

Current Trends and Future Directions in Sport for Development and Peace

By Jon Welty Peachey and Nico Schulenkorf

From a relative backwater in the sport industry, the field of sport for development and peace (SDP) has grown exponentially over the past two decades, to where it is now an in vogue and much published area of research across multiple disciplinary traditions and journals such as sport management, sport sociology, political science, international relations, development studies, and youth development, among others. A journal devoted to publishing the latest research in SDP has emerged – the *Journal of Sport for Development*. SDP has come a long way from its roots in programs for wounded veterans returning from World War I (Burnett, 2001), and even further back in history when wars were halted and temporary truces established during the ancient Olympic Games (Welty Peachey & Cohen, 2012). Approximately a thousand organizations across the globe now work in some aspect of SDP, from small non-profits to larger organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as the Laureus Foundation and Right to Play (Svensson & Woods, 2017). The United Nations even embraced the potential of sport to contribute to development agendas by establishing the Office of Sport for Development and Peace, although this office has since closed in 2017. Nevertheless, SDP is continuing to grow in practice and scholarship.

Admittedly, much of the early scholarship and practice in SDP was highly evangelical about the ‘power of sport’ to achieve development aims, without necessarily evidence to back up these claims (Coalter, 2013). SDP organizations also tended to approach their development work through a neocolonial lens, designing programs in the Global North or High Income Countries (HIC) and then importing them to local communities and contexts in the Global South or Low- to

Middle-Income Countries (LMIC) with little input by local stakeholders (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011). This all sparked criticism by many scholars about sport's potential role in development and its unique contribution (see Darnell, 2012; Hayhurst, Kay, & Chawansky, 2015; Harris & Adams, 2016). Fortunately, today, scholars and SDP organizations alike are less evangelical or neocolonial in their approach, although this has not totally dissipated (Welty Peachey, Cohen, Musser, & Shin, 2018). Overall, SDP scholarship is showing that if designed and managed well, sport has the potential to help achieve myriad development outcomes, although certainly not in all cases or contexts (Schulenkorf, 2017; Schulenkorf, Sherry, & Rowe, 2016). For instance, research has shown that sport can help develop social capital, expand networks, and improve life situations of participants (Spaaij, 2009; Adams, Harris, & Lindsey, 2018; Zhou & Kaplanidou, 2018); reduce prejudice amongst youth from different cultures and backgrounds (Welty Peachey, Cunningham, Lyras, Cohen, & Bruening, 2015); improve cross-cultural relations among disparate and politically opposed community groups (Sugden, 2006; Schulenkorf & Edwards, 2012); and serve as a vehicle through which to address issues of women and girl's empowerment (Hayhurst, 2013; Seal & Sherry, 2018), among many others.

All of this development in scholarship and practice in SDP warrants reflection on where the field is going in the next decades. This brings us to the purpose of this chapter, which is to provide an overview of the current trends in SDP research and practice, and then importantly, share our thoughts on future directions for the field. To ground our reflections on SDP, we embrace the broad definition of the field offered by Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011):

The use of sport to exert a positive influence on public health, the socialization of children, youth and adults, the social inclusion of the disadvantaged, the economic

development of regions and states, and on fostering intercultural exchange and conflict resolution. (p. 311)

We are well positioned to offer these reflections. The first author (Jon Welty Peachey) has over 22 years' experience working in SDP, 12 as a practitioner in international youth development, and 10 in academia. He has published extensively on theoretical and conceptual foundations of SDP and on leadership and management issues within the field. Nico Schulkorf, the second author, has been involved in international SDP and health promotion programs for the past 15 years, with a strong research focus on social, cultural, and health-related development outcomes. He has been working with local and international NGOs, Government Agencies, Sport Associations and Ministries in Sri Lanka, Israel and Palestine, and the Pacific Islands region.

Next, we offer our thoughts on current trends in research and practice in SDP, followed by our collective thinking on the future of the field. We do not wish to claim that our reflections here are all encompassing or that we have captured all of the directions scholarship and practice may move in the near future – many excellent scholars and practitioners in the SDP space could certainly add to and enhance our agenda. However, we hope that what follows can in some small way motivate students, scholars, and practitioners to think about and activate potential directions for their own work within the field.

Current Trends in SDP

As scholarship and practice in SDP continue to expand, a number of trends in theorizing, research, and practice have emerged. This section will review several salient trends: (a) theory building from a theory to practice/practice to theory standpoint, (b) proliferation of programs, (c)

decrease in sport evangelism and neocolonialism, (d) more sophisticated academic/practitioner partnerships; and (e) gender issues in SDP.

Theory to Practice/Practice to Theory

Scholars have been wrestling with the prospect of theory building in SDP for some time. While there are some notable examples of theories and conceptual frameworks which have emerged in the SDP space since 2010 (see, for example, Coalter, 2013; Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011; Schulenkorf & Siefken, 2019), many scholars have continued to borrow theories from other disciplines to frame their work, such as social capital theory and intergroup contact theory (Schulenkorf et al., 2016). Scholars have also questioned whether or not there can be grand theories in SDP due to the complexities of cultures, contexts, and populations served (Schulenkorf & Spaaij, 2015; Welty Peachey, 2015). Given this backdrop, there has been emerging inquiry into exploring the theory to practice and practice to theory connection in sport for social change, which includes SDP. Prominently, a recent special issue in the *Journal of Sport Management* (Sport for Social Change: Bridging the Theory-Practice Divide, published in September, 2019) features a number of scholars conceptualizing how theory can drive and support SDP program development, and also how theory can be grounded in practice, with practice driving theory development. This connection between theory and practice is an important consideration, as there has often been a divide between theory and practice in the SDP space (Welty Peachey & Cohen, 2016). Going forward, practitioners need to base their program logic models upon sound theoretical frameworks, and conversely, scholars should also utilize SDP practice to inform theory development, all of which helps answer the compelling question of ‘why sport’?

Proliferation of Programs

With approximately a thousand organizations now operating across continents, countries, and cultures, the SDP space has expanded rapidly over the past decade. Not all of this growth and expansion is necessarily positive, as the profusion of SDP organizations means that there is now more competition for funding dollars and program participants in many geographic areas. According to Svensson & Woods (2017), who conducted a survey of SDP organizations operating around the world, most SDP programs are geographically focused on Africa for their programming, but organizations are headquartered across Asia, Europe, Latin America, and North America. Importantly, many organizations appear to have their headquarters in the geographic region in which they are delivering programming, an encouraging sign to help further distance SDP from its neocolonial roots (Coalter, 2013). While SDP organizations focus on many social issues, livelihoods and health are the most common focal areas. Organizations are employing myriad types of sports in their programming, from cricket and rugby to soccer (football), which is utilized by about one-third of all organizations. Some program logic models embrace a sport plus emphasis, where sport is modified and augmented with other forms of non-sport programming to achieve targeted outcomes, while others follow more of a plus sport model, where sport is the hook to attract individuals to the program, and then they are connected with other social services. Still others employ a hybrid of these two approaches (Coalter, 2013).

While it has become common for SDP organizations to want to scale up their programming efforts to reach more individuals and expand geographically, this is not always desirable. For instance, recent work by Welty Peachey, Cohen, and Shin (in press) found that scaling up programming and operations comes with a host of challenges, and can shift the SDP organization away from its core competencies and lead to potential mission drift. As an

organization grows and takes on new organizational forms, there may not always be skilled managers and leaders in place to effectively help an organization navigate forward. Thus, it is advised that SDP organizations carefully consider the best way for them to achieve sustained impact, with depth rather than breadth of programming perhaps being more advisable in some instances.

Decrease in Sport Evangelism and Neocolonialism

As mentioned, while SDP scholars and practitioners early on embraced a problematic sport evangelism and neocolonial approach to much of their work, today, scholars and practitioners have a more informed and considered understanding of the role of sport in development, and on the critical need to involve local communities in design and development of programming (Schulenkorf, 2017). Of course, there are still agencies, organizations, scholars, and practitioners who trumpet the power of sport as the cure all to social ills, and who design programs with little to no input from local stakeholders (Welty Peachey et al., 2018), but these ill-informed approaches do appear to be decreasing, perhaps due to continued admonitions and calls from critical scholars to eschew SDP's neocolonial and evangelical roots (Darnell, Chawansky, Marchesseault, Holmes, & Hayhurst, 2018). It is encouraging that SDP stakeholders are now realizing the vital need to temper claims about sport's impact and role, and to embrace the need for robust evaluation mechanisms to provide evidence of programmatic effects. There are still many evaluation challenges in the SDP space that inhibit some organizations from engaging in rigorous evaluation, such as lack of time and knowledge (Welty Peachey & Cohen, 2016), but many are now realizing that concrete evidence is necessary to acquire funding and to enable program sustainability. Linked to this is a greater focus on sustainability in the SDP space, and the recognition that local stakeholders and communities must be involved in all facets

of program design and delivery for this sustainability to be achieved (Coalter, 2013; Schulenkorf, 2017). These are all encouraging signs that SDP will continue to have a seat at the table in development circles in the next decades.

More Sophisticated Academic/Practitioner Partnerships

For many years, those in the academic space and SDP practitioners have been partnering together primarily for programmatic evaluation purposes and for consultation related to program design and implementation. These partnerships have grown in number and sophistication over the years, and this trend will likely continue. Many SDP practitioners realize they may not have the necessary capacity in house to design and administer robust evaluation schemes and often reach out to academics for assistance in providing these services. For instance, Tracy Evans, a three-time Olympian in freestyle skiing and founder of the SDP organization Kids Play International, which aims to promote gender equity and the Olympic values by introducing less familiar sports to children in post-genocide affected countries like Rwanda and Cambodia, recently provided a keynote address at the annual conference of the North American Society for Sport Management (Evans, 2019). During her address, she shared that her organization did not have the knowledge or capacity to conduct a robust long-term evaluation of her programs, so she partnered with researchers at Virginia Tech University to design and administer the evaluation scheme. This practice is quite common in the SDP space and helps to bridge the academic-practitioner divide.

When these types of research partnerships first began, it was common practice for academics to approach SDP organizations with ideas for what they wished to study, outcomes they wished to measure, and administer an evaluation scheme with endorsement from the SDP organization but without much of its input into the evaluation process and outcomes to focus

upon (Welty Peachey & Cohen, 2016). Today, however, these research partnerships have evolved and are more sophisticated in their approach, with academics and practitioners working together to design a comprehensive and robust evaluation scheme from the outset that measures outcomes the organization truly wishes to capture data on. For example, when the first author initially began working with Street Soccer USA (SSUSA), a nonprofit SDP organization founded on the premise of helping individuals suffering from homelessness improve their life situations through the sport of soccer, he approached the organization with an idea for a research project to investigate social capital development in program participants and volunteers. While the organization had input into the project, it was not involved from the outset in determining design and outcomes to investigate. Over the past 10 years, as the first author has continued to work with SSUSA, the partnership has evolved to one where the organization often initiates the idea for the research in order to capture data on outcomes of importance to it, rather than being researcher-driven. Most recently, this has entailed launching a new research project focused on how followers develop into leaders within their organization, particularly into servant leaders.

The above example highlights the trend for scholars to become more reflexive in their approach to conducting research in the SDP space (Sherry, Schulenkorf, Seal, Nicholson, & Hoye, 2017, Spaaij, Schulenkorf, Jeanes, & Oxford, 2018). It is important for contemporary SDP researchers to be flexible and innovative in their research approaches, and to engage from the outset with practitioners to design locally-relevant projects that will add value to the organization and its mission. These reflexive and inclusive participatory research approaches should be the norm going forward to create meaningful change and provide information that is relevant and useful to the organization (Sherry et al., 2017).

However, academic-practitioner partnerships in the SDP space are not without their challenges. Many times, scholars have provided deliverables to SDP organizations that are written in academic jargon and generally unhelpful to the organization, or unfortunately, not provided deliverables to the organization as promised (Welty Peachey & Cohen, 2016). The latter point is concerning, as it furthers the academic-practitioner divide and cautions SDP organizations in seeking out academic partnerships in the future. Some academics have been prone to gathering the data they need to publish in peer-reviewed journals in order to satisfy the demands for promotion and tenure at their institutions, and then not follow up with or provide helpful information to the organization under study. This illustrates the differing goals that academics and SDP organizations may have with regards to the outputs of the research study (Welty Peachey & Cohen, 2015). However, by being more reflexive and participatory in their research approach, and by fostering integrative cultural experiences with a focus on program sustainability (LeCrom & Dwyer, 2015), academics can continue to be a vital support to SDP organizations in the achievement of their missions.

Gender Issues in SDP

Finally, recent conversations in the SDP space have also revolved around the increasing presence and participation of women and girls in SDP, examining the lived realities of program participants, volunteers, and staff (Seal & Sherry, 2018). This is an area within SDP that has been noticeably lacking from conversations and scholarship (Hayhurst, 2013). Fortunately, recent work and conversations have emerged around how girls can be new agents of social change and contribute uniquely to development agendas (Chawansky & Hayhurst, 2015), highlighted by a special issue in the *Sport in Society* journal in 2015 devoted to girls, international development, and the politics of sport. All of this work points to the fact that with

the increased presence of women and girls in the SDP space, a more nuanced and considered examination of how development projects are managed and operated, how participants feel about their experiences, and on how evidence of outcomes is generated, is warranted (Seal & Sherry, 2018). This “Girl Effect” movement (Hayhurst, 2011, 2013) revolves around the notion that girls can be an answer to the development problems in contemporary society and be change agents and catalysts in their communities. Programs emphasizing girls’ empowerment have been referred to as sport, gender, and development (SGD) programs. Much of the recent research in this area has explored the concept from postcolonial feminist perspectives (see Forde & Frisby, 2015; Hayhurst, Giles, & Wright, 2016), often critiquing existing SDP interventions for their neoliberal political and ideological agendas (Seal & Sherry, 2018). Chawansky (2011), for instance, has challenged scholars and practitioners to reconsider how gender is constructed and understood in the SDP space.

To illustrate, in their participatory action research project with the Girls’ Empowerment through Sport (GET) Cricket Program in Papua New Guinea aimed at “empowering young women and increasing their critical awareness of sociocultural issues related to health, gender inequality, and domestic violence” (Seal & Sherry, 2018, p. 247), Seal and colleagues (2018) revealed that the initiative did help to address various sociocultural issues related to gender in society. Specifically, they found that the GET program acted as a viable resistance site for girls to confront traditional gendered relations imbedded in societal perceptions, in addition to improving the overall wellbeing, motivation, and self-efficacy of the girls involved in the program. In the main, the program is providing women and girls with the belief that they can enact change in their society and its structures and systems that may inhibit gender equality. This is just one example of myriad programs around the world targeting girls’ empowerment through

sport, a focus in SDP we only expect to continue to expand in the coming years, as gender issues and challenges are a critical concern in many cultures and contexts.

Future Directions in SDP

Following on from the previous discussion of current trends in SDP, we now turn towards providing future opportunities in SDP research. In doing so, we build on recent SDP reflections (Schulenkorf, 2017) and our latest considerations of some of the areas that have not yet received sufficient focus in the literature. Again, we believe that our suggestions here are relevant and meaningful opportunities to move the SDP field forward, without claiming that they capture of all possible future directions. These include: (a) novel approaches to leadership, (b) social entrepreneurship, (c) design thinking, and (d) indigenous approaches and voices.

Novel Approaches to Leadership

While leadership is arguably one of the most researched topics in the field of business studies, the concept still needs to be fully understood in different social and managerial contexts (Frawley, Misener, Lock, & Schulenkorf, 2019). As such, leadership presents a truly complex and culturally influenced phenomenon (McCall, 2010), and we suggest that SDP research around leadership development, management and succession planning presents exciting opportunities for further theoretical and empirical debate. This is particularly relevant given that SDP projects often rely on individual ‘cause champions’ or change agents to generate and maintain momentum (see Edwards, 2015; Schulenkorf, 2010). In other words, the strategic planning for leadership development is of particular importance for the effectiveness and sustainability of programs.

Despite the growing significance of leadership knowledge in the SDP field, there has been limited research conducted on leadership development and succession planning from a

sport management perspective (for a notable exception see Wright & Côté, 2003). As such, scholars have ample opportunity to contribute to this field of scholarship. Schulenkorf (2017) has suggested that researchers could, for example, engage in comparative multi-case studies to investigate the strategies and processes employed by different SDP programs with the intent of providing theoretical frameworks and/or practical recommendations for best practice. At the same time, the particular challenges of leadership in the SDP sector could be explored in more detail, and new conceptualizations such as cross-border leadership (see Frawley et al., 2019) could be considered and applied.

Social Entrepreneurship

The business concept of entrepreneurship promises to play an increasingly important role in SDP practice and research, especially given the challenge of many SDP programs to sustain themselves beyond the time of external funding. As a recent SDP review has found, to date there are unfortunately only a limited number of studies conducted in this space, and in fact on the wider topic of building and improving livelihoods through sport overall (see Schulenkorf et al., 2016). However, in practice, different SDP organizations have turned towards new and innovative business models—including social entrepreneurship—to achieve financial growth and independence. For instance, the Kick4Life program in Lesotho has taken an innovative entrepreneurial approach towards community development by combining its charitable SDP initiatives with professional sport programs that are able to generate financial gains from high-profile matches played on a regular basis (see Kick4Life, 2019). In addition, Kick4Life has created a sport tourism/hospitality venture around its SDP programs which shows the organization's entrepreneurial thinking and ability to move beyond a complete dependency-model of traditional aid and social service provision.

Given this practical example—and similar ventures in other SDP settings around the world—scholars can and should use the opportunity to cooperate with organizations to make a stronger contribution to the SDP entrepreneurship literature. They would add to a currently very small canon of work that has approached entrepreneurship in the context of SDP. In fact, Cohen and Welty Peachey's (2015) investigation into the motivations and experiences of a former female SDP participant who developed into a social entrepreneur, presents the only specific SDP entrepreneurship study completed thus far. In the future, studies could be conducted on how the different types of entrepreneurs—including social and for-profit—will co-exist in the SDP arena. On a micro-level, it may also be timely to conduct a longer-term study on post SDP involvement and employment in an attempt to investigate if and how former SDP participants return to the SDP work arena—as entrepreneurs or otherwise. Here, Hoekman and colleagues (2016; 2019) have made a start by investigating what they have labelled 're-engaged youth' in SDP; an interesting phenomenon deserving much more engagement by researchers in the future.

Design Thinking

To remain innovative and 'hip', the fields of business and management on a regular basis focus on new and creative ideas, concept, and terms. Some of these seem to be more relevant and meaningful than others. For example, for a number of years the sporting world has placed increasing attention on issues related to 'sustainability', and in a sport-event context, no manager could do without plans for 'legacy'. Great concepts in principle, but as many SDP projects have shown, they have remained part of the managerial tick-list rather than a serious managerial focus. Other examples include business buzz-words such as 'ideation', 'disruption', 'radical transparency' and 'The Future' which promise significant positive change or advancement, but which have often remained nothing but lip-service.

Similar accusations can be related to the concept of ‘Design Thinking’. However, in recent years, management scholars and entrepreneurs from around the world have started to investigate and apply this allegedly lofty business-concept in more detail (Brown, 2008; Liedtka & Olgilvie, 2011; Ward, Runcie, & Morris, 2009). In a nutshell, Design Thinking is concerned with generating additional value and benefits to people, communities, and organizations through imagining and experimenting; in other words, in an active pursuit of novelty, people aim to think big and achieve something ‘better’.

Design Thinking has slowly been making its way into the sport management and SDP domains. As such, a recent scoping study by Joachim and colleagues (2019) not only determined the extent to which design thinking mentalities and/or approaches already exist within SDP research and practice, but also the various ways in which they manifest. The findings allowed for the provision of specific recommendations for SDP organizations, particularly those with limited organizational capacity, regarding logical points of entry for employing Design Thinking in the pursuit of organizational innovation. For instance, Joachim et al. (2019) suggested that to achieve deep user understanding and a true diversity of perspectives—key themes in Design Thinking practice—SDP organizations should include “disconnected (or subjugated) local voices in the design of programs, thus closing the gap between those who deliver SFD [sport-for-development] programs and those who stand to benefit from them” (p. 12). Techniques for achieving such deep user understanding focus on keeping the users at the center of all practice, including informal conversations with users, the collaborative development of empathy maps, role play exercises, and ethnographic research (see also Carlgren et al., 2016). Moreover, with a multidimensional concern for diversity in mind, users should ideally represent a complementary set of skills, personalities, and even hierarchal positions to maximize innovation.

Overall, while more conceptual research and empirical testing is needed in the Design Thinking space in order to truly understand the relationship between innovation and aspects of social and economic productivity and effectiveness, it seems that SDP scholars have made an important first step towards de-mystifying the concept and preparing for a more creative and human-centered future.

Indigenous Voices and Approaches

As alluded to in the introduction of this chapter, early scholarship and practice in SDP was highly evangelical about the ‘power of sport’ to achieve development aims, without necessarily evidence to back up these claims (Coalter, 2013). Fortunately, over the past decade, SDP organizations and researchers have started to conduct different research projects and monitoring and evaluation exercises to generate SDP-specific evidence-based research outcomes. Unfortunately, research has often been carried out by academics from HICs with little input by scholars from a LMIC context (Rossi & Jeanes, 2016). In fact, a recent review of SDP literature shows that although the majority of SDP programs are carried out in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, 90 percent of SDP authors are based in North America, Europe, and Australia (Schulenkorf et al., 2016). Lamentably, only eight percent of SDP studies have contributors from the countries in which the programs are delivered. As such, it seems that SDP research has thus far failed to fully engage with the wealth and diversity of local and/or indigenous voices, knowledge, experiences, and expertise.

Overall, there is an urgent need to engage better with LMIC scholars and to conduct collaborative, participatory SDP research in the future. Participatory research is differentiated from conventional research methodologies “not in methods but in the attitudes of researchers, which in turn determine how, by and for whom research is conceptualized and conducted”

(Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995, p. 1667). In the context of SDP programs, Collison, Giulianotti, Howe, and Darnell (2016) have highlighted “the importance of building strong relationships with skilled, experienced and informed locals in order to collect accurate and valuable data in unfamiliar locations” (p. 422). However, true participatory research even goes beyond this statement as it aims to align power and control within the research process. As Cornwall and Jewkes (1995) note, the most striking difference between participatory and conventional methodologies lies in “who defines research problems and who generates, analyzes, represents, owns and acts on the information which is sought” (p. 1668). Importantly, these issues affect all phases of the research process; from the development of research questions through to the communication of the results for action (Frisby, Reid, Millar, & Hoeber, 2005). Participatory research thus positions local people as the most knowledgeable actors in the research process.

With this in mind, there is a lot to learn from indigenous approaches to conducting research; in regards to methodology, approach, techniques and customs. While important contributions have started to be made, the SDP community is in a position to embrace this space much more aggressively. A good example of integrating indigenous voices into SDP discourses is provided by Mwaanga and Mwansa (2014) who exemplify the use of Ubuntu philosophy in designing and managing an international SDP program in Zambia. Their study provides some evidence of research hybridity where the particular SDP program was influenced by both Ubuntu and Christian philosophies. This suggests that there may be space for more inter-cultural and even inter-faith engagements in certain SDP settings, which would open up new opportunities for SDP planning, management, and evaluation.

Another good example of an approach that allows for a marriage of western and indigenous research is Talanoa. In fact, Stewart-Withers, Sewabu, and Richardson (2017)

highlight Talanoa as an appropriate and meaningful approach towards working *with* Pacific people, and de-centering conventional, western approaches to qualitative research. In an SDP research setting, Sugden and colleagues (2018) have provided a study where Talanoa made an important contribution as a culturally appropriate approach for international scholars to employ. In particular, when aiming to understand local culture and context – in their case the role of sport in reflecting and shaping group dynamics between Indigenous and Indian Fijians – Talanoa offered a much deeper engagement opportunity than traditional research methods could have provided. In fact, under a short-term ethnography paradigm (see Sugden, Adair, Schulenkorf, & Frawley, 2019), the Talanoa approach required detailed planning, willingness to engage, and the maximizing of local opportunities, but also allowed for traditional research techniques to accompany indigenous methods. Hence, we suggest that the debate around local vs. international research is really not a question of either/or; in fact, as the examples above have alluded to, there is ample opportunity to achieve reciprocal engagement and benefit through meaningful collaboration.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we set out to review some of the current trends in the SDP field, along with outlining several future directions for research. While the field has experienced significant growth over the past 20 years, and is moving away from its evangelical and neocolonial roots, there is still much opportunity for continued growth and development in scholarship, practice, and in bridging the theory-practice divide. We are encouraged and excited that scholars and practitioners seem to be taking a more nuanced and realistic approach to design, implementation, evaluation, and research within the SDP space. We are also encouraged that more attention and understanding has been given to the importance of locally-driven research and involvement in

SDP, although there is much more that can be done here to involve local and indigenous voices in all phases of SDP program design and implementation, as well as to invite and collaborate with indigenous scholars. With more SDP organizations emerging across the globe, increased integration of sport into government policy agendas, and burgeoning empirical and conceptual interest from scholars, the SDP field has great potential to contribute to the betterment of a global society. It is our hope that this chapter has stimulated those involved in SDP to consider new ways they can actively contribute to the field in the coming years.

References

- Adams, A., Harris, K., & Lindsey I. (2018). Examining the capacity of a sport for development program to create social capital. *Sport in Society*, 3, 558-573.
- Burnett, C. (2001). Social impact assessment and sport development. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 36, 41-52.
- Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(6), 84.
- Carlgren, L., Rauth, I., & Elmquist, M. (2016). Framing design thinking: The concept in idea and enactment. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 25, 38–57.
- Chawansky, M. (2011). New social movements, old gender games? Locating girls in the sport for development and peace movement. In A. Snyder & S. Stobbe (Eds.), *Critical aspects of gender in conflict resolution, peacebuilding, and social movements* (pp. 121–134). London, UK: Emerald.
- Chawansky, M., & Hayhurst, L. (2015). Girls, international development and the politics of sport: Introduction. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 18, 877–881.

- Coalter, F. (2013). *Sport for development: What game are we playing?* London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Cohen, A., & Welty Peachey, J. (2015). The making of a social entrepreneur: From participant to cause champion within a sport-for-development context. *Sport Management Review*, 18(1), 111-125.
- Collison, H., Darnell, S., Giulianotti, R., & Howe, P. D. (2016). Sport for social change and development: Sustaining transnational partnerships and adapting international curriculums to local contexts in Rwanda. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 33(15), 1685-1699.
- Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R. (1995). What is participatory research? *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(12), 1667-1676.
- Darnell, S. C. (2012). *Sport for development and peace: A critical sociology*. London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Darnell, S. C., Chawansky, M., Marchesseault, D., Holmes, M., & Hayhurst, L. (2018). The state of play: Critical sociological insights into recent 'sport for development and peace' research. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 53, 133–151.
- Darnell, S. C., & Hayhurst, L. (2011). Sport for decolonialization: Exploring a new praxis of sport for development. *Progress in Development Studies*, 11, 183–196.
- Edwards, M. B. (2015). The role of sport in community capacity building: An examination of sport for development research and practice. *Sport Management Review*, 18(1), 6-19.
- Evans, T. (2019, May). *Kids Play International*. Keynote address delivered at the North American Society for Sport Management Annual Conference, New Orleans, LA.
- Forde, S.D., & Frisby, W. (2015). Just be empowered: How girls are represented in a sport for

- development and peace HIV/AIDS prevention manual. *Sport in Society*, 18, 882–894.
- Frawley, S., Misener, L., Lock, D., & Schulenkorf, N. (2019). *Global Sport Leadership*. London: Routledge.
- Frisby, W., Reid, C., Millar, S., & Hoeber, L. (2005). Putting ‘participatory’ into participatory forms of action research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 367–386.
- Harris, K., & Adams, A. (2016). Power and discourse in the politics of evidence in sport for development. *Sport Management Review*, 19, 97–106.
- Hayhurst, L. (2011). Corporatizing sport, gender and development: Postcolonial IR feminisms, transnational private governance and global corporate social engagement. *Third World Quarterly*, 32, 531–549.
- Hayhurst, L. (2013). Girls as the ‘new’ agents of social change? Exploring the girl effect through sport, gender, and development programs in Uganda. *Sociological Research Online*, 18(2), 1–12.
- Hayhurst, L., Giles, A., & Wright, J. (2016). Biopedagogies and Indigenous knowledge: Examining sport for development and peace for urban Indigenous young women in Canada and Australia. *Sport, Education, and Society*, 21, 549–569.
- Hayhurst, L. M., Kay, T., & Chawansky, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Beyond sport for development and peace: Transnational perspectives on theory, policy and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hoekman, M. J., & Schulenkorf, N. (2016). Sustainable management of sport-for-development through youth re-engagement: the FREYCA framework. In L. M. C. Hayhurst, T. Kay, & M. Chawansky (Eds.), *Beyond Sport for Development and Peace* (pp. 135–149). Abingdon: Routledge.

- Hoekman, M. J., Schulenkorf, N., & Welty Peachey, J. (2019). Re-engaging local youth for sustainable sport-for-development. *Sport Management Review*. Advance online publication. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2018.09.001>
- Joachim, G., Schulenkorf, N., Schlenker, K., & Frawley, S. (2019). Design thinking and sport for development: Enhancing organizational innovation. *Managing Sport and Leisure*. Advance online publication. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2019.1611471>
- Kick4Life. (2019). How Kick4Life FC works. Retrieved from <http://www.kick4life.org/about/about-k4l/>
- LeCrom, C., & Dwyer, B. (2015). From evaluator to insider: An academic's guide to managing sport-for-development programs. *Sport in Society, 18*, 652-658.
- Liedtka, J., & Olgilvie, T. (2011). *Designing for growth: A design thinking toolkit for managers*. New York City: Columbia University Press.
- Lyras, A., & Welty Peachey, J. (2011). Integrating sport-for-development theory and praxis. *Sport Management Review, 14*, 311–326.
- McCall, M. W. (2010). Recasting Leadership Development. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 3*(1), 3-19.
- Mwaanga, O., & Mwansa, K. (2014). Indigenous discourses in sport for development and peace: A case study of the Ubuntu cultural philosophy in EduSport Foundation, Zambia. In N. Schulenkorf & D. Adair (Eds.), *Global Sport-for-Development: Critical Perspectives* (pp. 115-133). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rossi, T., & Jeanes, R. (2016). Education, pedagogy and sport for development: Addressing seldom asked questions. *Sport, Education and Society, 21*(4), 483-494.

- Schulenkorf, N. (2010). The roles and responsibilities of a change agent in sport event development projects. *Sport Management Review, 13*(2), 118-128.
- Schulenkorf, N. (2017). Managing sport-for-development: Reflections and outlook. *Sport Management Review, 20*, 243-251.
- Schulenkorf, N., & Edwards, D. (2012). Maximizing positive social impacts: Strategies for sustaining and leveraging the benefits of intercommunity sport events in divided societies. *Journal of Sport Management, 26*, 376-390.
- Schulenkorf, N., Sherry, E., & Rowe, K. (2016). Sport for development: An integrated literature review. *Journal of Sport Management, 30*, 22–39.
- Schulenkorf, N., & Siefken, K. (2019). Managing sport-for-development and healthy lifestyles: The sport-for-health model. *Sport Management Review, 22*, 96–107.
- Schulenkorf, N., & Spaaij, R. (2015). Commentary: Reflections on theory building in sport for development and peace. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing, 16*, 71–77.
- Seal, E., & Sherry, E. (2018). Exploring empowerment and gender relations in a sport for development program in Papua New Guinea. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 35*, 247-257.
- Sherry, E., Schulenkorf, N., Seal, E., Nicholson, M., & Hoye, R. (2017). Sport-for-development: Inclusive, reflexive, and meaningful research in low- and middle-income settings. *Sport Management Review, 20*, 69-80.
- Spaaij, R. (2009). Sport as a vehicle for social mobility and regulation of disadvantaged urban youth. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 44*(2-3), 247-264.

- Spaaij, R., Schulenkorf, N., Jeanes, R., & Oxford, S. (2018). Participatory research in sport-for-development: Complexities, experiences and (missed) opportunities. *Sport Management Review, 21*, 25–37.
- Stewart-Withers, R., Sewabu, K., & Richardson, S. (2017). Talanoa: A contemporary qualitative methodology for sport management. *Sport Management Review, 20*(1), 55-68.
- Sugden, J. (2006). Teaching and playing sport for conflict resolution and co-existence in Isreal. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 41*, 221–240.
- Sugden, J. T., Schulenkorf, N., Adair, D., & Frawley, S. (2018). The role of sport in reflecting and shaping group dynamics: The “intergroup relations continuum” and its application to Fijian rugby and soccer. *Sport Management Review*. Advance online publication. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2019.02.001>
- Sugden, J. T., Adair, D., Schulenkorf, N., & Frawley, S. (2019). Exploring sport and intergroup relations in Fiji: Guidance for researchers undertaking short-term ethnography. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 0*(0), 1-12. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.2018-0165>
- Svensson, P., & Woods, H. (2017). A systematic overview of sport for development and peace organizations. *Journal of Sport for Development, 5*(9), 36-48.
- Ward, A., Runcie, E., & Morris, L. (2009). Embedding innovation: design thinking for small enterprises. *Journal of Business Strategy, 30*(2/3), 78-84.
- Welty Peachey, J. (2015). Sport for development theory building and program design: Introduction to The special issue. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing, 16*(1/2), 1-4.
- Welty Peachey, J., & Cohen, A. (2012). Sport for social change and development. In GB Cunningham and JN Singer (Eds.), *Sociology of sport and physical activity* (2nd ed.). College Station, TX: Center for Sport Management Research and Education.

- Welty Peachey, J., & Cohen, A. (2015). Reflections from sport-for-development scholars: Challenges, barriers, and strategies of the field. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 3(4), 16-27.
- Welty Peachey, J., & Cohen, A. (2016). Research partnerships in sport for development and peace: Challenges, barriers, strategies. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(3), 282-297.
- Welty Peachey, J., Cohen, A., Musser, A., & Shin, N. (2018). Interrogating the motivations of sport for development and peace practitioners. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 53, 767-787.
- Welty Peachey, J., Cohen, A., & Shin, N. (in press). Constraints and strategies to scaling up in sport for development and peace organizations: Evidence from the field. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*.
- Welty Peachey, J., Cunningham, G., Lyras, A., Cohen, A., & Bruening, J. (2015). The influence of a sport-for-peace event on prejudice and change agent self-efficacy. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29, 229–244.
- Wright, A., & Côté, J. (2003). A retrospective analysis of leadership development through sport. *Sport Psychologist*, 17(3), 268-291.
- Zhou, R., & Kaplanidou, K. (2018). Building social capital from sport event participation: An exploration of the social impacts of participatory sport events on the community. *Sport Management Review*, 21, 491-503.