropy and social justice. In recent years, there has been a growing interrelationship between the first three policy approaches, with relatively less focus on ‘social justice’ policies. Accordingly, the focus of most SDP work has been relatively settled over the past five to seven years, especially in developing countries. As the SDP sector continues to expand, and as the MDGs come to a close in 2015, there is substantial scope for Commonwealth countries and other SDP organisational stakeholders to explore the future policies that may be pursued, and to probe the way in which social justice activities may be included.

Future roles and influences of SDP organisations: The SDP sector features four main organisational categories: NGOs, governmental organisations, private corporations and donors, and campaigning groups. There is scope for some stakeholders to be more fully engaged in directing and implementing SDP work, and in shaping partnerships and relationships across the sector. These stakeholders might include grassroots community-based organisations; and campaigning groups which focus, for example, on the local environment, sustainable development, fair trade, industrial rights, gender-based rights and child protection.

SDP sustainability: Most SDP organisations require key resources (notably, financial backing, political support and social connections) to survive. Many organisations – particularly NGOs – have failed due to their unsustainability. The SDP sector itself depends on such resources, particularly political influence at the national and international levels.

2.4 Conclusion: potential Commonwealth policy responses

Commonwealth countries and the Commonwealth *per se* have a critical role to play in shaping future SDP policy and practice. By ‘Commonwealth country’ in this context, we mean both national governments (such as ministries responsible for sport, education, development, youth and internal affairs), and the wide array of relevant governmental agencies and organisations. A critical role is played by national government in determining overall policy, and in facilitating (or otherwise) different kinds of SDP engagement.

There are three broad policy responses which Commonwealth countries and the Commonwealth *per se* might make with regard to these future issues and challenges. The three responses reflect different types of ‘strategic developmental’ (see 2.2) engagement with the sector. They also have a variety of potential advantages and disadvantages.

A minimalist strategic developmental approach: This policy approach would see Commonwealth countries:

- allow other organisations to set the policy and practice agenda for the SDP sector; this would likely feature a continuing mixture of practical development and free-market policies, with key roles continuing to be played by NGOs, some international organisations (e.g. the UN) and private donors;
- play a minimal role, in liaison, dialogue and advocacy with other SDP stakeholders, in shaping SDP projects and campaigns, and in assisting the sustainability of the SDP sector; and
- at the Commonwealth level, play no active part in facilitating knowledge exchange across countries, or in shaping the future development of the SDP sector.

The minimalist approach is perhaps most evident in Commonwealth settings where little governmental involvement in SDP is evident. In terms of advantages, it involves very low Commonwealth input, and may lead to continuity of SDP projects if resources are found elsewhere. In terms of disadvantages, this approach misses out on the social benefits of SDP, fails to build on the SDP expertise and opportunities within Commonwealth countries, and contributes little to sector sustainability.

An active strategic developmental approach: This policy approach would see Commonwealth countries:

- play a prominent role in setting the policy and practice agenda for the SDP sector; thus countries would be in a position to adapt SDP policies and practices according to their needs, with more scope for flexibility in adopting and combining practical development, free-market and social justice approaches;
- play a significant role in regard to liaison, dialogue and advocacy with other SDP stakeholders, in shaping SDP projects and campaigns, and in assisting the sustainability of the SDP sector; and

- at the Commonwealth level, playing an active role in facilitating knowledge exchange across countries, and in shaping the future development of the SDP sector.

The active approach is perhaps most evident in Commonwealth settings where there is substantial governmental support and advocacy for SDP work. In terms of advantages, it benefits from the implementation of SDP projects, involves some measured political input (and possibly economic, depending on context), enables and facilitates diverse SDP projects, promotes multi-organisation involvement in SDP, contributes to the sustainability of SDP, and builds upon SDP expertise within the Commonwealth.

A *leading strategic developmental approach*: This policy approach would see Commonwealth countries:

- play a leadership role in setting the policy and practice agenda for the SDP sector – thus, countries would seek to implement innovative and cutting-edge SDP policies and practices; this approach would also be marked by flexible approaches towards adopting and combining practical development, free-market and social justice policies on SDP;
- pursue strong liaison, dialogue and advocacy with other SDP stakeholders; take the lead in shaping SDP projects and campaigns; and play a leading role in assisting the political and economic sustainability of the SDP sector; and
- the Commonwealth would play a leading role in accumulating and developing knowledge on the SDP sector, and in shaping the future development of the SDP sector at the global level.

The leadership approach is perhaps most evident in Commonwealth countries which play a key role in knowledge transfer and guidance on SDP, and where a wide diversity of SDP policies and practices is apparent. In terms of advantages, it builds fully on and extends the expertise of the country or the Commonwealth in the SDP field; promotes the involvement of a wider range of SDP actors; promotes innovative SDP work; and leads the sustainability of SDP.

If the Commonwealth leans towards the ‘active’ or ‘leadership’ models, then it would be important to consider further the following issues for developing these approaches:

- How the greater participation of other SDP organisations might be facilitated? Specifically, these might include campaign groups and social movements, community-based organisations and local client or user groups.
- How SDP activity might be more effectively adapted to local and national contexts?
- How the SDP sector might work more effectively with wider stakeholders beyond sport, such as NGOs, governmental organisations and campaign groups that are focused on SDP issues?
- How, in particular, national governments (and especially ministries of sport, education, development and internal affairs) may become more active within the sector, at least in terms of providing political support and advocacy, and establishing the conditions for the successful implementation of SDP projects and campaigns?

Notes

- 1 See: Giulianotti 2011a and Kidd 2008.
- 2 See: www.un.org/sport2005/ (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 3 Sport-based intervention programmes have been active in developed countries for decades, in order to tackle social problems surrounding crime, education, employment, gender divisions, homelessness, poverty, racial discrimination and violence. Moreover, many international governmental organisations *and* NGOs run SDP programmes in both developed and developing countries.
- 4 See: www.laureus.com/projects/africa/mathare-youth-sports-association-mysa (accessed 19 November 2013); Keim 2003; UNDP 2009; SDP IWG 2008.
- 5 See Giulianotti 2011b for an earlier discussion of these categories.
- 6 See, for example: www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/; http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/sport-as-a-tool-for-development_en.htm; www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/physical-education-and-sport/sport-for-peace-and-development/ (accessed 19 November 2013).

- 7 See for example www.USAID.gov.au/aidissues/sport/Pages/default.aspx; www.britishcouncil.org/bangladesh-development-sports.htm; www.pch.gc.ca/eng/1294862402781/1294862402782 (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 8 See, for example: www.olympic.org/development-through-sport; www.uefa.com/uefa/footballfirst/footballdevelopment/grassroots/news/newsid=741855.html; www.icc-cricket.com/the-icc/social_responsibility/think_wise/news.php; www.fivb.org/en/Development/viewPressRelease.asp?No=37414&Language=en; www.sportaccord.com/en/what-we-do/sport-and-peace/ (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 9 See, for example: www.kickingaidsout.net/Pages/default.aspx; www.righttoplay.com/International/Pages/Home.aspx; www.streetfootballworld.org/ (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 10 See: www.nowspare.org/; [www.beyondsportworld.org/member/view.php?id=315;GlobalGiving\(2011\);www.srilankahighcommission.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=173%3Abeyond-prejudice-sri-lankas-unique-rehabilitation-effort&Itemid=117](http://www.beyondsportworld.org/member/view.php?id=315;GlobalGiving(2011);www.srilankahighcommission.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=173%3Abeyond-prejudice-sri-lankas-unique-rehabilitation-effort&Itemid=117); www.streetleague.co.uk/.
- 11 See www.mysakenya.org/; (accessed 19 November 2013); Bunde-Birouste et al. (2012).
- 12 See: www.cafod.org.uk/Education/Primary-schools/Sport; www.comicrelief.com/apply-for-a-grant/programmes/sport-change; www.christianaid.org.uk/whatwedo/eyewitness/americas/brazil-rio-olympics-sport.aspx (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 13 See: <http://nikeinc.com/pages/the-nike-foundation>; www.sportanddev.org/?3182/Adidas-partners-with-the-Peres-Center; www.coca-colaconversations.com/stories/whirled-peace-how-one-sport-is-bringing-about-change-on-and-off-the-field; www.mcdonalds.co.uk/ukhome/Sport/Football/Investment/small-grant.html (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 14 See: www.laureus.com/foundation (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 15 See: www.faren.net.org/ (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 16 See: www.playthegame.org/ (accessed 19 November 2013).
- 17 See: www.cleanclothes.org/; www.waronwant.org/campaigns/love-fashion-hate-sweatshops/playfair-2012/17267-no-olympics-sweatshops (accessed 19 November 2013).

- 18 See: www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/home/unplayers/fundsprogrammesagencies/unhcr (accessed 19 November 2013).

References

- Bunde-Birouste A, S Nathan, B McCarroll, L Kemp, T Shwe and M Grand Ortega (2012), *Playing for Change*, Football United, School of Public Health and Community Medicine, UNSW, Sydney.
- Giulianotti, R (2011a), 'Sport, Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution: A Contextual Analysis and Modelling of the Sport, Development and Peace Sector', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 2, 207–228.
- Giulianotti, R (2011b), 'The Sport, Development and Peace Sector: A Model of Four Social Policy Domains', *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol. 40 No. 4.
- Global Giving (2011), 'Sport for Peace for Children in Northern Uganda', available at: www.globalgiving.org/projects/sport-for-peace-for-children-in-northern-uganda/ (accessed 16 April 2013).
- Keim, M (2003), *Nation Building at Play: Sport as a Tool for Integration in Post-Apartheid South Africa*, Meyer and Meyer, Aachen.
- Kidd, B (2008), 'A New Social Movement: Sport for Development and Peace', *Sport in Society*, Vol. 11 No. 4, 370–380.
- Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG) (2008), 'Sport for Development and Peace: Governments in Action', available at: www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/sport/shared/sport/pdfs/SDP%20IWG/Governments%20in%20Action%20Part1-Table%20of%20Contents_Foreword_Introduction%20and%20Summary.pdf (accessed 18 April 2013).
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2009), 'UNDP works to rebuild peace, fellowship among youth in Sri Lanka', available at: www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/presscenter/articles/2009/11/12/undp-works-to-rebuild-peace-and-fellowship-amongst-youth-in-sri-lanka/ (accessed 18 April 2013).
- United Nations Inter-Agency Taskforce on Sport for Development and Peace (2003), *Sport for Development and Peace: Towards achieving the millennium development goals*, New York: United Nations.

Chapter 3

Critical Considerations for Sport for Development and Peace Policy Development

Dr Simon Darnell, Durham University

There are a host of critical issues, illuminated by research, that are relevant to policy development in the area of sport for development and peace (SDP). Four are discussed here: defining development, sustainable programming, sociological issues of identity and the political orientation of programmes. Reconciling these issues may mean considering policies that would: a) move SDP beyond top-down design and implementation; and b) reflect critically on the presumed meanings and benefits of sport itself.

3.1 Introduction and background

This paper is designed to offer insights from recent research in the field of sport for development and peace (SDP). The hope is that these insights stimulate reflection and conversation, as well as point towards some possibilities for future policy development in the area.

The ideas and suggestions that follow draw on the current academic literature on SDP, as well as my own research across three main research projects. The first of these studies was conducted in 2007 and 2008 and drew on interviews with young Canadians (n=27) who had served abroad in the 'International Development through Sport' internship programme that is operated by Commonwealth Games Canada. The second was a study in 2010/11 with programme officials from a variety of SDP projects including NGOs, advocacy groups, athlete foundations and professional sport. The third is a study currently underway examining sport for development as organised between countries in the global South, with a particular focus on Cuba and its partners in southern Africa and Latin America.

3.2 Critical considerations

There are a host of critical considerations that have emerged from these projects and that are relevant to the development of policy in SDP. Four are discussed here, recognising that this is not an exhaustive list. In particular, the first two issues can be understood as recurrent within the study and practice of international development more broadly; they are not unique to sport and SDP.

First, there is a tension within SDP in relation to the actual process of establishing the terms of development. Key questions here include: what are SDP policies and programmes trying to achieve in development terms? What *should* they be trying to achieve? How is this agenda established and with what effects? My own research, as well as the broader SDP research literature, suggests a recurring process by which SDP organisations seek particular (and laudable) development goals through sport such as empowerment, social inclusion or self-esteem. And yet these goals can and often do misalign with local demands for development in terms of, for example, employment, infrastructure or even traditional sports development. Andrew Guest's (2009) work in Angola is particularly insightful in describing this tension as he shows how Olympic Aid, a northern NGO and the precursor to Right to Play, drew in the early 2000s on universal humanism as a basis for its initiatives, but that such programmes were reinterpreted by local people in culturally specific ways. Guest compellingly argues that such results illustrate both local agency and resistance, and act as reminders of the various meanings of sport in different cultural and socio-political contexts. The results also illustrate a dogged modernisation philosophy within SDP, where sport is 'universal' and presumed to overcome the challenges of culture and inequality.

Second is the issue of sustainability of programming. In plain terms, where is funding for sport for development and SDP to come from, now and in the future? Where *should* it come from? Is it reasonable to accept corporate funding, for example, or does this compromise the progressive development principles of accessibility and programme autonomy? These are issues that SDP programme officials wrestle with in organising and working to sustain their programmes beyond the types of short-term and ad hoc interventions that have traditionally plagued international development. At the same time, the notion of what actually

constitutes success of SDP, and justifies continued efforts in the field, remains open to analysis and consideration. To a degree, it has always been the case that development initiatives, if successful, should render themselves obsolete. And yet the increasingly competitive field of SDP, in terms of both funding and implementation, means that volunteers and even local participants need to be retained for the future viability of projects, and organisations also need to show why their project is better than others, rather than compatible with other initiatives in the field.

Third are the sociological issues of identity and representation. My training as a sociologist propels me to examine issues of race, class, gender and sexuality, and so these issues regularly factor into my research into SDP. Research findings suggest that despite well-intentioned beliefs in the universal interest in sports like football/soccer, transnational relationships and experiences are being facilitated through sport for development policy and programming in places that are socially and politically complicated by the history of colonialism or contemporary globalisation. Interviews with young Canadian volunteers, for example, showed that they experienced discomfort of being presumed an expert in sport for development because they were white and middle class. At the same time, such racial and class-based privileges were rarely challenged in the field in meaningful ways. These issues are not ones that can be solved by celebrating sport as universal language or providing more training in cultural sensitivity, but are ones that require, for example, a strong policy commitment to anti-racism.

And fourth is the issue of the political orientation of SDP programming and policy. This issue can be seen, for example, in the divergence between international sport programmes from countries like socialist Cuba versus those of more liberal, or neo-liberal, democracies. In addition, though, there is also a range of political orientations *within* SDP programming itself that have yet to be fully acknowledged in policy terms. For example, while all can likely agree on the importance of sustainable economic development, particularly in poor countries, should this process be focused on seeking new competitive advantages or rethinking economic relationships and processes altogether? Should sport and SDP align with the global, corporate sport sector or attempt to preserve a new development niche? This is particularly salient as sport businesses seek new markets in regions like Latin America, which have diverse political systems and governments.

In practical terms, however, the importation of SDP policy and programming based on, or supported by, the for-profit sports sector is likely to face opposition in some parts of the world and also runs the risk of being co-opted into broader, market-based strategies.

3.3 Conclusion

There are (at least) three ways in which shifts in SDP policy might be considered in response to the issues raised above.

The first is to recognise and support a move away from the tradition of top-down development aid and towards training in SDP that is more locally focused and, in turn, potentially more sustainable. There are several examples of this happening already within the mainstream SDP sector. To this can be added early insights from the current research in Cuba, a country that implements a policy model designed first and foremost to provide educational opportunities in sport on an international scale that can be then be transferred into increasing capacity in sport. In this way, rather than a tool for development or a form of development assistance or aid, sport is repositioned as a form of solidarity that seeks to support development on a global scale.

Second, my work with Canadian interns serving in SDP produced the following recurring narrative: based on their own positive experiences with sport, many interns went into the field of sport for development with firm notions of what sport is and what it is not. However, the cultural diversity they experienced, the exposition of their relative privilege, and the complexities of development that they encountered while serving abroad had the effect of challenging and complicating these deeply held notions of sport, and doing so in what were ultimately highly productive ways. Sport, in relation to sport for development, went from being competitive and organised, to diffuse, local and malleable. This suggests that mobilising sport for development may offer an opportunity to think about the norms, values and benefits of *sport itself*. In this way, sport becomes less a means of or tool for development, and more a site for development processes to take place (see Coalter 2013). This commitment to reflection has practical implications, such as in the case of programmes delivered by *Right to Play* that tend to be based on play and co-operative games rather than competitive sport. However, there are also important implications for local autonomy and for

(re)considering SDP as a bottom-up process facilitated by learners and students of sport, rather than directed by teachers or experts.

Finally, there is, and should continue to be, a trend in SDP policy from sport (and development) as 'universal' to sport (and development) as culturally and politically specific. Embedding this perspective into policy can serve to promote and champion local autonomy and agency. There is a move in both international development studies and sport management studies towards participatory action research (PAR), whereby research participants set the research agenda (See Darnell and Hayhurst 2011). This raises the question, what if SDP participants set the development terms and agenda of policy and programming with support from SDP institutions and government? This kind of commitment would likely go some way towards improving the sustainability and development success of sport for development programmes.

References

- Coalter, F (2013), *Sport for Development: What game are we playing?* Routledge, London.
- Darnell, SC (2012), *Sport for Development and Peace: A Critical Sociology*, Bloomsbury Academic Press, London.
- Darnell, SC and LMC Hayhurst (2011), 'Sport for decolonization: Exploring a new praxis of sport for development', *Progress in development studies*, Vol. 11 No. 3, 183–196.
- Guest, AM (2009), 'The diffusion of development-through-sport: analysing the history and practice of the Olympic Movement's grassroots outreach to Africa', *Sport in Society*, Vol. 12 No. 10, 1336–1352.

Chapter 4

Safeguarding Children and Young People in Sport for Development and Peace Programmes

Liz Twyford, UNICEF UK

Despite all the potential gains that exist from taking part in sport, stakeholders across the Commonwealth are increasingly recognising and promoting that without deliberate efforts on the part of clubs and organisations, federations and policy-makers, we cannot be confident that children will always have a safe experience in sport. In response, a number of organisations working in sport and development came together to look at how sports provision could be kept safe, under the banner of the Safeguarding Children in Sport Working Group.

The group identified international standards as one key way to support the sports sector to work towards strengthening safeguarding, and has produced a draft set of child safeguarding standards with input from more than 30 organisations. The standards set out the actions that all organisations working in sport should have in place to ensure children are safe from harm.

During 2013–2016 a diverse range of more than 40 sporting organisations, representing different countries and stakeholder groups, are going to pilot the standards, identifying what works, what doesn't and what is needed to support implementation. Independent expert researchers will oversee the trial process.

The working group has identified national governments as critical drivers of change, with their significant potential to create a policy framework that supports their constituents to develop safeguards to protect sport participants. To this end, to support the development of policies and practice that protect children in sport, government agencies responsible for sport are encouraged to work closely with efforts to strengthen safeguarding in sport,

involve themselves in research into this issue and work with partner ministries (especially those responsible for child protection) to build links and share expertise, strengthening the links between sport and wider child protection networks.

4.1 Introduction

Millions of children and young people take part in sporting activities every day across the Commonwealth. For some children this is purely for recreation and fun. Others may participate in sport for development programmes. For some young people, sport may be their chosen future career, either as talented athletes, as coaches or as officials. Sport may also be used as a vehicle for diverting young people from anti-social or criminal behaviour.

All children have the right to participate in sport in a safe and enjoyable environment. Their rights are enshrined in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Despite all the potential gains that exist from taking part in sport, stakeholders across the Commonwealth are increasingly recognising and promoting that without deliberate efforts on the part of clubs and organisations, federations and policy-makers, we cannot be confident that children will always have a safe experience in sport.

In 2010, the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre commissioned a review of the available empirical research and policy initiatives related to protecting children from violence in organised sport (2010). The purpose of the review was to inform the structures and policies required for preventing, reporting and responding appropriately to violence in children's sport.

The research found that:

- There is a lack of effectively functioning structures, policies and systems at the organisational, national and international levels. This includes a lack of organisations which prevent violence against children, as well as functioning referral systems for sporting organisations where such organisations do exist
- There is an absence of empirical data on violence against children in sport, including the experience of young people in Africa, Asia and South America; the experience of boys; and longitudinal studies.

- Good practice in sport for development initiatives reflects and embeds children's right to play safely, and can provide a vehicle to promote the broader safeguarding and protection of children.

The research also specifically recommended that standards and codes of conduct should be developed, and personnel involved in sport should be trained on safeguarding so that they have the knowledge and understanding needed to make the environment safe.

4.2 The Safeguarding Children in Sport Working Group

In response to the research, and in light of growing interest within the sports sector to tackle these issues – including the endorsement by the sixth Commonwealth Sports Ministers Meeting (6CSMM) to strengthen mechanisms that work to safeguard and protect children and vulnerable adults participating in sport – a number of organisations working in sport and development came together to look at how sports provision could be kept safe under the banner of the Safeguarding Children in Sport Working Group.

The group identified international standards as one key way to support the sports sector to work towards strengthening safeguarding, and has produced a draft set of child safeguarding standards with input from more than 30 organisations. The standards set out the actions that all organisations working in sport should have in place to ensure that children are safe from harm.

These draft standards aim to assist sport and development stakeholders to create a safe sporting environment for children, wherever they participate and at whatever level, and to provide a benchmark for sports providers and funders to make informed decisions. They promote good practice and challenge practice that is harmful to children, and provide clarity on safeguarding children to all involved in sport.

Eleven draft standards have been proposed for organisations working with children in sport:

1. To have a written policy on keeping children safe
2. To have procedures, personnel and systems to support safeguarding
3. To assess and minimise risks to children

4. To have written guidelines on behaviour towards children
5. To work with equity – ensuring *all* children are safeguarded
6. To communicate the ‘keep children safe’ message
7. To provide education and training for keeping children safe
8. To engage with advice and support from the wider child protection sector
9. To work with partners to meet the standards
10. To involve children in development, review and implementation of safeguarding
11. To monitor and evaluate compliance and effectiveness of safeguarding measures

Beneath each standard is a set of criteria, which describe the elements that organisations should work towards in order to fulfil the standard (see Annex 4.1). Ultimately, the goal of this work is to help make the world of sport a safer place for children and young people everywhere.

4.3 Safeguarding standards research

During 2013–2016 a diverse range of more than 40 sporting organisations, representing different countries and stakeholder groups, are going to pilot the standards, identifying what works, what doesn’t and what is needed to support implementation. Independent expert researchers will oversee the trial process.

Some of the organisations involved in the trial already have sophisticated practices in place, while others are just starting the journey. By including a wide range of organisations, we hope to share good practice, learn how organisations have overcome challenges and ultimately understand what kind of support governments, federations and organisations need to make a tangible difference to the children and young people they are responsible for.

The working group will revise the standards to reflect organisations’ experiences, and will develop implementation guidelines to help new organisations work towards the standards.

International federations, national governing bodies, and organisations with oversight functions such as SportAccord and

UNOSDP, as well as local clubs like Manchester United, are all involved in this research process.

4.4 Building the capacity for safeguarding in sport

Alongside the work to strengthen the content of the standards, the working group is also engaged in lobbying work. The group is targeting key international bodies with oversight for sport, or those which fund organisations that deliver sporting activities, to garner their support for the standards, encouraging them to make additional support and guidance available to their members to work towards safeguarding measures.

The working group is also engaged in targeted research within the sector, as well as exploring long-term options for supporting safeguarding within sport internationally.

4.5 Conclusions

The working group has identified national governments as critical drivers of change, with their significant potential to create a policy framework that supports their constituents to develop safeguards to protect sport participants. To this end, to support the development of policies and practice that protect children in sport, government agencies responsible for sport are encouraged to work closely with efforts to strengthen safeguarding in sport, involve themselves in research into this issue and work with partner ministries (especially those responsible for child protection) to build links and share expertise, strengthening the links between sport and wider child protection networks.

Reference

UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre (2010), *Protecting Children from Violence in Sport. A Review with a Focus on Industrialized Countries*, UNICEF, Italy.

Annex 4.1 Overview of the standards

Criteria	A written policy on keeping children safe
1	The organisation has a safeguarding policy, signed off by the appropriate people within the organisation.
2	All staff, volunteers or other representatives are informed about this policy and have – after a formal introduction and discussion about the policy – signed the agreement.
3	All staff, volunteers or other representatives are required to comply with the policy – there are no exceptions.
4	There are systems in place to monitor compliance with the policy.
5	The policy covers the organisation's commitment to safeguard children in the different types of work undertaken, and clearly describes the agency's understanding and definitions of abuse.
6	Policies and practices are reviewed at regular intervals, ideally at least every three years or more frequently, in response to specific changes in circumstances, and are revised based on changes in needs, legislation, guidance, practice, experience, changes within the organisation, and so on.
7	Children are consulted as part of the initial development (where a policy is not in place) and ongoing review of safeguarding policies and practices.
	Procedures, personnel and systems
1	There are clear procedures in place that provide step-by-step guidance on what action to take if there are concerns about a child's safety or well-being, both within and external to the organisation.
2	There is an identified member of staff within the organisation who will be tasked with the responsibility for leading on safeguarding.
3	There are agreed ways of recruiting staff, volunteers and consultants and for assessing their suitability to work with children.
4	All those who have the opportunity for regular contact with children, or who are in positions of trust, complete a form declaring any previous criminal convictions relating to children, and are required to have other police checks made on them where possible. At the very least, references from two previous employers are obtained.

(Continued)

5	There is a confidential process for dealing with all complaints, concerns or allegations, and for recording incidents and reports and storing these securely. This process recognises how the complaint or concern is raised and by whom, and there is a clear timescale for resolving it.
6	The organisation provides children and young people with information about their rights and to whom they can turn to if they are worried, in a process which empowers them.
Minimising risks to children	
1	There is guidance on assessing possible risks of harm to children – especially where there are increased vulnerabilities, such as activities that involve time spent away from home or in working with children who have a disability.
2	Children are adequately supervised and protected at all times during activities and programmes. Adults are never alone with children in an enclosed space.
3	There are minimum operating standards in place for activities, transport, accommodation and spaces.
4	Where agencies are involved in placing children in the care of others, initial and ongoing regular checks should be made that the carers are suitable.
5	Guidelines exist for appropriate use of information technology (such as email, digital cameras, websites, the internet) to make sure that children are not put in danger and exposed to abuse and exploitation.
6	Children and young people are provided with information about the risks they may face in engaging in or seeking work in sports, and who to turn to for help.
Written guidelines on behaviour towards children	
1	There are written guidelines for behaviour.
2	The organisation provides guidance on appropriate/ expected standards of behaviour of adults towards children, especially for those adults who are responsible for children in residential care and caring for children who have a disability.
3	There is guidance on expected and acceptable behaviour of children towards others, and particularly other children.
4	There is guidance on positive ways of managing the behaviour of children that do not involve physical punishment or any other form of degrading or humiliating treatment, and are age and gender appropriate.

(Continued)

5	There are clear consequences for breaking the guidelines on behaviour, which are clearly linked to organisational disciplinary procedures.
Equity	
1	The safeguarding policy makes it clear that all children have equal rights to protection.
2	The child safeguarding procedures, guidance and training help staff and volunteers to recognise the additional vulnerability experienced by some children and the extra barriers they face to getting help, because of their race, gender, age, religion, disability, sexual orientation, social background or culture.
3	Codes of conduct/behaviour include statements about the responsibility of adults and children to treat one another with dignity, respect, sensitivity and fairness.
4	Codes of conduct/behaviour make it clear that discriminatory, offensive and/or violent behaviours are unacceptable and that complaints will be acted upon.
5	Processes for dealing with complaints are fair and open to challenge through an appeals process.
Communicating the 'keep children safe' message	
1	Information about the agency's commitment to keeping children safe is made available to all relevant parties in an appropriate manner. For example, schools, community leaders, mentors, parents, children, coaches etc.
2	Children are made aware of their right to be safe from abuse, and steps are taken to seek the views of children on policies and procedures and how they are working at regular intervals.
3	Information for children, parents/carers is made available about where to go for help in relation to child abuse, and what is likely to happen following a disclosure. This should be provided in a format and language that can be easily understood by everyone, including children.
Education and training for keeping children safe	
1	All members of staff, volunteers and other associates, including relevant partners, have training on safeguarding and child protection when they join the agency. This includes an introduction to the organisation's child safeguarding policy and procedures, and guidance on how to recognise, respond to and report concerns about child abuse.

(Continued)

2	Staff members and volunteers with special responsibilities for keeping children safe have relevant training and regular opportunities to update their skills and knowledge.
3	Training is provided to those responsible for dealing with complaints and disciplinary procedures in relation to child abuse and inappropriate behaviour towards children, and additional practical support is made available to them.
4	Children are provided with standardised advice and support on keeping themselves and one another safe.
5	Parents and the wider community are provided with standardised information, advice and support on safeguarding children.
6	Annual training on safeguarding and the organisation's policies is conducted, and are kept up to date in light of policy and procedure developments.
Engagement with advice and support	
1	Children are provided with information on where to go to for help and advice in relation to abuse, exploitation, harassment and bullying.
2	The organisation ensures that staff members with special responsibilities for keeping children safe have engagement with specialist advice, support and information on child protection.
3	Key stakeholders can demonstrate awareness of current advice and support relative to their level of engagement with children.
4	Contacts are established at the national and/or local level with relevant child protection agencies, non-governmental organisations and community groups providing support on child protection, and these can provide information, support and assistance to children and staff.
5	Arrangements are in place to provide support to individuals – both the children the agency works with and staff members – during and following an incident or allegation of abuse or a complaint.
Working with partners to meet the standards	
1	There is a process of engagement with partners on child safeguarding issues to ensure a shared understanding of safeguarding expectations, mutual learning and development of good practice.
2	A written agreement provides minimum standards for an agency's work with and through partners, and encourages further development beyond the minimum standards.

(Continued)

3	The existence or development of a child safeguarding policy and procedures form an essential part of partnership agreements.
Involving children	
1	Managers and senior staff ensure that children are listened to and consulted, and that their rights are met.
2	Steps are taken to regularly ask children and parents/carers their views on policies and practices aimed at keeping children safe and the effectiveness of these.
3	Children and parents/carers are consulted as part of a review of safeguarding policies and practices.
4	Consultation with children is inclusive, age appropriate, child-friendly and respects children as the experts on their situation.
Monitoring and evaluation	
1	Arrangements are in place to monitor compliance with child safeguarding measures put in place by the organisation.
2	The organisation uses the experience of operating safeguarding and child protection systems to influence policy and practice development.
3	All incidents, allegations of abuse and complaints are recorded and monitored.

Chapter 5

Maximising Action Sports for Development

Dr Holly Thorpe, University of Waikato

This brief paper identifies new trends in youth sport participation, particularly the growing popularity of non-competitive, informal, non-institutionalised 'action sports' (e.g. skateboarding, surfing, snowboarding, parkour). Drawing upon examples and research from within and outside the Commonwealth, it illustrates the potential of action sports for making a valuable contribution to the 'sport for development and peace' movement. As revealed through three distinct case studies, a number of valuable lessons can be learned about the potential of action sports for improving the health and well-being of children and youth in both (re)developing and developed nations.

The author makes a number of key recommendations for policy actions for Commonwealth member countries interested in using action sports to improve the health and well-being of children and youth. She advocates greater governmental and community investment in both new and existing action sport-related development and peace building (ASDP) programmes, both at home and abroad.

However, she also warns that care must be taken not to 'fit' action sports into existing frameworks and structures. Action sports have their own unique cultures and value systems that are often different to more traditional rule-bound sports, and thus it is necessary for organisations to work closely with action sport participants in designing programmes that meet both their needs and the desires of stakeholders. There is great potential for consulting and collaborating with action sport participants to further expand existing grassroots programmes, and to create new programmes that excite, inspire and empower children and youth, and offer a different set of social, physical and psychological skills when compared to traditional rule-bound sports. In so doing,

however, Commonwealth member countries should take care to avoid top-down models and instead approach such initiatives from a position of respect for the agency, autonomy and voices of action sport participants.

5.1 Introduction

The term ‘action sports’ broadly refers to a wide range of mostly individualised activities such as BMX (biking), kite-surfing, skateboarding, surfing and snowboarding that differ – at least in their early phases of development – from traditional rule-bound, competitive and regulated Western ‘achievement’ sport cultures. Various categorisations have been used to describe these activities, including extreme, lifestyle and alternative sports (Booth and Thorpe 2007; Rinehart 2000; Wheaton 2004). The term ‘action sport’ is increasingly the preferred term used by committed participants (many of whom resent the label ‘extreme sports’, which they feel was imposed upon them by transnational corporations and media conglomerates during the mid- and late-1990s).

Many action sports gained popularity in North America and some parts of Europe during the new leisure trends of the 1960s and 1970s, and increasingly attracted alternative youth who appropriated these activities and infused them with a set of hedonistic and carefree philosophies and subcultural styles. While each action sport has its own unique history, identity and development patterns, early participants sought risks and thrills, touted anti-establishment and ‘do-it-yourself’ philosophies. Core members saw their culture as ‘different’ to the traditional rule-bound, competitive and regulated Western institutionalised sport cultures (Beal 1995; Humphreys 1997; Wheaton 2004). For example, an early skateboarder, cited in the work of sports sociologists Becky Beal and Lisa Weidman (2003), proclaimed that the best part about skateboarding is that you, ‘don’t need uniforms, no coach to tell you what to do or how to do it’.

Since their emergence in the 1960s, action sports have experienced unprecedented growth – both in participation and in their increased visibility across public space (see, for example, Booth and Thorpe 2007; Rinehart 2000; Thorpe 2011; Wheaton 2004). During the mid- and late-1990s, television agencies and corporate sponsors began to recognise the huge potential in action sports as a way to tap into the highly lucrative youth market. Mainstream

companies quickly began appropriating the ‘cool’ images of surfers, skateboarders and snowboarders to sell products ranging from energy drinks to credit cards. The global exposure of the X Games and Gravity Games, the inclusion of action sports into the Olympic Games – particularly snowboarding, freestyle skiing, BMX and mountain biking (see Thorpe and Wheaton 2012a) – and the popularity of extreme sport video games and movies (e.g. Blue Crush, Dogtown and ZBoys), helped further expose these sports to the masses. As a result, action sport athletes have become household names. Indeed, skateboarder Tony Hawk, surfer Kelly Slater and snowboarder Shaun White were identified as being among the top ten most popular athletes among 13–34 year olds in North America (Transworld Business 2008). Surveys across Asia, Australasia, Europe and North America, including a number of Commonwealth countries, have also pointed to the increased popularity of non-institutionalised informal sport activities in general, and action sport specifically.

In assessing the rise of action sports, the most developed data sets are available from the United States. In 2003, for example, five of the top ten most popular sports in the United States were action sports, including inline skating, skateboarding and snowboarding (Thorpe and Wheaton 2012b). Estimates suggest more than 22 million Americans participate annually in action sports, particularly skateboarding, surfing, snowboarding and BMX riding, with many of these participants engaging in an array of action sports and practicing on a regular basis (Active Marketing Group 2007). Given the difficulty of capturing participation in these informal, outdoor, non-association-based activities, it is likely that participation rates are growing faster than these surveys suggest. Indeed when measures such as equipment sales and media commentaries are included, it is clear that in the twenty-first century many types of action sports are attracting an ever-increasing body of followers, outpacing the expansion of traditional sports in many Western nations (Active Marketing 2007; Gilchrist and Wheaton, 2011; Tomlinson et al. 2005; Wheaton, 2004). As British sport sociologist Belinda Wheaton (2004) explains in *Understanding Lifestyle Sports: Consumption, Identity and Difference*, many participants continue to embrace their countercultural heritage, viewing these activities as alternative *lifestyles* rather than as *sports*.

While young, white, middle- and upper-class, heterosexual males often constitute a dominant force at the core of many action sport cultures (Beal 1996; Evers 2010a; Chivers Yochim, 2010; Wheaton


Figure 5.1 Size and influence of action sports in the United States



Source: Transworld Media Kit 2007

Note: This table was produced in 2007 by a US-based media firm, and thus should not be considered as up-to-date evidence of current action sport trends beyond the US context.

Figure 5.2 Average action sports participants by sex in the United States



Source: Active Marketing Group 2007

Note: This table was produced in 2007 by US-based marketing firm, and thus should not be considered as up-to-date evidence of current action sport trends beyond the US context.

2000), demographics are shifting, particularly on the margins of the sports, with increasing participation across different social classes and age groups, including females and minority groups. Indeed, women are adopting proactive roles in the action sports culture and industry, as instructors, athletes, journalists,

photographers, CEOs and manufacturers (Pomerantz et al. 2004; Thorpe 2005, 2007; Young and Dallaire 2008). As a result of the increasing visibility of female role models, the expanding female niche market, and opportunities for female-only lessons, camps and competitions, the number of female action sport participants of all ages has grown rapidly over the past two decades.

The growth of action sports in many Western and some Eastern countries (e.g., China, Japan and South Korea) is affecting broader trends of youth sport participation (Thorpe 2008). In contrast to the increasing rates of participation in non-competitive, informal and non-institutionalised sports, youth involvement in many traditional team sports such as basketball, (American) football, ice hockey and rugby, is declining, or slowing, in many countries. This is a noteworthy trend for governmental agencies and organisations involved in the funding and development of future youth sport opportunities and initiatives (Gilchrist and Wheaton 2011; Tomlinson et al. 2005).

5.2 Beyond football: action sports for development and peace building

For many years, action sports were thought to be the exclusive domain of privileged, white, narcissistic Western youth. Stereotypes of surfers, skateboarders, snowboarders and climbers as hedonistic, thrill-seeking, anti-authoritarian, individualistic youth continue to proliferate in the mass media and popular cultural sentiment. Since the mid- and late-1990s, however, action sport participants have established non-profit organisations and movements relating to an array of social issues, including *health*.

While action sports for development and peace building (ASDP) organisations are a relatively new topic of scholarly investigation, a few researchers are drawing on psychological theories and concepts to explain humanitarian and empathetic responses among action sport participants (see Brymer 2009; Brymer and Oades 2008; Wymeret et al. 2008). Yet such approaches have tended to oversimplify, decontextualise and romanticise the relationship between action sport participation and activism. Arguably, recent work by a select few sociologists and cultural geographers offers greater insight into the nuances and contradictions operating within and across these organisations, and the broader social context in which they emerge (see, for example, Lavolette 2006; Thorpe and Rinehart 2012; Wheaton 2007).

There is considerable variation within such action sport-related non-profit organisations and social campaigns. Some ASDP organisations – such as Chill, Surfers for Peace and Umthombo Surf Stars – can be broadly categorised within the ‘sport, development and peace’ (SDP) sector in that they use participation in action sports such as snowboarding, skateboarding or surfing as an ‘interventionist tool to promote peace, reconciliation, and development in different locations across the world’ (Giulianotti 2011: 50). For many others, while the physical act of surfing, snowboarding or skiing plays an important role in uniting members of these groups and inspiring potential donors, the action sport is not *directly* being used as an ‘interventionist tool’ as in many other SDP organisations. Rather, these organisations are founded by action sport participants who utilise pre-existing structures and connections within and across local, national and global sporting cultures and industries to raise awareness and fundraise for issues they deem to be socially significant. While some of these organisations remain at the grassroots level and are relatively unknown beyond the local community or outside the action sport culture, others are gaining recognition from mainstream social justice and humanitarian organisations for their innovative efforts and creative strategies to produce new forms of passionate politics in local and global contexts. For example, Surf Aid International received the 2007 World Association of Non-Governmental Organizations (WANGO) Humanitarian Award; and Skateistan has won numerous awards for its efforts in educating urban and internally displaced children in Kabul.

While the everyday operations of some of these organisations take place outside Commonwealth contexts, it is important to note that many ASDP organisations receive funding and support from the transnational action sports community of which Commonwealth youths constitute a dominant force. Moreover, many action sport enthusiasts from Commonwealth contexts travel frequently and are active users of social media for connecting and communicating with international communities to which they have travelled or plan to travel. As such, residents of Commonwealth member countries often play key roles as founders, directors, board members, funders, ambassadors and volunteers for ASDP organisations in international settings. For example, Surf Aid International (SAI) was founded in the Mentawai Islands in 2000 by travelling New Zealand surfer Dr Dave Jenkins (MD) and a group of his surfing friends. The

non-profit organisation now has offices in New Zealand and Australia, as well as in the US and Indonesia, and receives annual funding from AusAid and NZAid, as well as Australian-based surfing corporations (e.g., Billabong); it also has a number of Australian professional surfers acting as ambassadors (e.g., Joel Parkinson and Mark Occhilupo). Skateistan is another good example of a successful international ASDP organisation founded by a resident of a Commonwealth country while living abroad. Arguably, as the examples of SAI and Skateistan suggest, there is considerable potential for Commonwealth member countries to learn much from the efforts of their citizens who are currently using action sports to create positive social change abroad. Invitations might be extended for such individuals to bring their skills back 'home' and to establish similarly creative and effective programmes for children and youth in need in Commonwealth nations.

5.3 Value of action sports for development and peace building

To date, the founders of most ASDP organisations have typically been action sport enthusiasts (rather than experienced humanitarian or aid workers) who have been inspired to create change when they observed poverty, inequalities and injustices during their sport-related travel (see Thorpe and Rinehart 2012). Very few of the major SDP programmes offer opportunities for action sport participation. Yet there is potential for action sports to be successfully incorporated into existing SDP organisations' programmes, particularly those focused on improving the health and well-being of children and youth for whom action sports are often hugely popular. Arguably, Commonwealth nation states would also do well to consider the potential of action sports for enhancing cultural understanding through international exchange programmes, such as the 'sports envoy' initiative being adopted by the US State Department's Sports United (see reference list below).

Action sports offer the potential for developing different skills and learning opportunities when compared to the sports typically used in SDP programmes. In contrast to organised sports such as soccer and basketball, most action sports are non-competitive (although competitions are popular among elite performers), thus offering opportunities for children and youth to gain a sense of achievement without having to compete against, and beat,

another team or player. Rather, participants can learn alongside one another and gain a sense of accomplishment based on their own skills development. For example, a novice skateboarder can get much satisfaction and joy from simply standing on the board and rolling a few feet along a flat surface; an intermediate skateboarder in the same space might be filled with pride when he or she successfully ‘ollies’ (jumps) the board a few inches off the ground; whereas an advanced skateboarder might get a sense of achievement from performing a board-slide down a metal rail. When appropriately supported, action sports offer ample opportunities for individual empowerment through skills mastery (e.g., co-ordination, balance), as well as valuable social skills (e.g., communication, sharing of social space).

In contrast to many traditional sports that require umpires or referees to control the play and discipline the players, most action sports are self-regulating, and thus participants often quickly develop an implicit understanding of the cultural etiquette for sharing the space. There is also a celebration of play, self-expression and creativity in the use of space and movement in many action sport cultures, which may offer unique opportunities for skills development, communication and respect between participants in developing nations or war-torn communities. According to Sharna Nolan (a founding member of Skateistan), skateboarding is: ‘a fantastic tool for communication... We get kids from all different ethnicities building relationships with each other. So we’ve got Hazera kids with Tajik kids ...’ Continuing she adds, ‘We’ve also got girls skateboarding, but we had to teach the boys that, no, they couldn’t push girls off the board and that they had equal rights to be in that space’ (cited in *Skateistan: The Movie*). Similarly, Oliver Percovich (also a founding member of Skateistan) explains: ‘Ultimately, what Skateistan wants to achieve is building trust, links between Afghans... some understanding between ethnicities. Skateistan is mixing social backgrounds. Here a street kid can meet the son of a minister. We promote activities that don’t exclude’. With approximately half of the Afghan population under the age of 25, Skateistan is making a valuable contribution to building a more positive future by empowering one child at a time – through skateboarding and art, language and computer education in a safe, supportive and inclusive environment (Thorpe and Rinehart 2012).

In contrast to many traditional, organised sports that were designed by men for men, most action sports developed in a

different gender context. As such, (Western) women have been active participants from early in the development of many action sports, thus offering opportunities for alternative gender relations. Percovich makes a similar observation of skateboarding in Afghanistan, explaining: 'lots of sports here are seen as for boys, [but] skateboarding was too new to be related to gender'. Whereas most traditional sports divide men and women into two separate and distinct groups, in many action sports, girls, boys, men and women often share the same space (e.g., the waves, a skateboard park, an indoor climbing facility, the snowy slopes), participating alongside friends and/or family members from both sexes and of varying ages and ability levels. Moreover, many action sports (e.g., skateboarding, parkour, ultimate frisbee, snowboarding) do not so explicitly privilege the male body (e.g., through speed, upper body strength, physical force), as do sports such as rugby, ice hockey or American football. Rather, the gender-neutral traits of balance, co-ordination, grace, personal style and the creative use of space, are highly valued within action sport cultures, such that boys and girls do not need to be separated in the learning experience (although, for cultural reasons, this may be appropriate in some contexts). In well-organised and appropriately supported environments, boys and girls can learn to respect one another and enjoy sharing the experience together. Arguably, action sports can complement the SDP movement by offering empowering learning experiences that encourage self-expression and creative thinking and, when supported appropriately, can develop a different set of physical and social skills among children and youth from different socio-economic and cultural backgrounds.

5.4 Action sports: the potential for risk

Some members within the SDP movement have expressed interest in employing action sports for cultural diplomacy, development and/or peace building projects, yet a number of concerns have delayed such initiatives. In particular, some SDP organisations and agencies worry that action sports may pose heightened risk of injury for participants. While action sports have the image of being 'high risk', this is largely a misperception based predominantly on the successful marketing of these sports and their athletes as 'extreme'. As Douglas Booth and Holly Thorpe (2007) clarify in *The Berkshire Encyclopedia of Extreme*

Box 5.1 Examples of action sports for development and peace building

Boarding for Breast Cancer: an educational programmes for female surf, skate and snowboard enthusiasts.

Surf Aid International: a non-profit humanitarian organisation dedicated to improving the 'health, well-being and self-reliance of people living in isolated regions', particularly in popular surfing locations in Indonesia.

Waves for Change: a South African youth development and HIV education programme rooted in surfing.

Chill: a US-founded non-profit providing underprivileged youth with opportunities to develop self-esteem and life-skills through board sports. The organisation now has 12 chapters in the US, two in Canada, and one each in Austria and Australia.

Skateistan: co-educational skateboarding schooling in Afghanistan, Cambodia and Pakistan.

Umthombo Surf Stars: an organisation providing street children in South Africa with opportunities to participate in beach-related activities, and training for future employment in ocean-related activities.

Protect Our Winters (POW): an international group of snowboarders and skiers committed to raising awareness of environmental deprivation, and particularly global warming.

Surfers Environmental Alliance (SEA): is committed to the preservation and protection of the environmental and cultural elements that are inherent to the sport of surfing.

Surfers Against Sewage (SAS): an environmental campaign group with a mission to rid the UK coastline of sewage.

Surfers for Peace: an informal organisation aimed at bridging cultural and political barriers between surfers in the Middle East.

Sports, many action sports are no more dangerous than traditional sports. For example, despite the 'extreme' image of snowboarding, in terms of the average number of deaths on the slopes, snowboarding is safer than skiing, bicycling and swimming. For

SDP organisations thinking about including action sports in their programmes, the cost and logistics of transporting additional safety equipment (e.g., helmets, shin pads, elbow guards) can be another complicating factor. However, SDP organisations might successfully explore sports such as ultimate frisbee or parkour, which require little equipment and, with the right coaching and support structures, can be very low risk.

Before governmental agencies or SDP organisations jump on the ‘bandwagon’ and start implementing action sport programmes in at-risk or developing communities, however, it is worth taking a closer examination of the informal, grassroots action sports participation already occurring within local contexts. As the two case studies in Annex 5.3 and Annex 5.4 illustrate, some action sport enthusiasts are creatively and proactively using these activities in their efforts to overcome the stress and trauma of living in spaces of conflict and/or natural disaster. In Annex 5.3, we see the importance of action sports for residents living in Christchurch (New Zealand) after the devastating February 2011 earthquake. For Christchurch residents who had been active participants prior to the earthquake, beaches, indoor skate parks and bouldering routes became ‘therapeutic landscapes’ – their sporting participation in these spaces helped some escape (if only temporarily) from the stresses of daily life. While the second case study is outside the Commonwealth context, it provides further evidence of the creative grassroots approaches being adopted by action sports enthusiasts in places of conflict and poverty. Annex 5.4 illustrates the value of parkour – the practice of running, jumping and leaping within the urban environment – for youth in high-density urban spaces with limited access to resources. More specifically, we see how young men in Gaza have embraced this activity as a physical form of self-expression and escapism. They proclaim the value of parkour for their resilience and coping with the frustrations, fears, anxieties and pains of living in the Khan Younes refugee camp. This case also illustrates another area where action sports are pioneers, that is in the use of social media (e.g., Facebook, YouTube) as cost-effective ways to engage participants in local and global contexts, and to communicate across borders. Both cases point to possibilities for Commonwealth member countries to provide a unique form of foreign aid through the support and development of grassroots ASDP organisations in disaster and/or conflict zones.

5.5 Conclusion

Of the 700+ organisations currently working under the SDP umbrella, the lion's share rely solely on a small selection of traditional sports – such as football, basketball, volleyball and hockey – in their efforts to improve the health and well-being of individuals and communities. Yet there is untapped potential in newer action sports (e.g., skateboarding, parkour, climbing, ultimate frisbee) for making a unique contribution to the SDP movement. It would be a mistake, however, for governmental agencies or SDP organisations to try to 'fit' action sports into existing frameworks. Action sports have their own unique cultural rules, norms and value systems, and participants tend to enjoy the anti-authoritarian, non-competitive, individualistic, creative and expressive elements of these sports. Organisations that deal mostly with traditional sports would do well to consult with action sport participants before developing programmes. Indeed, many valuable lessons might be learned from those individuals already working in successful ASDP organisations (e.g., Skateistan), and from those participants who have actively established grassroots groups in spaces of conflict and disaster. Furthermore, the local and transnational networks of action sports communities also offer interesting opportunities for cultural exchange programmes (either via physical travel or virtual dialogues facilitated by social media) that promote respect and understanding among action sport participants from within and across Commonwealth countries and other regions of the world. In sum, respectful collaborations with key individuals in both formal and informal ASDP projects have the potential to positively contribute to the sustainability and success of future youth-focused SDP projects.

Further information

PK Gaza: A powerful video recording of the PK Gaza training day that was disrupted by Israeli bombing nearby. See: www.youtube.com/watch?v=qE2eWIHEPwI

Surfing Bangladesh: www.surfingbangladesh.com/

Skateboarders in Christchurch making the most of earthquake-damaged terrain: www.youtube.com/watch?v=i2bvozq-KK8

Skateistan: www.skateistan.org (Afghanistan), <http://kh.skateistan.org/content/about-us> (Cambodia), and <http://pk.skateistan.org/> (Pakistan)

US Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Sports United, programmes using action sports for cultural exchange and diplomacy:<http://eca.state.gov/gallery/snowboarders-kyrgyzstan-visit-us>. Also see action sport athletes as 'sports envoys': <http://diplomacy.state.gov/discoverdiplomacy/explorer/issues/170128.htm>

Surfing For Peace: www.surfing4peace.org/. For information on the Gaza Surfer Girl Project see: www.surfing4peace.org/s4pindex/NewsAndEvents/Entries/2011/12/1_Gaza_Surfer_Girl_Project_From_Dream_to_Delivery.html

Surf Aid International: www.surfaidinternational.org

The Chill Foundation: www.chill.org, and www.chillaustralia.org.au/

Umthombo Surf Stars: www.umthombo.org/website/surf/

Waves for Change: www.wecanchange.co.za/Profiles/NGONPO/WavesForChange/tabid/475/Default.aspx

Skateistan: 'Skateboarding is just the carrot'

Skateistan – an 'independent, neutral, Afghan NGO' that provides skateboarding tuition, and art and language education, to 'urban and internally-displaced youth in Afghanistan' – began in 2006 when Australian skateboarder Oliver Percovich went to Kabul, Afghanistan, with his girlfriend Sharna Nolan, who had taken a position with the Afghanistan Reconstruction and Evaluation Unit. As soon as Percovich started skateboarding in the streets of Kabul, he was 'surrounded by eager children begging to learn how to skate'. Using the three boards he had brought to Afghanistan, Percovich 'developed a small school giving free skate lessons to street children'. Over the following months he 'scrounged' US\$7,000 in donations to buy more skateboards and equipment and set up some basic activities for the growing number of interested youth, and enlisted the assistance of two of his Australian skateboarding friends to help further develop Skateistan. Since 2007, Skateistan has received funding from foreign embassies (i.e., Denmark, Germany and Norway), with further assistance from private donations and fundraisers. To survive, and indeed thrive, in a highly competitive NGO market, Skateistan has also developed highly creative, collaborative relationships with skateboard companies. For example, skateboarding companies – Blackbox Distribution and TSG – have provided Skateistan with skateboarding equipment (e.g., skateboards, wheels, trucks and bearings) and safety gear (e.g., helmets and wrist-guards), and host various awareness- and fund-raising events in an array of countries (i.e., Australia, Germany and the United States). Skateistan is working with some of these companies to establish their own brand by coproducing, marketing and distributing helmets, skateboards, t-shirts, scarves and knee-pads worldwide; many of the graphics featured on these products are designed by Skateistan students during art classes. While the brand currently contributes just a fraction to the total percentage of the Skateistan income, Percovich recognises the development of the Skateistan brand as an important move toward a more sustainable organisation that is less reliant on external sources for funding.

(Continued)

Skateistan: 'Skateboarding is just the carrot' (cont.)

In 2009, with just over US\$700,000 in international donations and land gifted by Afghanistan's Olympic Committee, Skateistan built a 19,000 square foot indoor skateboard park – Kabul's largest indoor sports facility. Since the opening of this skate park, Skateistan has registered more than 1,100 Afghan children and youth (37 per cent female). Yet skateboarding is just 'the carrot' to 'connect with kids and build trust', says Percovich. Skateistan is receiving international acclaim for its efforts, winning the 2009 'Peace and Sport Nongovernmental Organization' award, and was the 2012 'Beyond Sports' winner of the 'Innovation through Sport' award. Skateistan was also selected as a Top 100 NGO for 2013 by *The Global Journal*, making it the highest ranking sport-related NGO. With such successes, Skateistan has expanded to offering similar skateboarding and educational programmes for children in Cambodia and Pakistan, and is currently in the process of building a second facility in Mazar-e-Sharif (northern Afghanistan). According to Sharna Nolan, who also became a founding member of Skateistan, as well as teaching key interpersonal skills and respect across cultural and gender divides, the aim underpinning the skateboarding instructional and educational programmes offered at Skateistan is to prepare Afghan children and youth to become future leaders: 'Skateboarding has given them more confidence. We want them to be problem solvers, to be part of the reconstruction of their country. We want them to have a voice'.

The potential of action sports for post-disaster recovery: the case of Christchurch

A spate of recent natural disasters has prompted many scholars working in the social sciences and humanities to examine the economic, social and psychological impact of natural disasters, such as hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, tsunamis, fires and volcanoes. To date, little research has examined the role of recreational sport and physical activity in the recovery and resilience of individuals and communities affected by natural disaster. Sport – and particularly action sports (e.g. surfing, skateboarding, mountain biking, climbing) – may seem trivial pursuits in the wake of a natural disaster. However, in the weeks and months following a natural disaster, as individuals and communities attempt to re-establish familiar lifestyles and routines, sport and physical activity can play an important role in individual recovery and community resilience.

Interested to understand how committed 'lifestyle sport' participants adapted their action sport participation in the changing socio-cultural-economic-physical geography following an earthquake, the author travelled to Christchurch in March 2012. She conducted semi-structured interviews with 14 surfers, skateboarders, climbers and mountain bikers living in Christchurch before, during and after the earthquakes. This study is among the first qualitative examinations of the effects of a natural disaster on residents' everyday sporting practices.

(Continued)

The potential of action sports for post-disaster recovery: the case of Christchurch (cont.)

For the Christchurch residents in this project, beaches, indoor skate parks and bouldering routes became 'therapeutic landscapes' – their sporting participation in these spaces helped some escape (if only temporarily) from the stresses of daily life. For example, Aaron, a passionate surfer, described the importance of surfing for social interaction and fun with his peers, which had a lingering affect: 'There is such a strong presence of community and fulfilment in relationships within surfing... I think just getting away from it all for a few hours... you'd come back [from your surf] and be in a calm place for at least a few days'. Similarly, Will appreciated the short-term escapism and 'endorphin rush' that helped 'take my mind off everything for a while'. He also enjoyed the opportunities to 'connect with my friends and surfing colleagues from Christchurch': 'If you saw someone you knew in the waves, suddenly it's "how are you doing, how's your house, what's happening?" It was great to catch up with mates that you hadn't seen for a while'. Caitlin also describes the importance of her relationships within the climbing community following the earthquake: 'Some of us talked about what happened' and agreed that going climbing together was a good way to 'move on from it [the earthquake]'. For Caitlin, the climbing community and the reestablishment of familiar sporting routines aided her recovery from the disruptive experience of the February earthquake: 'Once I got back into it, I found climbing is a way just to carry on, move forward'. Brad expressed the pleasures offered by skateboarding after the earthquake: 'Other people in my family don't really do much at all anymore. They just kind of hang around, waiting for the city to be rebuilt, whereas I'll just go skating, and I'll be happy'. Participation also enabled some to regain a sense of normalcy and return to familiar bodily experiences, regaining a sense of identity and belonging to their sporting communities. For others, participation helped them (re)develop a physical connection to the natural or built environment and, in some cases, justified their decision to stay living in Christchurch (and contribute to the rebuild process) rather than join the thousands migrating from the city.

Similar observations can be made in post-disaster spaces around the world. For example, following the 2010 Chilean earthquake, inline skaters took to the streets to practice their skills on damaged infrastructure. Skaters in New Orleans developed a makeshift skate park under the interstate in Gentilly. More recently, surfers along the east coast of the United States were making the most of Hurricane Sandy swells, and skateboarders in New York quickly took to appropriating hurricane-damaged terrain in highly creative ways. In the wake of natural disaster, participation in lifestyle sports appears to offer enthusiasts with opportunities to redefine physical and emotional disaster geographies. Based on this research, it might be argued that Commonwealth nation states would do well to give greater consideration to the role of non-traditional sporting spaces for residents' recovery and resilience following a natural disaster.

Grassroots action sports in spaces of conflict: the case of parkour in Gaza

To date, action sports have been a predominantly Western phenomenon. Yet with the rapid expansion of the internet and the global reach of action sport companies (e.g., Quiksilver, Billabong, Burton), events (e.g., the X Games) and media, children and youth throughout the Eastern world are also increasingly exposed to action sports. While some reject them as 'crazy American sports', others adopt and re-appropriate these activities in relation to their local physical and social environments. In the Muslim world, for example, surfing is gaining popularity in Iran and Bangladesh; Pakistani youth are taking up skateboarding in growing numbers; and sandboarding is a popular activity among privileged youth (and expats) in Saudi Arabia. While the following example is outside the Commonwealth context, it points to the highly creative approaches being adopted by young action sport enthusiasts in places of conflict and poverty, and the potential of action sports for improving perceived quality of life.

The practice of parkour is quickly gaining popularity among groups of young men in the Middle East. Simply defined, parkour (also known as 'the art of displacement' or free-running) is the practice of moving fluidly and efficiently across an urban environment, and often involves spectacular manoeuvres (inspired by gymnastics, break-dancing, climbing and/or skateboarding) on obstacles found in city spaces. Parkour is arguably one of the most accessible action sports. In contrast to skateboarding, surfing or sandboarding, which require (often expensive) equipment (e.g., skate-, surf-, sandboards) and access to specific types of environments (e.g., smooth concrete, waves, sand-dunes), parkour requires little more than a pair of shoes fit for moving efficiently within the urban environment. Today, groups of (mostly young male) traceurs and free-runners can be found in Bahrain, Doha, Egypt, Israel, Kuwait, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Some parkour groups are relatively small, informal groups of young men who train together, whereas others have grown into highly organised, hierarchical and commercial organisations with hired training facilities and coaches.

The grassroots development of parkour in the conflict-torn Gaza Strip is particularly interesting. Parkour reached Gaza in 2005, when recent university graduate Abdullah Anshasi watched the documentary *Jump London* on the Al-Jazeera documentary channel. He promptly followed this up by searching the internet for video clips of parkour, before recruiting Mohammed Aljkhbayr to join him in learning the new sport. Continuing to develop their skills, they soon found parkour to be so much more than a sport: 'it is a life philosophy' that encourages each individual to 'overcome barriers in their own way'. To avoid conflicts with family member, local residents and police, members of PK Gaza (the name chosen by the group) sought out unpopulated spaces where they could train without interruption. Popular training areas included cemeteries, the ruined houses from the Dhraha occupation, United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) schools and on the sandy hills in Nusseirat, formerly an Israeli settlement now deserted in the centre of Gaza City. The latter has particular meaning for the youth, who proclaim that by practicing parkour in the space, 'we demonstrate that this land is our right'.

As part of the younger generation of technologically savvy Gazan residents, the founders of PK Gaza are explicitly aware of the potential of the internet for their parkour practices, and also for broader political purposes. 'We started filming ourselves with mobile phones and putting the videos on YouTube', explains Aljkhbayr; they have continued to develop more advanced filming techniques using borrowed cameras and editing the footage on a cheap computer. The PK Gaza and Free-running Facebook page has almost

(Continued)

Grassroots action sports in spaces of conflict: the case of parkour in Gaza (cont.)

4,000 followers from around the world, and the group also posts regular YouTube videos that can receive upwards of tens of thousands of views. Both Facebook and YouTube are key spaces for interaction and dialogue with youth beyond the confines of the Gaza strip. In so doing, 'we contribute very significantly to raising international awareness of what is happening in Gaza. We offer video clips, photographs and writings related to the situation in which we live in the Gaza strip and deliver the message to all the peoples that [are] watching online that there are oppressed people here', proclaimed Aljkhbayr. Interestingly, these virtual spaces also enable dialogue that may contribute to building respect between participants of varying socio-cultural, religious and/or national backgrounds based on parkour participation. For example, YouTube videos created by the PK Gaza group receive support in Arabic and English from fellow parkour enthusiasts around the world, including the following comment from an Israeli parkour practitioner: 'Amazing guys! You got so much better than last year. I hope there will be peace between us one day', the message was signed 'Peace from Israel!'

Furthermore, with such global exposure, the PK Gaza group began to receive offers of support from individuals and groups around the world. For example, an Australian viewer offered to design their logo, which now features on the team website and t-shirts. In February 2012, with sponsorship from the Unione Italiana Sport Per Tutti ('Sport for All'), three of the original PK Gaza team were able to travel outside Gaza for the first time and attend the Italian Free Running and Parkour Federation's annual event in Milan. On this trip, they also performed in Rome, Bologna and Palermo, and met free-runners from across the world. The young men used this trip as an opportunity for informal cultural diplomacy and raising awareness of the plight of those living in Gaza. As this example suggests, virtual communications between action sport participants from different countries have the potential to facilitate online and physical cultural exchanges that offer unique opportunities for enhancing empathy, mutual respect and understanding of different cultures and ways of life.

As well as raising awareness of the conditions in Gaza and offering a temporary escape from the harsh realities of everyday life, the PK Gaza team strongly advocates the socio-psychological benefits of their everyday parkour experiences. They proclaim the value of parkour for resilience and coping with the frustrations, fears, anxieties and pains of living in the Khan Younes refugee camp. As Anshasi explains, 'I have witnessed war, invasion and killing. When I was a kid and I saw these things, blood and injuries, I didn't know what it all meant... this game [parkour] makes me forget all these things'. Similarly, Aljkhbayr describes a dire situation, 'We have wars regularly and the sanctions make our lives miserable', but parkour 'has given me the ability to overcome many obstacles. It's made me steadfast and has given me the strength to face the pressures of the occupation'. Continuing, he explains, 'There is always a problem here of one sort or another. If it's not the war or the sanctions, then it's an internal issue. It's depressing, but we try to practise self-help. We try to be our own doctors'. As the following comments from Gazan psychologist, Eyad Al Sarraj (MD) suggest, some medical and health professionals also acknowledge the value of such activities for young men living in such a stressful environment:

Many young people in Gaza are angry because they have very few opportunities and are locked in. An art and sports form such as free-running gives them an important method to express their desire for freedom and allows them to overcome the barriers that society and politics have imposed on them. It literally sets them free.

(Continued)

Grassroots action sports in spaces of conflict: the case of parkour in Gaza (cont.)

Such observations are supported by a plethora of research that has illustrated the value of physical play and games for resilience in contexts of high risk and/or ongoing physical and psychological stress (e.g., refugee camps), and the restorative value for children and youth who have experienced traumatic events (e.g., natural disasters, war, forced migration) (see, for example, Berinstein and Magalhaes 2009; Evers 2010b; Kunz 2009; Orayb 2005; Rung et al. 2011).

The pioneers of parkour in Gaza, Mohammed and Abdullah, are now working with a group of peers to support the next generation of parkour enthusiasts. They do so with the hope of the 'formation of a large academy to train new generations... and disseminate among young men and women all over Palestine'. According to Enshasi, one of the trainers for a group of 8–16 year old male parkour enthusiasts: 'My main focus as I grow older is to make sure that PK Gaza continues as an art and sports form in Gaza. I do not want it to die with us. This is why now I feel our main focus should be on training the next generation. They are young minds and bodies who want to be set free'. The regular training sessions and informal peer mentoring provided by the PK Gaza leaders offer boys and young men growing up in Gaza valuable social networks beyond the family, and support structures that facilitate coping and resilience through everyday physical pleasures. Perhaps most importantly, the social and physical experiences offered through parkour offer youth a sense of hope for a future with surmountable obstacles.

As illustrated via the brief case of parkour in Gaza, some youth are demonstrating remarkable agency in creating sporting opportunities that cater to their own and other local children and youths' physical, social and psychological needs. Such activities may not meet traditional definitions of sport, yet groups such as PK Gaza are adopting highly creative and resourceful approaches to realise some of the goals at the heart of the SDP movement. Acknowledging and privileging the knowledge of youth involved in grassroots sporting groups seems particularly important in regions, such as the Middle East, where the huge and growing population of young people has the potential to 'shake present regimes from within more devastatingly than even the forces of international politics' (Fuller 2004: 4). For Commonwealth nation states willing and/or able to provide aid to regions in need, offering funding and/or social support for grassroots action sports programmes might be considered as a unique and valuable approach to improving the health and well-being of local children and youth.

Note

1. Parkour is the practice of running, jumping and leaping within the urban environment.

References

Active Marketing Group (2007), Action sports: the action sports market, available at: www.activenetworkrewards.com/Assets/AMG+2009/Action+Sports.pdf (accessed 19 November 2013).

- Beal, B (1995), 'Disqualifying the official: An exploration of social resistance through the subculture of skateboarding', *Sociology of Sport Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 3, 252–67.
- Beal, B (1996), 'Alternative masculinity and its effects on gender relations in the subculture of skateboarding', *Journal of Sport Behavior* Vol. 19, 204–221.
- Beal, B and L Weidman (2003), 'Authenticity in the skateboarding world', in R Rinehart and S Sydnor (Eds.) *To the Extreme: Alternative Sports, Inside and Out*, State University Press, New York, 337–352.
- Berinstein, S and L Magalhaes (2009), 'A study of the essence of play experience to children living in Zanzibar, Tanzania', *Occupational Therapy International*, Vol. 16 No. 2, 89–106.
- Beutler, I (2008), 'Sport serving development and peace: Achieving the goals of the United Nations through sport', *Sport in Society*, Vol. 11 No. 4, 359–369.
- Booth, D and H Thorpe (2007), 'The meaning of extreme', in D Booth and H Thorpe (Eds.) *The Berkshire Encyclopedia of Extreme Sports*, Berkshire Publishing Group LLC, Great Barrington, 181–197.
- Brymer, E (2009), 'Extreme sports as a facilitator of ecocentricity and positive life changes', *World Leisure Journal*, Vol. 51 No. 1, 47–53.
- Brymer, E and L Oades (2008), 'Extreme sports: A positive transformation in courage and humility', *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Vol. 49 No. 1, 114–126.
- Chawansky, M (2011), 'New social movements, old gender games? Locating girls in the sport for development and peace movement', in A Snyder and S Stobbe (Eds.), *Critical aspects of gender in conflict resolution, peace building, and social movements (Research in social movements, conflicts and change)*, Vol. 32, 121–134), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, UK.
- Chivers Yochim, E (2010), *Skate life: Re-imagining white masculinity*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Darnell, S (2012), *Sport for Development and Peace: A Critical Sociology*, Bloomsbury Academic, London.
- Evers, C (2010a), *Notes for a Young Surfer*, University Press, Melbourne.
- Evers, C (2010b), 'Intimacy, sport and young refugee men', *Emotion, Space and Society*, Vol. 3 No. 1, 56–61.
- Fuller, G (2004), The youth crisis in Middle Eastern society, Brief paper, Michigan, The Institute for Social Policy and Understanding.

- Gaza Parkour team – ‘There is hope in life’ (2012), *War in Context*, available at: <http://warincontext.org/2012/11/21/gaza-parkour-team-there-is-hope-in-life/> (accessed 19 November 2013).
- Gilchrist, P and B Wheaton (2011), ‘Lifestyle sport, public policy and youth engagement: Examining the emergence of parkour’, *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, Vol. 3 No. 1, 109–131.
- Giulianotti, R (2011), ‘Sport, transnational peacemaking, and global civil society: Exploring the reflective discourses of “Sport, Development and Peace” project officials’, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 35, 50–71.
- Humphreys, D (1997), ‘Shredheads go mainstream? Snowboarding an alternative Youth’, *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 32 No. 2, 147–60.
- Kidder, J (2012), ‘Parkour, the affective appropriation of urban space, and the real/virtual dialectic’, *City and Community*, Vol. 11 No. 3, 229–253.
- Kunz, V (2009) ‘Sport as a post-disaster psycho-social intervention in Bam, Iran’, *Sport in Society*, Vol. 12 No. 9, 1147–1157.
- Laviolette, P (2006), ‘Green and extreme: Free-flowing through seascape and sewer’, *Worldviews* Vol. 10 No. 2, 178–204.
- Levermore, R and A Beacom (2009), *Sport and international development*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- McEvoy-Levy, S (2001) Youth as social and political agents: Issues in post-settlement peace building, Kroc Institute Occasional Paper #21:OP:2, available at: www.unoy.org/downloads/resources/YandP/2001_McEnvoy-Levy.pdf (accessed 19 November 2013).
- Nicholls, S (2009), ‘On the backs of peer educators: Using theory to interrogate the role of young people in the field of sport-in-development’, in R Levermore and A Beacom (Eds.) *Sport and International Development*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, 156–175.
- Nichols, S, A Giles and C Sethna (2011), ‘Perpetuating the “lack of evidence” discourse in sport for development: Privileged voices, unheard stories and subjugated knowledge’, *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 46 No. 3, 249–264.
- Orayb, S (2005), ‘The forgotten children of Albaqa’a: Children’s play in a Palestinian refugee camp’, unpublished Master’s thesis, University of British Columbia, available at: http://circle.ubc.ca/bitstream/handle/2429/16203/ubc_2005-0109.pdf?sequence=1 (accessed 19 November 2013).

- Pomerantz, S, D Currie and D Kelly (2004), 'Sk8er girls: Skateboarders, girlhood and feminism in motion', *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 27, 547–557.
- Rinehart, R (2000), 'Emerging Arriving Sport: Alternatives to Formal Sports', in J Coakley and E Dunning (Eds.) *Handbook of Sports Studies*, Sage, London, 504–519.
- Robinson, V (2008), *Everyday Masculinities and Extreme Sport: Male Identity and Rock Climbing*, Berg, New York.
- Rung, AL, ST Broyles, AJ Mowen, J Gustat and MS Sothern (2011), 'Escaping to and being active in neighbourhood: Parks use in a post-disaster setting', *Disasters*, Vol. 35 No. 2, 383–403.
- Sugden, J (2006), 'Teaching and playing sport for conflict resolution and co-existence in Israel', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 41 No. 2, 221–240.
- Sugden, J (2008), 'Anyone for football for peace? The challenges of using sport in the service of co-existence in Israel', *Soccer & Society*, Vol. 9 No. 3, 405–415.
- Thorpe, H (2005), 'Jibbing the gender order: Females in the snowboarding culture', *Sport in Society*, Vol. 8 No. 1, 76–100.
- Thorpe, H (2007), 'Gender and extreme sports' in D Booth and H Thorpe (Eds.) *Berkshire Encyclopedia of Extreme Sports*, Berkshire Publishing Group LLC, Great Barrington, 103–111.
- Thorpe, H (2008), 'Extreme sports in China', in F Hong, D Mackay and K Christensen (Eds), *China Gold: China's Quest for Global Power and Olympic Glory*, Berkshire Publishing Group LLC, Great Barrington.
- Thorpe, H (2011), *Snowboarding Bodies in Theory and Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, Hampshire.
- Thorpe, H (under review), 'Natural Disaster and Action Sport Arrhythmia: The Case of the Christchurch Earthquake', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*.
- Thorpe, H and N Ahmad (under review), 'The Potential of Action Sports for the SDP Movement: Lessons from a Grassroots Parkour Group in Gaza', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*.
- Thorpe, H and R Rinehart (2012), 'Action sport NGOs in a neo-liberal context: The cases of Skateistan and Surf Aid International', *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, Vol. 37 No. 2, DOI: 10.1177/019372351245592.
- Thorpe, H and B Wheaton (2012a), "'Generation X Games", action sports and the Olympic Movement: Understanding the cultural politics of incorporation', *Sociology*, Vol. 45 No. 5, 830–847.

- Thorpe, H and B Wheaton (2012b), 'The Olympic Movement, action sports and the search for Generation Y', in J Sugden and A Tomlinson (Eds.) *Watching the Olympics: Politics, Power and Representation*, Routledge, London, 182–200.
- Tomlinson, A, N Ravenscroft, B Wheaton and P Gilchrist (2005), *Lifestyle Sport and National Sport Policy: An Agenda for Research. Report to Sport England*, available at: www.sportengland.org/lifestyle_sports_and_national_sports_policy.pdf (accessed 19 November 2013).
- Transworld Media Kit (2007), available at: <http://business.transworld.net/> (accessed 19 November 2013).
- Wheaton, B (2004), *Understanding Lifestyle Sports: Consumption, Identity and Difference*, Routledge, Oxford.
- Wheaton B (2007) Identity, politics, and the beach: Environmental activism in 'Surfers Against Sewage', *Leisure Studies* 26(3): 279–302.
- Wheaton, B (2000), "'New Lads?' Masculinities and the "New Sport" participant', *Men and Masculinities*, Vol. 2, 434–456.
- Wright, B (2012), 'Parkour: The art of obstacles', *Cairo West Magazine*, available at: www.cairowestmag.com/?p=442 (accessed 19 November 2013).
- Wymer, W, D Self and C Findley (2008), 'Sensation seekers and civic participation: Exploring the influence of sensation seeking and gender on intention to lead and volunteer', *International Journal of Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, Vol. 13, 287–300.
- Young, A and C Dallaire (2008), 'Beware*#! Sk8 at Your Own Risk: The Discourses of Young Female Skateboarders', in M Atkinson and K Young (Eds.), *Tribal Play: Subcultural Journeys through Sport*, JAI Press, Bingley, 235–254.

References for Skateistan case study

- Brooks, J (2009), 'Skateistan: A rebirth of skateboarding in Afghanistan', 8 August, available at: <http://xgames.espn.go.com/skateboarding/article/4384172/rebirth-skateboarding-afghanistan> (accessed 20 September 2013)
- Skateistan (2012), *Skateistan Annual Report*, available at: <http://skateistan.org/annual-report-2012> (accessed 12 September 2013)
- Skateistan (n.d), 'What we do', available at: <http://www.skateistan.org/programs> (accessed 20 September 2013).

Thorpe, H and R Rinehart (2012), 'Action Sport NGOs in a Neo-Liberal Context: The Cases of Skateistan and Surf Aid International', *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, DOI: 10.1177/0193723512455923.

References for Gaza case study

BBC News, (2012), 'Life in the Gaza Strip', *BBC News*, 22 November, available at: www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-20415675 (accessed 10 February 2013).

News Sources (2012), 'Gaza Parkour Team – "there is hope in life"', *War in Context*, 21 November, available at: <http://warincontext.org/2012/11/21/gaza-parkour-team-there-is-hope-in-life> (accessed 12 April 2013).

Shahin, M (2012), 'Free Running Gaza', *Saudi Aramco World*, November/December, available at: www.saudiaramcoworld.com/issue/201206/free.running.gaza.htm (accessed 12 February 2013).

Thorpe, H and N Ahmad (2013), 'Youth, action sports and political agency in the Middle East: Lessons from a grassroots parkour group in Gaza', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, DOI: 10.1177/1012690213490521.

Chapter 6

Using Sport and Play to Achieve Educational Objectives

Kathryn McCracken and Emma Colucci, Right to Play

Acknowledging the work of the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG), the Commonwealth Secretariat, UN Educational, Social and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), UNOSDP and many other partners globally, this chapter builds on this work and uses the experience of Right To Play and its government partners to further articulate how state and non-state actors can use sport and play to reach their educational objectives.

Several evaluations have shown that when well designed, sport and play programmes in school can improve academic attitudes, behaviours and overall success (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2010; Ratey 2008; Bailey et al. 2009; Stead and Neville 2010). This paper does not reiterate this evidence in depth, but rather shares Right To Play's experience working with governments and formal education institutions to highlight key components of how sport- and play-based programmes have contributed to achieving educational objectives. The paper provides guidance on how these stakeholders can begin to use what is already known to strengthen education systems.

The work Right To Play and local partners undertake with ministries of education to enhance the quality of education through policy formulation, curriculum development and teacher training is specifically highlighted.

The paper concludes with a set of comprehensive recommendations for the Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport's (CABOS) consideration, which are designed to support stakeholders interested in advancing sport and play for education. The recommendations highlight potential action and strategy in the following areas:

- i. Setting the stage
- ii. Design, development and delivery
- iii. Monitoring and evaluation

In considering these issues, CABOS is encouraged to build upon and reinforce existing recommendations made by sport and play stakeholders, notably: SDP IWG 2008; ACSM, Nike and ICSSPE 2012; and Kay and Dudfield 2013).

6.1 Introduction

As the 2015 deadline for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA) goals nears, global discussions on education increasingly focus on the gains and challenges of the last decade. As noted in UNESCO's most recent EFA Global Monitoring Report (UNESCO 2012), while the advancements in primary school enrolment rates are significant, other EFA goals surrounding quality education and early childhood care and education have experienced little comparative growth. Although many children are accessing education in rates higher than ever before, their ability to advance and complete a full cycle of primary education is not well supported in many contexts. Out of the 650 million children enrolled in primary school, 120 million fail to reach Grade 4. These numbers are even lower for secondary enrolment. As a result of underinvestment in education, teachers often enter training programmes with limited subject-specific knowledge. As such, teaching programmes often focus on further developing this knowledge, rather than focusing on pedagogy or effective teaching techniques. It is well supported that inequality in access, poor quality education, limited number and capacity of teachers, and resulting low retention rates have emerged as some of the most serious issues facing education today.

As we move towards a Post-2015 Framework, stakeholders must consider the various reforms and investments needed to effectively address these educational challenges. It is well established that sport and play have innately enjoyable and participatory qualities that, when tapped into effectively, have the power to enhance educational outcomes. In order to achieve these positive outcomes, programmes must be well designed, implemented and evaluated to ensure that the best aspects of sport and play are used (Bailey et al. 2009; Stead and Neville 2010;

Crabbe 2009). Although the ability of sport and play to impact and address these challenges cannot be ascribed to all programmes and is broadly under-evaluated, growing research over the last decade highlights the positive contribution sport and play can make to the healthy cognitive, social, emotional and physical development of children and youth (Hirsh-Pasek and Golinkoff 2008; Ratey 2008; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2010; Bailey 2006; Trudeau and Shephard 2008).

6.2 Purpose of this chapter

Acknowledging the work of the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG), the Commonwealth Secretariat, UNESCO, UNOSDP and many other partners globally, this chapter aims to build on this work and use the experience of Right To Play and its government partners to further articulate how state and non-state actors can use sport and play to reach their educational objectives. Several evaluations have shown that when well designed, sport and play programmes in school can improve academic attitudes, behaviours and overall success (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2010; Ratey 2008; Bailey et al. 2009; Stead and Neville 2010).

This brief paper will not reiterate the evidence in depth, but rather will share Right To Play's experience working with governments and formal education institutions to highlight key components of how these programmes have addressed the challenges. It will also aim to provide guidance on how the stakeholders can begin to use what is already known to strengthen their education systems. Recognising that there is limited available research in this area, particularly from low-income countries, Right To Play will reflect primarily on the evidence and case studies available and personal experience to identify lessons learned and good practises. Right To Play acknowledges the importance and role of sport and play in the delivery of informal education; however, this approach will not be addressed in this chapter.

6.3 Achieving education objectives through sport and play

6.3.1 *Increased engagement in learning, attendance and retention*

A number of studies have shown that education through sport and play allows children and youth to better enjoy and engage

with the learning process, while enhancing social connectedness between participants. This creates an environment more conducive to open communication and encourages a love of learning (McCune 1998; Hirsh-Pasek and Golinkoff 2008; Jeanes 2010; Kay 2009; Crabbe 2009; Colucci 2012).

Evaluations of Right To Play programmes have found that student participation and levels of concentration have increased as a result of participation in sport and play. In an evaluation from Thailand, it was found that students in participating schools were active class participants 77 per cent of the time as compared to students in non-participating schools where that figure was 48 per cent (Right To Play 2008). Some teachers from the evaluation attributed the increase in effective class participation to an enthusiasm about the games through which the students were being taught, as well as the active learning methodologies employed by teachers. Increased motivation to participate in and attend school consistently emerges as a strong outcome for students involved in Right To Play activities, and is associated with long-term outcomes such as increased enrolment and retention in school. This was seen in an external study in rural Azerbaijan, where school principals reported an increase in attendance from 15 to 20 per cent, as well as by teachers in the Thailand evaluation (Harry Cummings and Associates Inc. 2007; Right To Play 2008). In Liberia, findings have confirmed that integration of Right To Play's activities has increased school attendance and performance by giving children incentives to learn (Rothe 2011).

6.3.2 Increased academic achievement

Additional evidence supports that well-designed sport and play programmes can contribute to improved academic performance of students (Bailey et al. 2009; Stead and Neville 2010). A literature review of studies examining the link between school-based physical education and play-based learning programmes and academic outcomes from 11 different countries found: positive associations between general physical activity and academic performance in 79 per cent of the studies; positive associations between classroom or physical play-based learning activities and academic performance in 89 per cent of the studies; and positive associations between extracurricular physical activity and academic performance in 100 per cent of the studies (US Department of Health and Human Services 2010). As highlighted

by additional research, incorporating sport and play in teaching methodologies can enhance cognitive functioning in a variety of ways, ranging from enhancing neurological development and cerebral growth, to optimising the mind-set to improve alertness, attention and motivation by providing a break in cognitive tasks (Ratey 2008; Pellegrini and Smith 1998; Bjorklund and Douglas Brown 1998; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2010). Although there is insufficient evidence to determine the exact catalyst for the change in each individual activity, evaluations of Right To Play programmes have also demonstrated that participants have stronger academic achievement than non-participants, including stronger language and numeracy skills. In Ghana, Benin and Mali, survey participants scored 85 per cent, 83 per cent and 91 per cent respectively on cognitive, attitudinal and behaviour-related tests. This was compared to 62 per cent, 67 per cent and 82 per cent in the same areas for children who were not engaged in sport and play activities (Right To Play 2009).

6.4 How are governments using sport and play to contribute to education objectives?

Recognising growing evidence in this area, some governments have made significant efforts to harness the potential of sport and play to reach their own educational objectives. Right To Play and local partners work with ministries of education to enhance the quality of education through teacher training and curriculum development. To ensure the effective integration of learning through sport and play into the curriculum, teachers are trained in the pedagogy of physical play – either through in-service or pre-service trainings. With coaching and support over time, teachers strengthen their capacity to apply these new approaches in their classrooms, either integrated into existing curricula or as complements to the existing school day structure. Some examples of this work include:

Thailand: In 2010, the Thai Royal Ministry of Education developed a new basic education curriculum that introduced life skills education. Right To Play, the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the Elementary Teachers Federation of Ontario entered into a partnership with the ministry to integrate the use of sport and play for life skills development in the basic primary curriculum.

Benin: Following a national forum on education in 2007, the Republic of Benin’s Ministry of Education (MOE) undertook the

development of an early childhood education programme based on holistic development for children aged two and a half to five. During the curriculum development process, the MOE highlighted an absence of play-based learning – a widely recognised foundation of early childhood development – in the existing programme. To support these reforms in the curriculum, the MOE initiated a working group with Right To Play, the Elementary Teachers Federation of Ontario, the National Institute for Research and Training in Education, and the Department of Preschool Education.

Rwanda: For years Right To Play has worked with UNICEF, the Rwandan Ministry of Education (MOE), the Rwandan Education Board and local partners to ensure holistic child development through the implementation of sport and play programmes in school districts across Rwanda. Following the success of this approach, Right To Play’s Red Ball Child Play and Early Child Play modules were validated by the National Education Board. In 2011, the MOE decided to formally include these approaches into the National Physical Education Curriculum.

Although these examples are relatively too new to assess their full impact, a number of promising approaches and challenges can be extracted from each example and Right To Play’s experience more broadly for governments and other stakeholders with similar goals. The recommendations below have been informed by these case studies.

6.5 Methodology

In each example, governments and partners worked together to tailor existing Right To Play, play-based materials to specific cognitive, physical, emotional and social development outcomes in children and youth. An important component of using sport and play effectively for learning is related to stimulating children’s thinking around a learning outcome of the game they are about to play.

Right To Play’s methodology, entitled ‘Reflect-Connect-Apply’, is based on the work of educationalists such as Freire, Brown, Piaget, Bransford and others, all of whom cumulatively support the concept of an educational process that is active, relevant, reflective, collaborative and applied. The activities are designed for a range of different ages and development stages, and are focused on a variety of key learnings. This methodology has

emerged as a strong indicator of success in assessments of existing sport- and play-based school programmes. As such, it has been adapted by the governments in the above examples and integrated in formal curricula and training.

6.6 Recommendations

The following recommendations, designed to support stakeholders interested in advancing sport and play for education, build upon and reinforce existing recommendations made by sport and play stakeholders. They are not all encompassing, and readers are invited to consider additional recommendations of this nature, notably: SDP IWG 2008; ACSM, Nike and ICSSPE 2012; and Kay and Dudfield 2013 when considering reforms in this area.

Setting the stage

- Conduct reviews of existing curricula to address specific gaps in learning and to tailor interventions to address these gaps.
- Engage a number of stakeholders, including education authorities, parents and teachers, education specialists and academia, to create a holistic approach to childhood development through sport and play.
- Consider environmental conditions that help ensure that sport- and play-based approaches are effective, including the provision of ongoing capacity building and refresher training for teachers (particularly in the areas of inclusion, gender equality and child protection), the provision of safe environments, and investments in infrastructure to create safe play spaces.
- Ensure understanding and support of parents and communities. In many contexts, transmission-based or didactic approaches to education are the norm, and sport- and play-based methods for learning are largely undervalued and unknown to many parents and adults working with children.
- Consult, inform and involve children, parents, parent-teacher associations, communities and educators at all levels to ensure buy in and support. Provide supporting information and research in local languages.

- Promote policies and practises which ensure equity in access, including equitable distribution of resources, engagement in decision-making, participation and leadership, and training with a specific focus on gender equality, inclusion and child protection.
- Provide all schools, including the centres for early childhood development, with infrastructure, sports facilities and equipment for active learning, including land titles where applicable.
- Ensure safe places for active learning and recreation in schools. Develop specific guidelines and policies which align with international standards in child safeguarding (United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child¹) for education institutions.
- Ensure adequate investments for education which promote learning through sport and play, including but not limited to resources for teacher training and ongoing mentorship and support, adaption and delivery of curriculum and training materials, infrastructure, and built-in pilot periods and phased implementation and scaling for reforms.

Evaluations of Right To Play programmes underscore the need for comprehensive and ongoing training for teachers. These evaluations suggest that teachers with training and support demonstrate a more collaborative teaching style. In Thailand, the trainees tested for their appropriate use of child-centred teaching scored 26 per cent higher than their counterparts (Right To Play 2008). Other studies have shown that teachers who received this training were also more likely (up to eight times in Thailand specifically) to use inclusive teaching practices than non-participating teachers (Right To Play 2009; Harry Cummings & Associates Inc. 2007; Berman 2008; Centre for Community Based Research 2008).

Design, development and delivery

- Consider both the integration of sport- and physical play-based learning into existing curricula, and compulsory physical education periods when approaching holistic child development.
- Adapt existing curricula to achieve specific objectives through age-appropriate sport and play activities (i.e. life skills development).

- Adopt a sport- and play-based education methodology that is active, reflective, collaborative and applied.
- Ensure cultural relevance of sport and play activities. This may require significant research, scoping and time by pedagogical experts in country in order to identify and adapt traditional games and activities from different areas of the country.
- Ensure teachers and educational authorities are well trained in the pedagogy of physical play. In many contexts, formal teacher training does not integrate sport and physical play teaching methodology into the curriculum. As such, significant resources are necessary to train trainers and teachers on a national or even provincial scale.
- Ensure ongoing coaching for teachers to support the application of new knowledge and skills. Training in absence of ongoing support is not enough to ensure intended outcomes.
- Ensure that physical education programmes incorporate the use of sport- and play-based learning for holistic health (including sexual and reproductive health).
- Promote the development of disability sport in all educational settings, and ensure teacher training includes adaptive and inclusive play-based activities.
- Ensure all training for educators includes how to adapt activities and create inclusive experiences.
- Engage a number of stakeholders in the consultative process, including educational specialists in pedagogy of physical play and sport- and play-based learning practises, and multiple government ministries and levels of government with shared goals.
- Consider the number of trainers needed to adequately deliver training of teachers over the desired period.
- Build in pilot periods during which new curricula can be tested and adapted.
- Enforce requirements for quality physical education programmes in school timetables, and adopt guidelines for length and age-appropriate activities.

- Invest in opportunities for knowledge sharing and professional development in play-based learning and pedagogy for teachers.
- Use interscholastic sport events to promote educational and health messages.
- Provide opportunities for extracurricular sport and play programmes whenever possible, and build the provision of these programmes into the school culture and mandate.
- Build in incentives for schools and teachers which commit to and demonstrate action towards holistic child development through sport and play.

Monitoring and evaluation

- Ensure that strong structures and frameworks are in place to measure outcomes and conduct research to improve sport- and play-based education methodology.
- Take steps to monitor training of teachers, as well as teacher delivery and understanding of reforms.
- Engage universities, particularly education and social science faculties, in research and monitoring and evaluation.
- Support research and evaluation of existing practises, in particular those that support ongoing and in-depth research and evaluation, and seek to understand which specific components of sport and play programmes are the most effective in targeting education challenges.
- Ensure a cohesive approach to monitoring and evaluation, including clear roles and responsibilities, particularly during the initial planning phases.
- In Thailand, the Royal Thai Ministry of Education and partners designed the Thailand Life Skills Framework and provided capacity building for both teachers and the Education Service Area Office to prepare for monitoring and evaluation of the programme. An impact assessment of the pilot schools was planned for 2013.

In an effort to provide additional support towards research and monitoring and evaluation in Benin, the creation of an Early Childhood Research Center located at the National Institute for Training and Research in Education is currently being explored.

About Right To Play

Right To Play is a global organisation that uses the transformative power of play to educate and empower children facing adversity. Through playing sports and games, Right To Play helps one million children weekly in more than 20 countries to build essential life skills and better futures, while driving lasting social change. Founded in 2000 by four-time Olympic gold medallist and social entrepreneur Johann Olav Koss, Right To Play is headquartered in Toronto, Canada, and has national offices in Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States and regional offices in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. Our programmes are facilitated by more than 600 international staff and 13,500 volunteer coaches.

For more information visit: www.RightToPlay.com

Note

- 1 See: www.unicef.org.uk/Documents/Publication-pdfs/UNCRC_PRESS200910web.pdf (accessed 19 November 2013).

References

- ACSM, Nike and ICSSPE (2012), *Designed to Move: A Physical Activity Action Agenda*, the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM), NIKE, Inc. and the International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education (ICSSPE).
- Bailey, R (2006), 'Physical Education and Sport in Schools: A Review of Benefits and Outcomes', *Journal of School Health*, Vol. 76 No. 8, 397–401.
- Bailey, R, K Armour, D Kirk, M Jess, I Pickup and R Sandford (2009), 'The Educational Benefits Claimed for Physical Education and School Sport: An Academic Review', *Research Papers in Education*, Vol. 24 No. 1, 1–27.
- Berman, L (2008), *Right To Play Indonesia Evaluation: Building Child Rights' Awareness and Promoting Holistic Child & Youth Development*, External evaluation of Right To Play's Indonesia programme (funded by UNICEF and the William J. Clinton Foundation).

- Bjorklund, D and R Douglas Brown (1998), 'Physical Play and Cognitive Development: Integrating activity, cognition, and education', *Child Development*, Vol. 69 No. 3, 604–606.
- Centre for Community-Based Research (2009), 'An Evaluation of Live Safe Play Safe Within the Right To Play Sport and Play Program in Sierra Leone, Rwanda and Ghana', Centre for Community-Based Research (CCBR), Ontario.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2010), The Association Between School-Based Physical Activity, Including Physical Education, and Academic Performance, US Department of Health and Human Services, Atlanta. Available at: www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/health_and_academics/pdf (accessed 19 November 2013).
- Colucci, E (2012), 'Sport as a Tool for Participatory Education – The grassroot soccer methodology', in K Gilbert and W Bennett (Eds.), *Sport, Peace, and Development*, Common Ground Publishing, London, 341–354.
- Comic Relief (2011), Liberia
- Crabbe, T (2009), 'Getting to know you: using sport to engage and build relationships with marginalised young people', in R Levermore and A Beacom (Eds.), *Sport and International Development*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 176–197.
- Harry Cummings and Associates (2007), Evaluation of the SportWorks Program in Azerbaijan for Right To Play, External evaluation of Right To Play's SportWorks programme (funded by Swiss Academy for Development), Toronto.
- Hirsh-Pasek, K and RM Golinkoff (2008), 'Why Play = Learning', in RE Tremblay, RG Barr, R DeV Peters and M Boivin (Eds.), *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development*, Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development, Montreal.
- Jeanes, R (2010), 'Educating through sport? Examining HIV/AIDS education and sport-for-development through the perspectives of Zambian young people', *Sport, Education and Society*, Vol. 18 No. 3, 388–406.
- Kay, T (2009), 'Developing through sport: evidencing sport impacts on young people', *Sport in Society*, Vol. 12 No. 9, 1177–1191.
- Kay, T and O Dudfield (2013), *The Commonwealth Guide for Advancing Development through Sport*, Commonwealth Secretariat, London.
- McCune, L (1998), 'Immediate and Ultimate Functions of Physical Activity Play', *Child Development*, Vol. 69 No. 3, 601–603.

- Pellegrini, AD and P Smith (1998), 'Physical Activity Play: The nature and function of a neglected aspect of play', *Child Development*, Vol. 69 No. 3, 577–598.
- Ratey, J (2008), *Spark: The Revolutionary New Science of Exercise and the Brain*, Little, Brown and Company, New York.
- Rothe, D (2007), *Sport and play for the development of children and youth affected by conflict in Liberia*, Evaluation of the 2008–2011 project directed by Right To Play and funded by Comic Relief.
- Right To Play (2008), 'Thailand South Evaluation: Teaching Practices and Social and Emotional Learning', Right To Play, Toronto.
- Right To Play (2009), 'Life Skills Evaluation: Benin, Mali, and Ghana', Right To Play, Toronto.
- SDP IWG (2008), *Harnessing the Power of Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments*, Right to Play, Toronto.
- Stead, R and M Neville (2010), *The Impact of Physical Education and Sport on Education Outcomes: A Review of Literature*, Institute of Youth Sport, Loughborough.
- Trudeau, F and R Shephard (2008), 'Physical education and school activity, school sports and academic performance', *International Journal of Behavioural Nutrition and Physical Activity*, Vol. 5 No. 10.
- UNESCO (2012), *Youth and skills: Putting education to work*, EFA Global Monitoring Report 2012, UNESCO, Paris.
- UNICEF, Clinton Foundation and Berman, L (2008), Indonesia

Chapter 7

Evaluating the Contribution Sport Makes to Development Objectives in the Pacific

Dr Allison Simons

It is widely acknowledged that there is only limited long-term and systematic research into the effectiveness of sport as a tool for development outcomes. In response the Australian government, through a partnership between the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and the Australian Sports Commission (ASC), has invested approximately A\$2 million to assess the contribution of sport to development outcomes in the Pacific and build the capacity of partners to deliver effective programmes. This investment underpins Australia's commitment to its aid programme, delivering results through evidence-based policy and programmes.

This chapter serves as a case study of this initiative, and includes preliminary findings on the contribution of the Australian Sports Outreach Program (ASOP) initiative to development objectives in the Pacific, drawing on research and data collected to date.

7.1 Introduction and background

The Australian Sports Outreach Program (ASOP) is an Australian government initiative that aims to build the capacity of partners to plan and conduct quality sport-based activities that address locally identified development priorities. This programme, which started in 2006, is funded by the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and is delivered by the Australian Sports Commission (ASC).

ASOP Pacific Country Programs are delivered with government and civil society partners in seven Pacific countries: Fiji Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu.

Through these programmes, ASOP seeks to address three high-level outcomes:

- an increase in healthy behaviours across the Pacific;
- an improvement in social inclusion outcomes for youth, people with disabilities and women; and
- an improvement in social cohesion.

The ASC has engaged Sustineo (a project management, assurance and evaluation professional services firm) to undertake three separate, but interrelated activities:

- to develop and enhance participatory monitoring and evaluation systems to meet the operational needs of the ASOP Pacific Country Programs, and which build local capacity for reflective learning;
- to test whether the ASOP Pacific Country Programs have achieved their stated objectives (that is, their effectiveness) and to ascertain whether there are better ways of achieving these objectives (that is, their efficiency); and
- to contribute to the evidence base for the case for sport in a development context through research.

The focus of this chapter is on the results of the research activities conducted to date, in order to provide some interim insights regarding the contribution of the ASOP Pacific Country Programs to development outcomes in the Pacific.

7.2 Impact of the ASOP Pacific Country Programs

Many claims have been made about the power of sport to contribute to a wide range of social outcomes, but these claims often lack the support of sound evidence (Donnelly et al. 2011). The ‘vacuum created by a lack of systematic and long-term studies’ (Massao and Straume 2011) means that policy-makers often lack the information required to make decisions about sport for development programmes, and about sport for development as a development approach more generally.

The research funded by the ASC across the Pacific will help address this empirical vacuum by building an evidence base for sport for development in the Pacific, in order to assess the impact of the ASOP Pacific Country Programs’ activities. The evidence

gathered can also be used to design better sport for development interventions in the future.

Between June 2012 and February 2013, research was undertaken in Tonga, Vanuatu and Nauru. This research represents the first stage of a multi-year research programme, which will conclude in June 2014.

Through a mixed-method approach that employs both quantitative and qualitative activities, the research seeks to address three main questions:

- How, and to what extent, have the ASOP Pacific Country Programs contributed to a growth in sustained healthy behaviours?
- How, and to what extent, have the ASOP Pacific Country Programs contributed to improving social cohesion?
- How, and to what extent, have the ASOP Pacific Country Programs contributed to improving social inclusion?

Provisional answers to the three research questions – based on the results of the quantitative research in Tonga and the qualitative research in Vanuatu, Tonga and Nauru – are provided below:

How, and to what extent, have the ASOP Pacific Country Programs contributed to a growth in sustained healthy behaviours?

The main healthy behaviour promoted by the ASOP Pacific Country Programs is an increase in physical activity through participation in sport. Other healthy behaviours promoted by the programme include a reduction in kava, alcohol and tobacco consumption and the promotion of a healthy diet. The exact focus of each programme differs depending on locally defined priorities. Research into the impact of the ASOP Pacific Country Programs on improving healthy behaviours was undertaken in Tonga, Vanuatu and Nauru. Only the results from Tonga and Vanuatu are presented here in regards to health-related data, as the Nauru research was still underway at the time of writing.

The ASOP Vanuatu programme (known locally as ‘Nabanga’) has contributed to a significant rise in physical activity for youth and adults. Knowledge and awareness of the benefits of healthy behaviours is also very high and directly linked to the Nabanga programme. This is particularly important considering the lack of health promotion and basic service provision provided by the

government. In this health awareness void, the programme plays a vital role.

On the island of Aniwa in southern Vanuatu, the qualitative data gathered indicates that Nabanga has been directly responsible for a significant increase in physical activity in the vast majority of islanders in the 15-to-40 age range. Each of the participants in that age range play sport at a moderate to intense level, between three and six times per week. This is significantly higher than the recreational physical activity levels that existed before the programme.

A high level of physical activity on Aniwa has also been recorded in a study led by Siefken (cited in Massao and Straume 2011) and in the Vanuatu Ministry of Health *Mini-Steps Survey* (2012). The Siefken study identified high levels of leisure time physical activity (82.6 per cent of men and 89.9 per cent of women); these levels were significantly higher than those recorded on the nearby island of Aneityhium (77.3 per cent of men and 70.7 per cent of women), where the Nabanga programme is not active.

In addition, there is a high awareness of healthy behaviours throughout Aniwa. This awareness has been raised over time through multiple non-communicable disease (NCD) surveys and health promotion through the Nabanga programme. Key informants and participants could recount the dangers of diabetes and high blood pressure, and all of them saw physical activity as the main way to reduce the risk of these negative outcomes, alongside changes in tobacco consumption and the consumption of high-energy foods.

The Nabanga programme has also directly contributed to a rise in awareness of the negative effects of tobacco consumption among the younger male population, and many of those interviewed spoke of reducing smoking during the football season or quitting altogether. Smoking is banned during Nabanga activities, and this ban is enforced by chiefs and others during games. When probed about the reasons for reducing smoking or quitting during the football season, respondents suggested the main reason was to be fitter so they could play football at a more intense level.

In Tonga, the ASOP Country Program focused on the delivery of the Kau Mai Tonga strategic health communication campaign, which aims to increase participation in netball among women in the 15-to-45 age range through mass media approaches. A number of

key messages were disseminated during the 2012 campaign and their recall was tested using a quantitative survey, which was nationally representative. Qualitative research was also undertaken with women in the target age range to understand more about the impact of the programme and the barriers to participation in netball.

The key finding of the quantitative survey is that there was a high level of message recall, demonstrating that the campaign was effective in disseminating health promotion messages. Those respondents who reported having increased their physical activity in the last four months had a significantly higher recall of the campaign messages than those reporting to be less active or those reporting the same levels of physical activity.

Preliminary analysis of the qualitative data suggests that the majority of participants were aware that the aims of the campaign were to increase women's recreational activity in order to improve their health. Some women were initiating netball-related activities in their own communities. Importantly, many participants indicated they had made lifestyle changes since playing netball, including eating a healthier diet, drinking less alcohol and smoking less.

Participants believed there was considerable support to engage in netball from their communities, parents, husbands and from their churches. Many participants commented on more positive community attitudes towards women of all ages being actively engaged in sports; this was a shift from the dominant expectation that married women should stay at home and complete chores and care for their children and families.

How, and to what extent, have the ASOP Pacific Country Programs contributed to improving social cohesion?

The ASOP Pacific Country Programs draw on the convening power of sport to connect youth and adults in inter- and intra-village situations, with a view to improving communication and fostering social cohesion. Research into the impact of the ASOP Country Programs on social cohesion was undertaken in Vanuatu and Nauru.

In summary, the Nabanga programme has directly contributed to a significant improvement in social cohesion on Aniwa Island. The practice of playing sport together, coupled with the increased social interaction engendered by Nabanga activities more generally, has generated a sense of unity that transcends community and religious affiliations.

The most striking impact of the Nabanga programme on Aniwa Island in Vanuatu has been its ability to foster social cohesion on an island suffering from a chronic legal and cultural dispute based on access to the lagoon in the north of the island. The dispute has escalated in recent years, as different groups seek to exploit the lagoon for tourism ventures and other economic opportunities. This conflict, in turn, restricted movement around the island. Personal and social interaction between groups was limited to participation in religious worship and traditional ceremonies.

With the introduction of the Nabanga programme in 2008, representatives from all villages have worked closely through the Nabanga committee to organise sporting activities, and the games have provided a focal point for the communities to interact more regularly. The bonding created through organising and playing sport two days per week has led to a wider range of social and economic negotiation, including exchanging goods, discussing traditional ceremonies and organising labour exchange activities, fundraising and religious events. The Nabanga programme provides an important neutral territory for such social negotiation, which was previously undertaken primarily in village or religious settings.

In addition, sports competitions are sites of social and cultural negotiation and sanction. Traditional *kastom* systems of exchange and ‘sorry’ ceremonies are used to address any issues that may arise on the sports field, which helps address latent conflict and reinforce traditional justice systems.

In Nauru, the inter-community social interaction provided by the ASOP programme (known locally as ‘*Ep’on Keramen*’) has helped foster a broader sense of community within the island. Despite the small size of the island, there was previously little social interaction between communities. Community members tended to reside in their respective villages and typically only interacted at Australian Football League (AFL) matches, which often became adversarial and violent. Despite a strong following, Australian football was banned by the Nauru minister of sport in 2006. Since then, *Ep’on Keramen* has helped build a model of community-driven sporting interaction, which in turn has helped overcome the history of sports-related violence on the island.

How, and to what extent, have the ASOP Pacific Country Programs contributed to improving social inclusion?

The ASOP Pacific Country Programs seek to empower youth, women and people with disability to improve their lives by

building human capital, strengthening self-efficacy and leadership opportunities, and transforming socio-cultural perceptions of physical activity and health. Research into social inclusion issues was undertaken on Aniwa Island and Espiritu Santo in Vanuatu.

Like many other islands in Vanuatu, Aniwa Island is characterised by a lack of economic opportunities and a lack of access to education and health services. It is a place where traditional governance systems remain relatively intact, and where state institutions are conspicuous by their absence. The youth of Aniwa have very limited employment opportunities and rely primarily upon the exploitation of natural resources to make a living, alongside work in traditional gardens. Due to the lack of services and employment opportunities, and the relative abundance of natural resources, the youth of Aniwa spend a large proportion of their time on recreational activities. The qualitative research data indicates that the Nabanga programme has filled a void in the lives of many youth on the island, and has made some inroads into strengthening their self-efficacy. The vast majority of the youth on the island participate in the Nabanga programme as competitors, while some act as officials or work closely with the Nabanga committee in a voluntary capacity.

The Nabanga programme on Espiritu Santo works with a local disability advocacy group, Sanma Frangipani Association, to promote social inclusion and well-being outcomes for people with disability and their families. The programme provides 'Sport Ability' training for volunteers, who deliver inclusive sports programmes in community settings.

Qualitative research indicates that the promotion of sports activities that allow people with disability and able-bodied participants to interact builds self-confidence in children with disability, expands social networks and builds awareness within the community of the ability of children with disability.

Many children with disability interviewed described the increase in self-efficacy and confidence they felt after they realised they could play sport. Beneficiaries appreciated the fact that the programme helped build their confidence, and as a result expanded their social networks and allowed them to make more friends. Playing sport with able-bodied children was particularly important in this regard. There is some evidence that general community activities are being modified in a way to encourage greater participation of children with disability.

The parents and carers of children with disability described an increase in awareness of their child's capability upon watching them play sport, and for some parents this resulted in feeling more engaged with their child. Parents also commented on the importance of feeling supported in the care of their child. All of the parents noted that community attitudes at the village level had changed for the better once people saw children with disability playing alongside their able-bodied friends.

7.3 Conclusion

The ASOP Country Programs are on track to achieve the intended development objectives. Evidence collected from the research activities to date indicates that the programme is contributing to a growth in sustained healthy behaviours, improved social cohesion and improved social inclusion. These findings indicate that sport is being used successfully as a tool to address these development priorities.

The ASC is using the results collected through the research to feed into the continuous improvement of ASOP initiatives. Lessons learned will be applied across the ASOP Country Programs and will inform the design of new projects in the future. Research activities will continue until June 2014. The Australian government is committed to sharing the results of this with the sport for development sector and continuing to build the evidence base for sport as a tool to achieve development outcomes.

Further information

www.ausport.gov.au/supporting/international

www.ausaid.gov.au/aidissues/sport/Pages/default.aspx

References

- Donnelly, P, M Atkinson, S Boyle and C Szto (2011), 'Sport for development and peace: a public sociology perspective', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 32 No. 3, 589–601.
- Massao, PB and S Straume (2011), *Urban Youth and Sport for Development*, UN HABITAT, Nairobi.
- Ministry of Health, Government of Vanuatu (2012), *Mini-Steps Survey of Aniwa Island*.

This page has been intentionally left blank




The Commonwealth

Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) brings the power of sport to solving some of the most difficult challenges of humankind, such as the realisation of the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals.

Commonwealth leaders have consistently endorsed the role that SDP can play in development and peace work, in particular in the domain of youth engagement and empowerment. This collection of papers, commissioned by the Commonwealth Secretariat and the Commonwealth Advisory Body on Sport (CABOS), showcases innovative approaches and examples of effective SDP policies and strategies.

Written by CABOS members, independent experts and agencies, the papers reflect critical thinking and urgent debates among leading scholars and practitioners of SDP.



ISBN 978-1-84929-118-7



9 781849 291187