Title: **Reassessing sport-for-development: moving beyond 'mapping the territory'**

Author(s): Beacom, Aaron and Levermore, Roger

DOI: 10.1080/19406940.2011.627362

Reference: Roger Levermore & Aaron Beacom (2012) Reassessing sport-for-development: moving beyond 'mapping the territory', International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 4:1, 125-137, DOI: 10.1080/19406940.2011.627362

Re-assessing sport-for-development: Moving beyond 'mapping the territory'

Roger Levermore, University of Liverpool[1]

Aaron Beacom, University College Plymouth St Mark and St John

Submission to the *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*

Word Count: 6000 (6900 inclusive of references)

Abstract

Over the past decade, as the efficacy of many development interventions was being challenged, sport based development initiatives appeared to offer alternative conduits for addressing health, education and other developmental concerns. We have, over the past five years, contributed to an emerging body of literature, which has explored the rationale, structure and delivery frameworks underpinning this so-called 'sport-for-development' movement. Commenting on the literature, Lindsey and Grattan are critical of the overt focus on 'Northern' actors engaged with sport-for-development programmes and postulate a 'de-centred' approach (that encompasses a more nuanced understanding of 'Southern voices') thus broadening our comprehension of the development process. This paper constitutes our response to Lindsey and Grattan's contentions, while also

[1] Corresponding author is Dr Roger Levermore. Email: r.j.levermore@liverpool.ac.uk

taking into account Darnell and Hayhurst's rejoinder, which advocates a re-focusing on the global hegemony of key development actors and a critical analysis of Northern led development initiatives. We argue that both papers make valuable contributions, promoting the theorising of sport-for-development discourse through what are in many respects, methodologically rigorous complementary perspectives. Having examined the contribution of these two papers, we consider key issues that are likely to characterise the future trajectory of sport-for-development discourse thus taking the debate beyond 'mapping the territory'. These issues include the power relations in sport-for-development, the evolving contribution of sports INGOs as key actors in sport-for-development and the challenge of evaluating development processes. The paper highlights the importance of engaging with the established mainstream development discourse that provides an extensive body of theory through which to construct a critical assessment of sport-for-development. This is evident for example, in contending theories relating to the process of evaluating the impact of development interventions. The paper concludes by highlighting the importance of listening to the voices of all stakeholders involved in the sport-for-development process if the significance of such interventions is to be fully understood.

Keywords: sport, development, power, stakeholders, evaluation, agency

Introduction

Having attempted, in the articles and book chapters we have authored jointly or separately, to address what we saw as a resurgence in the use of sport in social and economic development, we welcome the papers by Lindsey and Grattan and Darnell and Hayhurst as they move the debate beyond what has often been characterised as 'mapping the territory'. Especially important is the way in which they engage with bodies of theory that provide alternative perspectives on the sport-for-development process. Both have broadened the scope of sport-for-development debate and challenge some of the widespread assertions made in this sub-discipline to date. In particular, they have prompted us to read and apply more extensively, literature from across the social sciences. This article details these wider debates. It considers some of the key issues emerging from both papers and in light of those, what concerns might need to be addressed through future research and writing around sport-for-development. Specifically, we consider the imperative to promote voices from areas/fields that, until now, have been somewhat neglected, especially in highlighting how far localised sport-for-development can operate with relative freedom from international, top-down influence. We divide this work into four sections. First, we position the two papers within the context of wider sport-for-development literature. We then focus on three of the issues that have emerged from reading these papers and related literature from the social sciences. These are:

- The degree to which development can be de-centred
- The tension between de-centring sport-for-development and the continued agendas of 'Northern' based sports INGOs
- The challenge of establishing evaluative frameworks with the capacity to identify the impact of sport-for-development programmes.

The contribution of these debates in the context of the literature on sport and international development

While the idea of engaging with sport in a development context is not new (Levermore and Beacom 2009), the surge of activity that has taken place over the course of the past decade has generated considerable interest within the academic community. Levermore and Beacom (see for example Levermore 2008a, 2008b; Levermore and Beacom 2009) set out to chart the trajectory of sport-for-development through its formative years. This has extended more recently to include in-depth analyses of aspects of the sport-for-development debate including the role of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in sport-for-development (Levermore 2010, 2011a), evaluation (Levermore 2011b) and diplomacy (Beacom, in press). Through our attendance and participation in a series of conferences beginning in 2005, we opened up a dialogue with a number of policy makers, academics and field workers. Of particular note were contacts made during the UN sponsored sport-for-development conference in Magglingen (2005).[i] This engagement also provided the opportunity to attempt to initiate discussion with the mainstream development community – a process which demonstrated the often peripheral position of sport in the wider international development movement. It cumulated in a series of papers being commissioned and delivered at the ISA Congress in Chicago in 2007. Authors included those working in academia or at senior level in international sport-for-development organisations as well as those engaged in field work. These papers formed the basis for the text *Sport and International Development* (Levermore and Beacom 2009). Given this context, the terms of reference for a significant proportion of the book was drawn from discourses concerned with international policy and

strategic issues encountered in the international conference circuit. At the same time, contributions have, through reflecting on field work and action research, provided critical commentary on organisations engaged in sport-for-development

Although few have deconstructed the pervasiveness of the power of the 'international system' there have been many instances of calls for the top-down reading of sport-for-development to be re-read and contested in terms of the hegemonic power of Northern actors as Darnell and Hayhurst note in their paper in this edition of the journal. These works have built upon core development studies contentions (especially emanating from post-colonialism perspectives) that powerful discourses in development should be questioned and challenged. Lewis *et al.*, (2008) for example call for representations/understanding of development to be widened further. Lindsey and Grattan, exploring the subject from the perspective of sport-for-development, provide an alternative interpretivist approach focusing on the experiences of actors in the Global South. In extending their critique of the generalised nature of writing on sport-for-development, they highlight the limitations of the critical literature based on neo-colonial and dependency theories. In this, they refer to Giulianotti's (2004) idea of neo-colonial re-positioning through sport-for-development, and the contention that sport-for-development does little to address this unequal relationship. Again the basis of the criticism is the generalised nature of such writing, which is not rooted in field experience. Their contention of the 'long chain' between large Northern donor organisations and delivery on the ground opens up a rather different critical perspective on the current delivery of sport-for-development. It suggests that within these linkages there is considerable scope for disjoint with support not necessarily filtering through or the original objectives of the

donor agency being lost in translation. There is perhaps scope for Lindsey and Grattan to extend their research by further examination of how these relationships evolve in the context of specific case studies and linking this to mainstream development literature which addresses the tension between the needs and expectations of different stakeholders in the development process (Menocal and Mulley 2006).

To elaborate further, although the literature has highlighted the inherent tensions and unequal power in sport-for-development relations and called for there to be more alternative narratives emerging from 'Global South' localities, Lindsey and Grattan identify a gap in sport-for-development literature. This is the relative dearth of research into how sport-for-development takes place in local environments with little (or less than presumed) influence from international, Northern institutions, networks and political, economic and cultural 'pressures'. In other words, the extent to which decentralisation, assertion of localism, independence from the 'world (capitalist) system' occurs, is indeed largely lacking in much sport-for-development literature. Instead, there has largely been (not least in our works) an implicit and explicit acceptance that sport-for-development is a 'top-down', principally 'Global North'-led process and that all sport-for-development programmes are shaped to various degrees by this international process; limiting the possibility of them operating some level of independence. As such, although the two case studies developed by Lindsey and Grattan cannot be generalised, they do provide an indicator for those who conduct sport-for-development research. Similar concerns have been raised in related leisure studies literature; Bouchet and Harvey (2010, 17-18) note that, 'Thanks to the

ongoing withdrawal of the State *per se*, roles have changed, leaving greater initiative to the local communities and to the business organisations that almost everywhere help launch new forms of leisure activities'. Similarly, Klein (2009, 1119) argues that variations exist in the power relations of developing nations and sport 'behemoths' and this includes displacing 'normal hegemonic mechanisms of control'. Given that the disciplines of human geography, development studies, economics, history, sociology, politics and others are consulted to inform the sport-for-development analysis – and all have much to say about power/space relationships - such a gap is a significant one.

We believe that Lindsey and Grattan also add to the debate on the 'folly of categorisation', so well expressed by McFarlane (2006, 1413), where 'categorisation is an endless pursuit'; the challenges of development are common to rich and poor country alike. Regions are so different economically, politically and culturally, that they cannot be grouped together. It is a failure of Western thinking that continually seeks a binary code. A common term is used in this and other work: to 'pluralise "the South"' – to encourage other readings/content homogenous narratives. The categories 'are active imaginative barriers that militate against the possibilities of different countries to learn from one another' (McFarlane 2006, 1415). There is, he argues, a tendency to learn only from a small cluster of similar speaking countries. This leads to the contention that what is required is a more globally informed social science, which pluralises production of knowledge.

Moreover, the Lindsey and Grattan and Darnell and Hayhurst papers prompted us to review the social sciences literature, and to reflect on the validity of research to date. In re-reading issues related to power relations, authors such as Edwards (1989, 123) ask whether development writing is out of the reach of audiences that are to a large extent the focus of the literature (the recipient of aid)? This is often because the cost of development publications is prohibitive for many who live in the 'Global South' who could contest/question what has been written. For example, although our publications have been written by, and focused at, policy makers, academics, field workers and students, it was still a shock to discover the prohibitive cost of many sport-for-development articles/books, for libraries/universities across sub-Saharan Africa who wish to purchase them. For example, in South Africa (a country with relatively easy access to development literature), the price of our *Sport and International Development* edited text (Levermore and Beacom 2009) is sold for three times the cost at which it can be purchased in the UK (£120 compared to £40). Therefore, reading the Lindsey and Grattan article also triggers in our minds a relevance to some of the key issues articulated in Edwards's (1989, 117) seminal paper that critiqued concepts of development, including post-colonialism as embodying 'a series of attitudes that contribute to the irrelevance of much of their output to the problems of the world in which we live'. This is because, 'In much …development work, the advice we put forward cannot be used locally because it is manufactured under completely different circumstances' (127). This means that many who write about Development Studies engage in 'a spectator sport, with a vast array of experts and others looking into the 'fishbowl' of the Third World from the safety and comfort of their armchairs' (Edwards 1989: 124).

Core sport-for-development discourses in the future

Having considered the direction of recent discourses relating to sport-for-development, we now briefly introduce three areas of concern that we feel need to be addressed in future debates relating to this aspect of development. The first, developing out of Lindsey and Grattan's contention regarding local stakeholders having agency, focuses on the extent to which local communities are subject to varying levels of international influence in the development process. Building from this is the second area, which suggests we examine critically motivations behind the increasing engagement of sports INGOS in sport-for-development projects. The third concentrates on ongoing concerns with evaluating the impact of programmes, which is also touched upon in the Lindsey and Grattan article.

Sport-for-development: Nuances of power based on spatiality?

As stated in the introduction, our reading of the original article and its response inspired us to a wider reading of the social sciences literature. This has prompted deeper reflection of the sport-for-development work in general and our work in particular. This section refers to the idea that the literature to date has privileged the view that development at a local level is heavily influenced by 'interactions with the Global North' and therefore failed to properly recognise that there could be some degree of independence for local development from global development processes/pressures.

Recognition of the growing prominence and self-determination of 'the local' (in contrast to charting what happens at the local level and noting how these are shaped by global pressures/influences) is evident in different contexts throughout the

disciplines that have informed sport-for-development discourse (for example sociology, history, management studies and development studies). This was particularly well-documented at the turn of the century within development geography. For Bebbington and Bebbington (2001), research on civil society and alternative perspectives of development understated the diversity of organisations and local development programmes that existed around the world. There was an over-generalisation of the extent to which power residing in the 'Global North' influenced micro development and a failure to take into account the 'multi-scalarity' that exists in power relations at varying levels (Coe *et al.* 2004, 468). What was needed was the retheorisation of development in general and 'local development' more specifically, by incorporating better geographical analysis to feature de-centred development approaches (Bebbington 2003). This relates to Brohman's (1995, 121-122) contention that actual development experiences of different societies have been simplified and distorted in an attempt to look for similarities with Western (neoliberal and modernisation) notions of development; 'Geographical and historical diversity at the global, national and local/regional scales needs to be recognised within development frameworks, especially those designed to contribute towards policy making'. This results in 'Local self-confidence [being]… undermined and most grassroots social groups and popular organisations have been blocked from acquiring the knowledge and skills that they need to analyse and solve problems for themselves' (Brohman 1995, 130). Building on this, Edwards (1989, 124) argues that this situation 'prevents the transformation of people into agents of their own development by retarding the sharing of knowledge and information. The monopoly needs to be broken so that people become able to participate fully in the creation and use of their own knowledge. If this is not done, research and information will

continue to circulate in a close circuit from which poor people will always be excluded'.

However, although variations in the location of power undoubtedly exist throughout development, on balance, we continue to side with the argument that power relations in sport-for-development are skewed more towards 'the international' than it is to de-centred local contexts. Again, such a position is well-documented across the development studies and the social sciences. For Bouchet and Harvey (2010, 20), 'Global South' countries operating/existing in a space that is in some ways de-centred is very hard to conceptualise. The capitalist system is about unevenness and is beset by contradictions as 'Capitalist expansion links localities and people across global space, with commodity chains running from fruit farmers in Chile to dinner tables in North and Latin America' (Bebbington 2003, 300). Ito (2011) provocatively argues that notions of 'de-centring' are the latest examples of neo-liberal buzzwords and therefore examples of empty rhetoric. Indeed, focusing too much on 'the local' can underplay inequalities in the development process and hinder the opportunity to redress unequal power relations (Mohan and Stokke, 2010).

A different argument is presented by sociological perspectives on 'network identities' which contend that the 'power of the international' can be inherent in the make up of many people's identity around the world as the globalisation/Westernisation of educational and cultural networks can influence outlook, thus weakening 'de-centred' identities (Mau *et al*. 2008). This process can affect those who have not travelled beyond their local or national boundary (this process is incredibly complex as the work of Delanty (2006) on critical

cosmopolitanism demonstrates).For example, the prominent neoliberal Zambian economist, Dembisa Moyo, recognised that she needed to travel to the seats of power in order to get her message across; in other words, she became part of a cosmopolitan, international community (CNN 2009).

In light of these two factors, researching in sub-Saharan Africa can be particularly problematic. For example, Adams and Megaw (1997) noted how research can lack a certain 'neutrality' because of "researchers' power" and their epistemological make-up that can include the influence of cosmopolitan identity. With reference to the Lindsey and Grattan paper, it might be argued from these perspectives that they themselves do not truly break away from power relations in their work. How far were their research choices, methods, questions, choice of journal for publication, surveys etc., underlined by implicit power relations? Was the underlying epistemology of the sports listed as being used for development– themselves Western creations – questioned? Furthermore, we wonder how far subtle forms of the influence of the cosmopolitan international community has been hidden in the language/terminology used in the semi-structured interviews and in the cultural and educational affects on those Zambians who helped shape the research? The following section progresses this stance in locating power relations amongst stakeholders in sport-for-development.

Re-appraising the actors: The IOC, power relations and sport-for-development

Notwithstanding arguments concerning the recognition of Southern based organisations as having agency in international development and the need to adopt a more de-centred approach to researching sport-for-development, the evolution and

governance of sports INGOs suggests that power relations continue to be 'top down' and Northern dominated. Efforts to develop linkages between the objectives of key international sports organisations, for example the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and International Federation of Association Football (FIFA), and wider development objectives, have been evident for some time (Samaranch 2001, Loland 2006), despite the apparent tension between, participatory sport-for-development initiatives (typically with social, educational and health objectives) and the predominantly elite performance focus of sports INGOs (Hayhurst and Frisby 2010). Given the volume of recent academic literature concerning sport-for-development, it is surprising that there has not been more focus on the efforts of such organisations, in particular the engagement of the Olympic Movement, as a principal sports INGO, with the wider international development agenda. This is significant in relation to arguments presented by Darnell and Hayhurst since it links to wider matters concerning power relations within the development agenda as organisations such as the IOC position themselves on the global stage in part through engagement with an increasing range of development initiatives (Henry and Al-Tauqi 2008). At the same time, while theorising at this level of analysis, we do not perhaps take into account sufficiently, the ways in which people living in the Global South, experience sports-based development projects including those initiated by large sports INGOs such as the IOC. In this sense, Lindsey and Grattan's argument concerning the 'multiple realities' of development projects, with the capacity of local actors to 'contextualise, re-interpret, resist, subvert and transform international development agendas' takes on added meaning.

Since the emergence of the UN sponsored Sport for Development and Peace movement in 2002, opportunities for the Olympic movement to engage in development through sport, have become more apparent and the IOC have been developing links with the UN as it expands this aspect of its interests. The IOC *Sports for Hope* initiative will for example, extend the influence of the organisation through the development of a series of *Sports for Hope* centres.[ii] The pilot centre in Lusaka, Zambia (operational in 2010) provides the opportunity to combine training with education programmes –including 'education on the values of Olympism'.[iii] This, at time of writing, is to be followed by a second Olympic Youth Development Centre in Haiti, which would again aim to combine sport, education and healthcare programmes. Such activities have considerable potential to enhance the profile of the IOC internationally and are likely to feature increasingly in IOC planning.

Such activity is not new and relates also to development initiatives that essentially responded to growing concerns with the asymmetry evident across Olympic sport. Henry and Al-Tauqi (2008) provide an interpretation of the growth of the Olympic Movement's development arm, Olympic Solidarity, from the perspective of core-periphery (developed states – developing states) relations. Their central contention is that the origins of the Olympic movement resides in the Global North, as well as the subsequent tensions emanating from bi-polar Cold-War politics, which are played out through the development phases of Olympic Solidarity and its predecessors. They argue that the emergence of the Committee of International Olympic Aid (CIOA), the precursor to Olympic Solidarity, emerged in part, as a result of pressure from Soviet members of the IOC who were 'apparently keen to champion and be seen to be championing the notion of aid to the newly independent states' (Henry

and Al-Tauqi 2008, 360). In that sense, the activities of the CIOA can be interpreted as part of wider 'aid diplomacy' discourse that was taking place against the backdrop of the Cold War.

The significance of sport-for-development initiatives as a mechanism to enhance the international recognition and legitimacy of the Olympic Movement, should then, not be underestimated. Historically this became particularly apparent during periods when the IOC felt threatened by alternative global sporting forces, for example through the emergence of alternative sports organisations such as the Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEFO). The sponsoring of athletes through Olympic Solidarity funds and the resourcing of a range of coach development programmes designed to support NOCs in the Global South can be seen in the context of this imperative to enhance the image of the Games and to retain international legitimacy (Chatziefstathiou, *et al.* 2008).[iv] Such forms of IOC engagement would appear to challenge Lindsey and Grattan's argument that sport-for-development is not necessarily/always a Northern led project. Despite increasing international representation the IOC is inherently a Northern construct in terms of organisational structure, governance and membership (Guttmann 1994) and plays an increasingly prominent role in the international sports industrial complex. In his critique of the Movement, Eichberg (1997, 100) argued that the IOC as; 'an oligarchic, self-co-opting organisation with world-wide monopolistic tendencies, lacks democratic structure, legitimation and control from below'. He went on to contest that although a social problem from the very beginning, this was not regarded as a special political problem as long as the IOC members were - elected or not - a mirror of the nations and cultures represented in the Olympic Games. However, since the decolonisation

of Africa and Asia and the rise of non-European sports movements, the balance of participating nations has changed, and the Olympic structure now demonstrates a remarkable national-cultural inequality. This he noted; 'has resulted in increasing tensions between UNESCO, where the non-European countries form a solid majority, and the IOC, where Western and European members still dominate'.

While such contentions would appear to support the idea of a sport-for-development movement dominated by organisations based in the Global North this perception of Northern hegemony, which has characterised much of the literature relating to sport-for-development, is in turn the basis for Lindsey and Grattan's critical assessment of existing literature. This criticism centres not on the contribution of such key international actors, rather it draws attention to the extent to which local actors can 'contextualise, reinterpret, resist, subvert and transform' their agendas. What limits this perspective however, is the nature and extent of the case study research. In relation to the work of the IOC for example, while testimonials and accounts of those in receipt of Solidarity funding demonstrates the variety of ways in which individual athletes and governing bodies relate to such programmes,[v] they do not constitute the basis for a rigorous assessment of the relationship between the various stakeholders involved in the process. Beyond the generalisability of core issues identified in Lindsey and Gratton's case studies, such as indigenous perceptions of the value of sport as a conduit for social and community development, the limits of their research becomes apparent. For example, the central claim relating to their two case studies (based on thirty seven interviews across the two sites), of the lack of direct support from donor organisations reaching the ground (and the level of dependency of recipients, on that support), may indeed be open to challenge in the context of

Olympic Solidarity initiatives. This can however, only be established through further case study work.

Ownership and evaluation of sport-for-development programmes: unfinished business

The increase in rhetoric concerning the capacity of sport-based initiatives to deliver a range of social, economic and developmental goals (for example as expressed by the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group 2008) has led to heightened concerns as to how the impact of sport based initiatives can be quantified. Such unease has been translated into research projects, for example from a UK perspective, the *Value of Sport Monitor* commissioned by Sport England and UK Sport (Coalter 2006) through which efforts have been made to create an evaluative framework. Nevertheless anxiety is still evident. Coalter (2007, 68) indicates that the 'intellectual incoherence' evident in the engagement of sport-for-development in the domestic context is also evidenced at an international level where expectations for sport to deliver are even greater. Lindsey and Grattan echo this in identifying the general assumption among their interviewees, that sport can contribute to the realisation of a range of social and community goals, including the notion that it can 'bring together' young people and the associative value of participation in sport, diverting young people away from a range of anti-social or illegal activities. Discourse relating to the evaluation of sport-for-development initiatives is likely to evolve not just at the technical level of devising empirical frameworks for quantifying impact but also in the sense of critiquing evaluative regimes as articulating wider concerns regarding the distribution of power and control within the development process. Lindsey and Grattan contend that evaluation is dominated

by a ‘rationalistic and managerial approach’ in which the terms of reference are determined by donor organisations and in which there is no meaningful dialogue with other partners in the development process.

Within the wider development discourse, these rationalistic managerial perspectives are apparent at a number of levels. Levermore (2011a, 340) refers to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP 2009, 5), which notes that ‘without effective planning, monitoring and evaluation, it would be impossible to judge if work is going in the right direction, whether progress and success can be claimed and how future efforts might be improved’. The World Bank has been working for a number of years, on the production of the World Development Indicators (The World Bank 2010).[vi] The range and diversity of these indicators suggests an appreciation of the complexity of international development and the limitations of considering development as a linear process, where evaluation is based on measuring the causal relationship between interventions and outcomes. At the same time, alternative evaluative discourses are evident in a range of general developmental contexts (Savedoff, *et al.* 2006, Guijt, *et al.* 2011). In responding to the need for alternative perspectives Coalter (2009) focuses on the potential to democratise evaluation, engaging with partners in a more meaningful way and considering the process as formative rather than summative. In this sense, Coalter (2010) contends that evaluation should be considered as part of ongoing programme development rather than the legitimation of international organisations and lobbies. A number of organisations have emerged in response to widespread apprehension about evaluative processes, for example, the International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) which was initiated in 2002 (DAC 2001).[vii] This was followed

by the Centre for Global Development which set up the Evaluation Gap Working Group in 2004 and has continued to focus on anxiety from within the development community about evaluation (Clemens and Demomlynes 2010). It is important that all stakeholders engaged in the process of sport-for-development, have the opportunity to engage with these wider discourses, if meaningful evaluative processes are to be established.

Notwithstanding contending arguments relating to the evaluative process, the imperative for stakeholders to demonstrate the efficacy of programmes in the context of their longer-term sustainability will continue to characterise the development agenda. As enablers and activators, there is an expectation that organisations (whether indigenous or international) will contribute to the development of infrastructures and capacity building, that ensure initiatives have the potential to be self-perpetuating. In this sense, the Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness and the subsequent Accra Agenda for Action (OECD 2005/2008) presented the terms of reference for development activity, that has influenced how major providers, such as Right To Play, approach delivery and evaluation of programmes (Beacom and Read 2011). While this does not refute Darnell and Hayhurst's (2011) contention that development processes continue to be framed by hegemonic neo-liberal interests, it does however, call into question the notion of a clear delineation between 'donors' and 'recipients' and develops the idea of mutual responsibility. It suggests that there is increased potential for participatory evaluative processes that can, through a formative approach, contribute in a meaningful way to the enhancement of sport-for-development initiatives.

Concluding thoughts

This paper has provided the authors with a welcome opportunity to comment on the direction of discourse relating to sport-for-development. In particular, we have been able to acknowledge the value of arguments presented by Lindsey and Grattan that suggested the need for a more 'de-centred' approach to investigation of the sport/development relationship, which would enable the researcher to unpack the multiple realities determining how sport-for-development is experienced. Central to this argument is the contention that explaining and understanding social phenomena is a complex business that requires a better appreciation of the nuances of power relations as well as a re-assessment of methodologies employed and the motivation behind such research. At the same time we have been able to consider Darnell and Hayhurst's rejoinder which, while acknowledging the value of Lindsey and Grattan's argument, stressed the need to retain a focus on the geo-political perspective that, through unequal power relations and distribution of authority, continues to set the terms of reference for sport based development initiatives (although it should be acknowledged that Lindsey and Grattan did recognise the significance of these macro level issues and indeed their research is framed within a particular perspective of the international development process). From there, we have had the opportunity to suggest issues that are likely to feature in future discourse relating to the sport-for-development.

Lindsey and Grattan's argument does go some way to encouraging a more nuanced approach to the investigation of sport-for-development. While the experience of field workers and other stakeholders engaged with the delivery of sport-for-development, has been discussed (Levermore and Beacom 2009), this was against the background

of development frameworks instituted by Northern donors. The contribution that Lindsey and Grattan make is to foreground these considerations, in the process questioning the methodologies employed in seeking to explain and understand what it means to engage in sport for the purposes of development. This prompted us to return to the rich seam of development and other social sciences literature that explores these issues from a range of perspectives and from contending ideological positions. Indeed, if there is any one message that has come from the exercise, it is to encourage anyone seeking to understand the idea of sport-for-development to explore this literature. Sport-for-development is an activity, not an academic discipline, nor indeed should it aspire to be. The theoretical underpinnings of the development process are well established and continue to evolve and commentators should engage with these.

In considering the focus of future discourse, we have identified three areas. First, the issue of where power and authority are located within the development process was considered. This opened up more fundamental questions about ownership and control of the wider development process. While these issues are dealt with at length within development literature, it also opens up debate regarding the appropriateness of distinguishing between the international and domestic development agenda. We then considered the issue of actors in the sport-for-development process and the tendency, in literature addressing the characteristics and governance of sports INGOs, to pay little attention to the rationale and resourcing of sport-for-development programmes that they initiate. The work of the IOC, particularly through Olympic Solidarity, for example, demonstrates many of the concerns relating to the Northern hegemony of sport-for-development as a movement. Yet, the

asymmetry evident in sporting infrastructure between the so-called one third and two thirds worlds and the commitment of the IOC to retain its international reach, has led to its increasing investment in development projects. The efficacy of these projects requires further exploration and this should include the adoption of a case study approach in order to understand relationships between the various stakeholders in the process. Finally, the paper identified the heightened significance of evaluation of sport-for-development initiatives. This was considered in the context of the wider methodological challenge of effectively assessing social interventions that do not, by definition, lend themselves easily to empirical analysis. At another level the ownership of evaluative processes is part of the wider debate about ownership and control of the development agenda. Donors are likely to continue to demand accountability. How that is provided and by whom will continue to form the basis of much debate.

We have valued this opportunity to engage in healthy ongoing dialogue regarding the issues that have framed sport-for-development literature. Future research and writing on the subject can only be meaningful if it engages more effectively with all stakeholders involved with the development process. This means listening to the voices of communities where sports based interventions are being considered, as well as the views of policy makers and funding bodies working in Northern and Southern policy arenas.

References:

Adams, W.A., and Megaw, C.C., 1997. Researchers and the rural poor: Asking questions in the Third World. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 21(2), 215-229.

Beacom, A., (in press). "Sport in the City": Sub-state diplomacy and the Olympic Bid. *In:* S. Harris and A. Adams, editors, *Sport for Sports Sake: Theoretical and practical insights in sports development.* Southampton: Leisure Studies Association.

Beacom, A., and Read, L., 2011. Right To Play: Sustaining Development Through Sport, *In*: B. Houlihan and M. Green, editors, *Routledge Handbook of Sports Development.* London: Routledge, pp. 337-352.

Bebbington, A., 2003. Global Networks and Local Developments: Agendas for Development Geography. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 94(3), 297-309.

Bebbington, A.J., and Bebbington, D.H., 2001. Development alternatives: practice, dilemmas and theory. *Area*, 33(1), 7-17.

Brohman, J., 1995. Universalism, Eurocentrism, and Ideological Bias in Development Studies: From Modernisation to Neoliberalism. *Third World Quarterly*, 16(1), 121-140.

Bouchet, P., and Harvey, J., 2010. Leisure and North-South Relations. *Loisir & Sociéte (Society & Leisure)*, 33(1), 17-22.

Clemens, M., and Demomlynes, G., 2010. When Does Rigorous Impact Evaluation Make a Difference? The case of the Millennium Villages. *Centre For Global Development Working Paper 225.* Centre For Global Development. http://www.cgdev.org/contact/publications/detail/1424496 (accessed 19 July 2011)

Chatziefstathiou , D., Henry, I.P., Al-Tauqi, M. and Theodoraki, E., 2008, Cultural Imperialism and the Diffusion of Olympic Sport in Africa: A Comparison of Pre- and Post- Second World War Contexts. H.Ren and L.DaCosta editors *Olympic Studies Reader*. Barcelona: Centre d'Estudis Olímpics.278-292.

Coalter, F., 2006. *Sport-in-Development: A Monitoring and Evaluation Manual*. London: UK Sport.

Coalter, F., 2007. *A Wider Social Role for Sport: Who's Keeping the Score?* London: Routledge.

Coalter, F., 2009. Sport-in-Development: Accountability or Development? *In*: R. Levermore and A. Beacom, editors, *Sport and International Development.* Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 55-75.

Coalter, F., 2010. The Politics of Sport for Development: Limited Focus Programmes and Broad Gauge Problems? *International Review of the Sociology of Sport.* 45(3) 295-315.

CNN, 2009. Interview with Dembiya Moyo. Accessed from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BHKa4qiIegM, (accessed 6 July 2011).

Coe, N.M., *et al.*, 2004. 'Globalizing' regional development: a global production networks perspective. *Transactions: Institute of British Geography*, 29, 468-484.

Corbridge, S., 1993. Marxisms, modernities, and moralities: development praxis and the claims of distant strangers. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 11, 449-472.

DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation, 2001. *International Development Evaluation Association – an update (document 10)* http://www.oecd.org/secure/pdfDocument/0,2834,en_21571361_34047972_31736128_1_1_1_1,00.pdf (accessed 19 July 2011).

Delanty, G., 2006. The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1), 25-47.

Edwards, M., 1989. The Irrelevance of Development Studies. *Third World Quarterly*, 11(1), 116-135.

Eichberg H., 1997. *Body Cultures – Essays on Sport, Space and Identity*, London: Routledge.

FIFA (undated) *Football For Hope: Football's commitment to social development.* http://www.fifa.com/mm/document/afprograms/worldwideprograms/footballforhope_e_47827.pdf (accessed 19 July 2011)

Guilanotti, R., 2004. Human Rights, Globalization and Sentimental Education: The Case of Sport. *Sport in Society*, 7 (3), 355-369.

Guijt, I. *et al.* 2011. Evaluation Re-visited: Improving the Quality of Evaluation Practice by Embracing Complexity, (conference report) *Centre for Development Innovation* (online) http://contextinternationalcooperation.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/evaluationrevisitedconferencereport.pdf (accessed 30 June 2011)

Guttmann, A., 1994. *Games & Empires: modern sports and cultural imperialism.* Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Hayhurst, L., and Frisby, W., 2010. Inevitable Tensions: Swiss and Canadian Sport-for-Development NGO Perspectives on Partnerships with High Performance Sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly.* 10 (1) 75-96.

Henry, I., and Al-Tauqi, M., 2008. The Development of Olympic Solidarity: West and Non-West (Core & Periphery) Relationships in the Olympic World. *International Journal of the History of Sport.* 25(3) 355-369.

Ito, T., 2011. Historicizing the power of civil society: a perspective from decentralization in Indonesia. *The Journal of Peasant Studies.* 38(2), 413-433.

Klein, A., 2009. The transnational view of sport and social development: the case of Dominican baseball. *Sport in Society,* 12 (9), 1118-1131.

Levermore, R., 2011a. Evaluating sport-for-development: Approaches and critical issues. *Progress in Development,* 11(4), 339-353.

Levermore, R., 2011b. Analysing the extent to which evaluation of corporate social responsibility for development through sport is conducted. *Third World Quarterly,* 32(3), 551-562.

Levermore, R., 2010. CSR for development through sport: Examining its potential and limitations. *Third World Quarterly,* 31(2), 223-241.

Levermore, R., 2008a. Sport-in-International Development: Time to Treat it Seriously? *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 14(2), 55-66.

Levermore, R., 2008b. Sport: a new engine of development? *Progress in Development,* 8, 183-190.

Levermore, R., and Beacom, A., 2009. *Sport and International Development.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Lewis, D., Rodgers, D., and Woolcock, M., 2008. The Fiction of Development: Literary Representation as a Source of Authoritative Knowledge. *Journal of Development Studies*, 44(2), 198-216.

Loland, S., 2006. Olympic Sport and the Ideal of Sustainable Development. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport.* 8, 144-156.

Mau, S., Mewes, J., and Zimmermann, A., 2008. Cosmopolitan attitudes through transnational social practices? *Global Networks* 8(1), 1-24.

McFarlane, C., 2006. Crossing borders: development, learning and the North-South divide. *Third World Quarterly*, 27(8), 1413-1437.

Menocal, A. and Mulley, S., 2006. Learning from Experience? A review of recipient-government efforts to manage donor relations and improve the quality of aid. *Overseas Development Institute Working Paper 268.* London: ODI. http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/1372.pdf (accessed 19 July 2011)

Mohan, G., and Stokke, K., 2000. Participatory development and empowerment: The dangers of localism. *Third World Quarterly*, 21(2), 247-268.

OECD, 2005/2008. *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action.* (online) http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/11/41/34428351.pdf (accessed 1 July 2011).

Olympic Solidarity (2009) *Where the Action Is: 2009 – 2012 Quadrennial Plan.* Lausanne: IOC. http://www.olympic.org/Documents/PDF_files_0807/os_2009_2012_en.pdf (accessed 22 July 2011)

Samaranch, J., 2001. The Olympic Movement. *ICHPER – SD Journal.* 37(2) 4-11.

Savedoff, W., Levine, R., and Birdsall, N., 2006. Will We Ever Learn? Improving Lives Through Impact Evaluation, *Centre for Global Development.* (online) http://www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/7973 (accessed 27 June 2011)

Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group, 2008. *Sport for Development and Peace: Recommendations to Governments.* http://www.righttoplay.com/International/news-and-media/Documents/SDP%20IWG%20Final%20Report_light.pdf (accessed 12 July 2011)

The World Bank, 2010. *World Development Indicators.* Washington: The World Bank.

United Nations Development Programme. (2009) *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results.* New York: UNDP.

USAID, 2009. *Trends in International Development Evaluation Theory, Policy and Practice.* http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADQ464.pdf (accessed 19 July 2011)

Notes

[i] The Magglingen Declaration (2005) set the general objectives and terms of reference for the sport-for-development movement.

[ii] There appear to be a number of similarities between the structure and delivery framework of this initiative and the *Football for Hope* programme run by FIFA (FIFA undated). Here again, attempts have been made to establish centres for delivery, there are links with wider development aspirations, in particular the Millennium Development Goals and the initiative is presented as part of FIFA's CSR programme.

[iii] IOC Sports For Hope Project http://www.olympic.org/development-through-sport/ioc-sports-for-hope-project (accessed 08.02.2011)

[iv] Chatziefstathiou *et al.,* (2008) identify the colonial characteristics of the diffusion of Olympic sport in the pre-war years, and point to the tension between those in the IOC keen to encourage sport participation within indigenous populations, with those concerned about the potential for such activity to act as a conduit for populations to begin to assert themselves. They compare this with the momentum in the post-war period, toward expanding the numbers of National Olympic Committees (NOCs) and

supporting their development through Olympic Solidarity, as in part generated by threats to the universalist claims made by the IOC. They set out to discuss these changing priorities in the context of so-called cultural imperialism.

[v] Accounts of how Olympic Solidarity funding supports individual athletes and national governing bodies (NGBs) are readily available through the Olympic Solidarity and NGB websites (Olympic Solidarity 2009). As such they do provide a particular perspective on the administration and benefits of the initiatives. Nevertheless, these sources do not in themselves constitute the basis of rigorous research into how individuals experienced the Solidarity support mechanisms and there is a strong case for academic research in this area.

[vi] This compendium of what are presently 298 indicators focuses on areas such as levels of literacy, agricultural production, infant mortality rates and prevalence of infectious diseases. It provides a baseline against which the efficacy of interventions in areas such as health and education can be assessed (World Bank WDIs Online undated).

[vii] For a discussion on trends in evaluation, please see USAID (2009) *Trends in International Development Evaluation Theory, Policy and Practice.* http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADQ464.pdf (accessed 19 July 2011).