

PEACE AND SPORT: CHALLENGING LIMITATIONS ACROSS THE SPORT FOR
DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE SECTOR

Jeremy Aaron Bellotti

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Master of Arts
in the Department of Political Science,
Indiana University

June 2012

Accepted by the Faculty of Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

John S. McCormick, Ph.D., Chair

Scott M. Pegg, Ph.D.

Master's Thesis
Committee

Michael D. Snodgrass, Ph.D.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family for their overwhelming love and support; to my mother Laura for encouraging me to pursue a master's degree, as well as my father Mark and my brother Joshua for providing the continuous inspiration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank the entire Peace and Sport organization for fully supporting and accommodating this research. Several Peace and Sport officials offered their time and valuable insight during the 2011 Forum in Monaco, and for this I am sincerely indebted.

Also, although they requested to remain anonymous throughout this paper, I am extremely grateful for each individual interviewee who was generous enough to give their time in assisting with the progress of this study.

Lastly, I owe an enormous amount of gratitude to the members of my thesis committee: Dr. John McCormick, Dr. Scott Pegg, and Dr. Michael Snodgrass. Thank you all for making this commitment, and for offering your expertise to assist in the expansion of my scholastic aptitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Methodology	
Peace and Sport.....	7
Israel-Palestine.....	10
Chapter 2: Literature Review (State of the Field)	
Sport: An Instrument for Development in the Twenty-First Century.....	14
Concepts and Utility of Sport	17
The Institution of SDP	20
Sporting Skepticism.....	23
Chapter 3: Analytical Framework of the SDP Sector	
I. Historical Context.....	26
Stage 1.....	26
Stage 2.....	28
Stage 3.....	30
Phase 1 / Stage 3.....	31
Phase 2 / Stage 3.....	31
Political Context / Global Civil Society.....	32
II. Four Social Policy Domains.....	33
1) Corporate / neo-liberalism.....	34
2) National and intergovernmental organizations / strategic developmentalism.....	36
3) Mainstream NGOs / developmental interventionism	39

4) New social movements and radical NGOs / social justice	41
III. Four Transnational Themes	43
1) Transnational Ethics	44
2) Transnational Anthropolitics of Practice	46
3) Transnational Social Relationships	48
4) Transnational Sector Relationships within the Global Civil Society	49
IV. Three Ideal-Type Models of Peacemaking.....	51
1) Technical SDP Model.....	52
2) Dialogical SDP Model.....	55
3) Critical SDP Model	57
Chapter 4: Findings / Conclusion	
Findings.....	59
1) Technical Limitations	59
2) Practical Limitations.....	63
3) Political Limitations	68
Conclusion	78
Bibliography	82
Curriculum Vitae	

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) movement has become widely-recognized throughout academic literature as having evolved into a legitimate transnational development sector (see Levermore, 2008a; Levermore & Beacom, 2009). Giulianotti (2011a; 2011b; 2011c), in particular, has offered a clear and elaborate framework of the SDP sector. In doing so, he also identified three main limitations associated with SDP projects (see Giulianotti, 2011c). These limitations found in the literature on SDP work (e.g., Armstrong, 2004; Darnell, 2009; Giulianotti, 2004; Hognestad & Tollisen, 2004) exemplify the primary concerns and criticisms expressed across various fields of research in regards to sport as a tool for development.

Employing Giulianotti's (2011a; 2011b; 2011c) framework, under what conditions might an SDP organization emancipate themselves from these three main limitations identified across the SDP sector? This paper asserts that the model offered through a case study analysis of one recently established NGO firmly challenges Giulianotti's (2011c) limitations thesis, and provides valuable insight into how the SDP sector can best address these shortcomings in moving beyond such restraints.

Across the SDP sector, Giulianotti (2011c) found that these three main limitations encapsulate certain *technical*, *practical*, and *political* weaknesses. Such limitations provide this study with a clear analytical framework of distinguishable shortcomings associated with SDP work. As the primary focus of this paper, the case study will be explored through the lens of these limitations.

Technical. The first limitation revolves around technical project implementation weaknesses that stem from poorly managed short-term funding contracts or failures to

plan for scenarios such as sporting equipment breakdowns; both of which cause a lack of resources and program sustainability. These limitations tend to affect smaller SDP agencies, which often lack the internal collaboration with a broader network across civil society and, hence, lack any substantial ability to gain access to more sustainable project support (Giulianotti, 2011a).¹ Whereas smaller agencies become more susceptible to these technical limitations due to minimal scale and power, larger SDP organizations may also succumb to such shortcomings through a lack of strategically diverse partnerships as well as allowing certain donors to override project objectives in ways that compromise the organization's core development principles.

Practical. Intersubjective, or practical, flaws often stem from a lack of knowledge SDP project workers may have regarding the local conditions or poor quality of collaboration with certain client groups and non-sport development agencies. Shortcomings in SDP projects related to a lack of quality collaboration can often be attributed to the 'vertical hierarchy' of knowledge transfer (Nicholls, 2009), while limited local cultivation tends to result from a lack of educational training and/or an officials' critical reflexivity (Giulianotti, 2011c). Also, although marginalized groups – such as women, peoples with disabilities, and youth – are most often sought out as primary beneficiaries in development aid, these individuals are rarely consulted and collaborated with as those who might be best equipped to guide such assistance (Beacom, 2009; Crabbe, 2009; Saavedra, 2009). Furthermore, and potentially most significant, far too many grassroots practitioners lack the resources and opportunity to publish their practical

¹ Various innovative sports-equipment agencies seek SDP projects in order to alleviate limitations regarding the breakdown of equipment. For example, the OneWorldFutbol Project designed an indestructible football specifically for use in extremely harsh conditions that SDP projects are primarily faced with; where desperate youth often play with rag balls or even bottles. See www.oneworldfutbol.com

knowledge of SDP work in academic journals or collaborate with mainstream organizations (Nicholls & Giles, 2007).

Political. Critical, or political, weaknesses involve the imperialistic and neocolonial relationships sports, and inevitably many SDP projects, often reinscribe between the Global North and South. This limitation can be linked to the ‘colonial residue’ left over from Giulianotti’s (2011b) first historical stage explained in Chapter 3 (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011). It is unequivocally the greatest concern for contemporary SDP scholars and officials alike, largely because it is often a negligible yet permeable trait stretching across each level of a development project. As Lambert (2007) suggests, the value neutrality deriving from impartial rules and regulations in sport has a potential to be overcome by the ideological content people laden such activity with, which may equally foster conflict as much as cohesion. Along with certain practical flaws of program organization, this limitation can often be attributed to a lack of any focused educational curriculum to complement the implementation of sport (Townsend, 2007).

The emergence of the current SDP sector can mostly be credited to the significant influence of intergovernmental organizations, such as the United Nations (UN), overtly encouraging the utility of sport as a vehicle towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Various institutions, including the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP), the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG), the Inter-Agency Taskforce on Sport for Development and Peace (2003), Canadian Heritage’s ‘Sport for Development and Peace’ section, the International Sport for Development and Peace Association (ISDPA), and

UNESCO's 'Sport for Peace and Development' division, now employ the "SDP" appellation in defining their objectives (Giulianotti, 2011a).

Along with intergovernmental organizations, such as the UN and the World Bank, initiatives within the transnational SDP sector derive from a diverse array of actors including governments, local and external non-governmental organizations (NGOs), transnational corporations (TNCs), and international sport federations such as the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) (see Giulianotti, 2011c; Levermore & Beacom, 2009a). Moreover, with recently established global networking hubs, such as the International Platform on Sport and Development (sportanddev.org), the SDP sector has been able to institute definitive objectives and become increasingly interconnected across civil society. This study, therefore, represents an important extension of the current knowledge regarding the SDP sector as well as provides valuable insight for research in the fields of sport, development, and international relations. As Giulianotti and Robertson (2007) suggest, there exists a transdisciplinary understanding of sport and the SDP sector.

The analytical framework for this study will largely draw from the three main limitations of SDP projects that have been identified by the recent research of Giulianotti (2011c). A contextual framework of the SDP sector as a whole will be provided through various ideal-type characteristics of SDP organizations and policy (see Giulianotti, 2011a; 2011b; 2011c). The case study analysis will explore a recently established organization – referred to as Peace and Sport – within the SDP sector, focusing primarily on its regional projects throughout Arab communities in the occupied West Bank (Peace

and Sport labels this project ‘Israel-Palestine’) as well as the broader significance of its annual Forum.²

Israel-Palestine offers this case study a contextual framework that situates SDP, and Peace and Sport, amidst global peacebuilding initiatives strategically guided towards building and strengthening social cohesion, development, and sustainable peace. Moreover, the annual Forum highlights the innovative efforts of Peace and Sport to establish tenable synergies between the worlds of sport and development, while strengthening the influence of, and collaboration with, groups that are often marginalized in the development process (e.g., women, youth, people with disabilities, communities and individuals from the Global South).

This paper consists of four main chapters. Chapter 1 will explain the methodology employed for this research. This paper has applied heavily inductive, qualitative methods to gather data and explore the case study. The first section outlines these methods throughout a detailed description of Peace and Sport. Second, a valuable contextual framework for this research is provided by briefly exploring key aspects of Israel-Palestine. Chapter 2 consists of a literature review that addresses the state of the field through an illumination of the broad-scope relationship between sport and international development in the twenty-first century. It also considers the impact of this relationship on the SDP sector, international relations, and academic research.

Chapter 3 provides the contextual and analytical framework of the SDP sector that is to be used as the basis for this study. First, three historical stages outlined by Giulianotti (2011b) are attributed to establishing contemporary SDP initiatives, currently situating the SDP sector firmly within the political context of global civil society (see

² See www.peace-sport.org/israel/-/palestine/actions-in-israel-palestine.html

Giulianotti, 2011a; 2011b; 2011c). Second, Giulianotti (2011a) provides a clear framework of definitive objectives by categorizing the four main social policy domains pursued across the SDP sector. Third, the primary transnational themes throughout SDP work are identified (Giulianotti, 2011c). Fourth, the final section of chapter 3 provides an elucidation of the ideal-type models of peacemaking within the SDP sector, which offers a context for Peace and Sport initiatives in Israel-Palestine (Giulianotti, 2011b). Chapter 4 will employ this framework in constructing a critical analysis of Peace and Sport initiatives. This chapter will explore the case study findings from this research in correlation with Giulianotti's (2011c) limitations thesis as well as offer final conclusions.

CHAPTER 1: Methodology

Peace and Sport

Amidst the process of determining an organization within the SDP sector that might stand as a viable case study, it was preferable that this organization possess an ability to meet certain contemporary standards set out in the literature. These standards help offer a unique, focused, updated, and informative analysis with the potential to expand scholastic knowledge to disparate fields outside, as well as within, the academic spheres of sport, development and SDP.

Along this line, it was thought that a relatively recent NGO would provide the greatest potential of personifying the most innovative strategies within the contemporary SDP sector. As some scholars have suggested, the failures of past development organizations may have offered directional clarity in the current institutional environment (Levermore, 2008b; Peacock, 2011). Also, due to the time limitations of gathering this research, it was essential that the NGO represented in this study offer an opportunity, or forum, in which to speak openly with various leading SDP officials, local activists, decision makers, and stakeholders in order to compile as much qualitative data on this case study within the short amount of research time allotted. Therefore, the organization represented in this case study was Peace and Sport.

Established in 2007, 'Peace and Sport, L'Organisation pour la Paix par le Sport' (known more commonly as 'Peace and Sport') offered this study a unique exploration of a recently established SDP organization dedicated to innovative strategies in efforts towards building sustainable peace across the globe through promoting sport as an instrument of reconciliation, understanding and social stability (Bouzou, 2010). This non-

profit organization is self-proclaimed *apolitical*, and is based out of the neutral standing Principality of Monaco. Peace and Sport represents an international initiative under the High Patronage of H.S.H. Prince Albert II of Monaco that utilizes sport to “unite people, far beyond ethnic, religious or social differences.”³

Peace and Sport’s main interventions occur through locally-based projects in regions made vulnerable by poverty, recent conflicts, or lack of social cohesion/stability. *Neutrality, independence, long-term commitment, action-orientated, and flexibility of intervention* represent the five principle values that guide the action of Peace and Sport. Currently, this organization collaboratively intervenes with several locally-based projects in disparate regions of Côte d'Ivoire, Burundi, Timor-Leste, Colombia, Haiti, and Israel-Palestine. The programs in each of these regions that are supported by Peace and Sport serve as ‘pilot projects’ that are intended to generate best practices, which, through the annual Forum, are exchanged in open-dialogue with actors around the world involved with SDP initiatives.⁴

Altogether, Peace and Sport supports three main directives in each of these regions, including *peace-building*-, *emergency*-, and *peace-promotion*- programs. The first, *peace-building* programs, is dedicated to opening local sports-centers within deprived communities, improving existing sports facilities and supporting national strategies, while supervising and socially-reintegrating local youth through such initiatives. *Emergency* programs provide victim trauma assistance and support social reconstruction through sport in regions that have been devastated by natural or man-made disasters. *Peace-promotion* programs focus primarily on supporting recurrent sporting

³ This was quoted from a speech given by H.S.H. Prince Albert II of Monaco on April 18, 2008, during the Peace and Sport official visit to Dili, Timor-Leste. See www.peace-sport.org

⁴ See www.peace-sport.org/overview/presentation-of-our-locally-based-projects.html

events, offering a strong symbolic impact, in order to encourage dialogue and inspirational concepts of utilizing peace through sport.

The primary focus in regards to project implementation in this study will be on Peace and Sport's Israel-Palestine initiatives throughout Arab communities in the occupied West Bank. Here, two target populations are the primary focus of Peace and Sport objectives: Arab youth in communities near Jerusalem on the Palestinian side of the wall, but who officially belong to Israel, as well as youth living in refugee camps located in volatile areas of Bethlehem and Hebron.⁵ While various issues in this region remain overtly contentious, both the Israeli and Palestinian governments have allowed Peace and Sport to develop SDP programs in collaboration with local NGOs.

The data collected for this study draws heavily on qualitative research. Semi-structured interviews were primarily used to collect viable information from various sources within the SDP sector who gathered at the 2011 Peace and Sport International Forum in Monaco. These sources included various diplomatic government officials, individuals associated with governmental and intergovernmental organizations, local and external NGOs, SDP academia, stakeholders, donors and sports federations, as well as Olympic and local athletes and community activists. While source-bias qualifications are plausible due to most interviews being conducted during the Peace and Sport Forum, each interviewee did request to remain anonymous to an extent that freed them to speak more openly – relative to the conditions – and offered slightly more credibility to their contributions as well as to the overall research design. Even though interviews were conducted separately and under varying conditions, considerable limitations remained due to a research environment favoring SDP objectives and agencies.

⁵ See (target populations) www.peace-sport.org/israel/-/palestine/actions-in-israel-palestine.html

Although aspects of the dialogue were often impromptu depending on the individual, the semi-structured research design provided a strict focus on the SDP sector in general, and the overall influence of Peace and Sport and the impact of their initiatives throughout Israel-Palestine in particular. Most all of these interviews were initiated through personal participatory efforts at the 2011 Peace and Sport International Forum in Monaco, with the rest being conducted via telephone and email after this event. Along with these semi-structured interviews, research data was also collected through utilizing active observational techniques and external-source accumulation methods.

The aim of this research, in regards to Israel-Palestine, was to gather an understanding of what role Peace and Sport plays in the region and how their projects are implemented. Hence, the goal was not to provide any measure of evaluation for these projects *per se*. In such regard, this study was heavily limited due to a lack of field research within this region. While the Forum offered a unique opportunity to speak with individuals actively involved with these SDP projects in the region, this study was unable to engage with group participants or Palestinian community leaders out in-the-field who share the first-hand experience and knowledge of such programs. Therefore, the information gathered regarding these projects was merely in relation to Giulianotti's (2011c) broader limitations thesis.

Israel-Palestine

Although it is far beyond the scope of this research to assert any elaborate explanation of historical issues surrounding fragile relations between Israelis and Palestinians, the relationship is briefly addressed here only to form a context for the peacebuilding initiatives of Peace and Sport in the region. As Sugden (2007) suggests, contemporary

complexities evolving out of deep historical roots regarding Israeli and Palestinian conflict make it only more viable to simply outline key socio-political and demographic features pertinent to a particular study. Therefore, a focus will remain on such aspects and the role sport plays within this region. The current initiatives in Israel-Palestine pursued by Peace and Sport involve predominately Arab communities located in Qatanna, Dheisha (Bethlehem refugee camp), Hebron, Dahiat El Sallam, and Kafr Akeb.

Demographically, 2008 census data collected through the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics indicated that the total population of Israel stood around 7.4 million residents.⁶ More recent data suggests that Israel's total population consists of approximately 75% identifying as Jewish Israelis, 20% identifying as 'Palestinian-Arab-Israeli', and the remaining 5% identifying as *other* (Sugden, 2007).⁷ Still, there are various religious, ethnic, and tribal affiliations that tend to complicate any exact estimation. Census data taken in 2007 through the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics lists the total population of Qatanna at 6,458, Dheisha at 8,736, and Hebron – which is the largest city in the West Bank – at 163,146.⁸ Each of these populations is split quite evenly between males and females. Both Dahiat El Sallam (3,000 residents) and Kafr Akeb (27,000 residents) are neighborhoods along the outskirts of Jerusalem; caught in the so-called *no-man's land* between the municipal boundary and security fence. There are an estimated 60,000 residents who live in such areas around Jerusalem, where many come from refugee camps and endure a low socio-economic status along with heavily limited services (Peace and Sport, 2009).

⁶ See www.cbs.gov.il/hodaot2009n/14_09_192e.pdf

⁷ See www.cbs.gov.il/reader/shnaton/templ_shnaton_e.html?num_tab=st02_02&CYear=2011

⁸ See www.pcbs.gov.ps/Portals/_pcbs/census2007/ind_loca_09.pdf

The establishment of an Israeli state in 1948, following the atrocities of WWII, is most often viewed in Western societies – particularly the US – as a major achievement for persecuted Jews. Yet, Said (2002) recognized that the creation of Israel may also be equally understood as disastrous for a Palestinian diaspora that mostly fled to neighboring Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. Beyond an acknowledgment of this dual suffering, he insists that these two communities must not detach from the others experiences and should instead begin to plan a common life together for a future of coexistence. In essence, a foundation for sustainable peace can only become reality when a mutual recognition of different cultural traditions, history, oppression, and suffering is respectfully acknowledged and new attitudes about the Other take shape (Ateek, 1989). Many suggest that sport has the ability to facilitate this opportunity for rapprochement, coexistence, and sustainable peace in Israel-Palestine (see Sugden, 2007).

The success and participation of Arabs in major professional Israeli sport – in particular, the Israeli national football team – is often perceived by Palestinians as an integrative achievement that can expand into other aspects of society (Sorek, 2005). While some scholars, such as Harif (2003), argue that such achievements in sport represent the potential cure for Israeli and Palestinian tensions and could successfully establish greater equality, other scholars, such as Sorek (2007), suggest that Israeli professional sport only re-emphasizes Jewish hegemonic power relations over the Arab population. For instance, through an exploration of Israeli media, Shor and Yonay (2010) found that Arab football players on the Israeli national team were often condemned to silence by the media upon making statements or addressing issues regarding the opinions and demands of the Palestinian public. Moreover, Ben-Porat (1998) has argued that

professional sport was integral in processes constructing a cultural façade of the [Jewish] state of Israel. Indeed, maintaining the Jewish identity and ensuring national unity are associated with Israeli's core requirements for Peace with Palestinians (Ben-Meir, 2008).

Waxman (2006) highlights the major tension Israel faces between the demands for national unity and the demands for establishing peaceful relations with Palestinians. Still, optimism surrounding the potential peacebuilding aspects of sport can be found in various locally-based SDP projects throughout Israel-Palestine (Sugden, 2008). For example, as an apolitical organization, Peace and Sport strongly supports collaborative initiatives with local community groups from both Israel and Palestine in order to implement various integrative and educational SDP events.⁹ Nujidat (2007) suggests that a facilitation of peaceful integration comes out of such non-political initiatives at the local level, where strengthening youth relations becomes the backbone of community cohesion. At this locally-based community-sports level, Israeli and Palestinian youth are positively exposed to the Other and interact in peaceful and beneficial ways that may not have otherwise been facilitated without SDP programs (Liebmann & Rookwood, 2007).

⁹ See www.peace-sport.org/israel/-/palestine/actions-in-israel-palestine.html

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review (State of the Field)

Sport: An Instrument for Development in the Twenty-First Century

Sage (1979) claimed that ‘sport is one of the most ubiquitous activities of modern contemporary society,’ and suggested that the twentieth century should be recognized as ‘The Century of Sport’ for elevating the development of modern sport. Moving forward into the twenty-first century, sport has become more contemporarily declared a human right that should be utilized for the common good of all peoples (Peacock, 2011; Donnelly, 2008). Here, the ubiquitous aspect of sport has become systematically utilized, within the context of globalization, by transnational and local institutions in attempts to establish development projects that aim to facilitate efforts towards dramatic social change and sustainable peace.

Following the UN’s recognition at the turn of the century that sport – as a universal language and fundamental right for all (Beutler, 2008) – is a vehicle with the potential to significantly facilitate progress towards achieving the MDGs, the first decade of the twenty-first century has witnessed an enormous intensification of ‘sport-in-development’ initiatives (Levermore, 2008a). Indeed, there have been a growing number of institutions strategically focusing their efforts on the primary goal of international development through a utilization of the pervasive values attributed to sport (Levermore & Beacom, 2009; Njelesani, 2011). More recently, these values of sport have been recognized and asserted by the UNOSDP as playing a ‘significant role as a promoter of social integration and economic development in different geographical, cultural, and political contexts,’ making sport ‘a powerful tool to strengthen social ties and networks,

and to promote peace, fraternity, solidarity, non-violence, tolerance, and justice’ (Darnell & Black, 2011).¹⁰

The concept of utilizing sport as an instrument for the broader good of humanity is far from a novel idea at its core (Peacock, 2011). For example, the modern-era IOC has been committed for more than a century to situating the Olympic movement at the heart of global modernization, egalitarianism, and progress. Actors across civil society, such as the Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) in Nairobi, Kenya – established in 1987, have also been successful in implementing such aspects of sport (Willis, 2000). Yet, it has been the ‘isomorphism’ of modern institutionalization through globalization, as well as critical academic analyses, where the most recent concepts throughout civil society – of applying sport towards much more definitive objectives within the field of development – have evolved into the focused and internationally legitimized institutional practice it is today (Giulianotti, 2010; Peacock, 2011).¹¹ Furthermore, Levermore and Beacom (2009) argued that the recent advancement of sport-in-development institutions and initiatives can partially be explained as a recognition of, and response to, the failures of traditional, orthodox development strategies. These traditional policies mainly emphasized modernization through industrialization and the *economic* rather than the *social* environment, and have been strongly advocated by Western Liberal Democracies in the post war-era (Darnell & Black, 2011; Levermore, 2008b).

Hence, the sometimes ambiguous dichotomy between sport-development throughout the twentieth-century and the sport-for-development movement forging ahead

¹⁰ These declarations come from the UNOSDP website, and were quoted in Darnell and Black (2011). See www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/

¹¹ The term *isomorphism* appears in Peacock (2011) as defining the tendency of modern social forms and organizations to resemble one another.

into the twenty-first century can be more clearly understood as an evolution of both sport – the role/responsibility it is seen as having within civil society – and, more importantly, of the approaches to development (Kidd, 2008). As this contemporary mobilization of sport for purposes of development has progressed, the broad institutionalization of such practices has become more commonly referred to, in a variety of cultural, political, and academic spheres, as the Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) movement, or *transnational* sector (Darnell, 2010; Darnell & Black, 2011; Giulianotti, 2011c).

In the past decade, initiatives within the SDP sector have been established as widely-recognized and viable strategies of social intervention in disadvantaged communities around the world (for example, see Willis, 2000; Sugden & Wallis, 2007). The increasing number of such organizations that work at the global, national, and local levels has led to the introduction of sport-based programs in ‘practically every country, from Azerbaijan to Zambia’ (Levermore & Beacom, 2009). These SDP projects within conflict-ridden regions, such as the Balkans, the Middle East, West and Central Africa, Sri Lanka, and South America, among elsewhere, attempt to facilitate efforts towards strengthening social relations between divided peoples (Giulianotti, 2011b). Sport is widely viewed as an international language that projects a value-neutral message within these regions. It offers a profound ability to reach communities of people where communication by traditional development institutions and politicians would mostly be met with skepticism, and has therefore become a preferred instrument in facilitating contemporary development (Levermore, 2008b; Kidd, 2008).

Stemming from this growing public and political interest in initiating sport as a possible means to promote rapprochement, cohesion, and sustainable peace, the number

of governments, national and intergovernmental organizations, local and external NGOs, TNCs through global corporate social engagement (GCSE) – often these initiatives assert *corporate social responsibility* (CSR), and international sport federations collaborating to implement such projects in divided societies has largely increased (Giulianotti, 2011b; Hayhurst, 2011; Levermore, 2008b). Over 350 organizations engaged in such work are currently listed on the International Platform on Sport for Development website alone, which is maintained by the Swiss Academy for Development (SAD) in Bienne, Switzerland (Darnell & Black, 2011; Kidd, 2008).¹² In comprising such a diverse transnational sector, this extensive caste of emerging stakeholders has placed considerable interest in SDP initiatives while still managing collaborative efforts ‘alongside traditional development actors in government, multilateral institutions, and NGOs’ (Darnell & Black, 2011). Develtere and De Bruyn (2009) identify the use of sport to this end as a prominent part within the emerging ‘fourth pillar in development aid.’

Concepts and Utility of Sport

Within this diverse and complex transnational sector of SDP, which includes actors across the Global North and South (Giulianotti, 2011c), there are both various ways in which institutions conceptualize *sport* as well as various ways in which sport is understood to facilitate development (Levermore, 2008b). In many ways, these are not mutually exclusive paradigms. The former consist of concepts that delineate what constitutes *sport*, where, when applied to development, although competitive sport does factor into this process in various programs, many SDP initiatives also consist of sport in a recreational or non-competitive manner (Levermore & Beacom, 2009). For example, Skateistan (skateistan.org) uses recreational skateboarding to promote peace and

¹² See www.sportanddev.org/en/connect/organisations/organisations_list/

reconciliation throughout regions in Afghanistan, and the International Platform on Sport for Development website provides information on organizations utilizing martial arts, dance, recreational running and cycling, swimming, etc.

Levermore and Beacom (2009) recognize that as the worlds of *sport* and *development* continue to emerge in collaboration, it becomes ‘imperative to emphasize that the concept of sport within the context of SDP should be broadly defined such as to include all types of organized physical activity that may serve as a tool for development and peace.’ The UN recognizes this definition of sport to include ‘play; recreation; organized, casual or competitive sport; and indigenous sports or games’, which afford its participants ‘physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction’ (United Nations Inter-agency Taskforce on Sport for Development and Peace, 2003). Therefore, a concept of sport within the transnational sector of SDP can potentially, and possibly should, represent as broad an array of “activities” as the institutions implementing them.

The latter aspect deals in terms of attempts at distinguishing certain objectives of project implementation, and the ability to delineate between organizations throughout the SDP sector. For example, the World Bank distinguishes between *operational* and *advocacy* NGOs establishing programs for development (Levermore, 2008b), while Kidd (2008) distinguishes between *sport development* and *sport for development* organizations and initiatives. Moreover, Giulianotti (2011a) describes *sport-specific* and *generalist* SDP objectives. Yet, the most well-known terminology – and most widely-referenced throughout recent SDP literature – to distinguish SDP initiatives derive from Coalter’s (2006) *sport-plus* and *plus-sport* differentiation.

Sport-plus organizations are identified as focusing efforts primarily on sport and the development of sustainable sport organizations, programs, and development pathways, while addressing broader development issues through highlighting the social benefits of sport. In an attempt at expanding this idea of sport-plus initiatives, Levermore (2008b) also identified *sport-first* projects; these primarily stimulate user group participation in traditional forms of Western competitive sport, while the consequences of development are merely an unintentional by-product. Conversely, the primary focus of plus-sport organizations and initiatives is to mainstream development organizations tackling broader social and health issues. Here, sport is utilized as a facilitator to bring large groups of people together in order to achieve project objectives (Coalter, 2009; Levermore, 2008b).

Although these may be distinguishable characteristics of any particular organization, the SDP sector presents a *continuum* of such programs where these traits are not always clear-cut and tend to overlap (Coalter, 2009). For example, a plus-sport program, implementing a collaborative project alongside a sport-plus organization in a certain region, may decide to provide resources (e.g., sports equipment) through a sport-first organization, TNC, or sport federation. The continuum of SDP programs, as recognized by UK Sport in its Sport in Development Monitoring and Evaluation Manual (Coalter, 2006), relates to the wide array of contexts in which projects are undertaken, which in turn effects the outcomes of such programs and often leads to indistinguishable differences (Levermore & Beacom, 2009).

Hence, it is important to note, that when contextualizing the SDP sector, while many of the ambitions remain analogous, there is ‘tremendous diversity of purposes,

methodologies, actual activities, levels of intervention and social contexts associated with SDP' that must be considered (Kidd, 2011; Levermore, 2008b). Of particular influence recently across the SDP sector has been the ability of various institutions along this diverse continuum to establish collaborative transnational networks in implementing such projects, somewhat narrowing the knowledge gap. Giulianotti (2011c) briefly recognizes that 'various transnational SDP institutions – such as the Sport and Development platform in Switzerland, Peace and Sport in Monaco, Right to Play in Toronto, and streetfootballworld in Berlin – have become global hubs for knowledge transfer throughout the SDP sector.' Hence, the annual Peace and Sport International Forum in Monaco is an important aspect of the current SDP sector to acknowledge when considering the concerns of Fokwang (2009) over the need for 'considerably more transfers of knowledge from the Global South to the North' in comparison to the top-down 'vertical hierarchy' (Nicholls, 2009).

The Institution of SDP

Much of the recent institutional expansion and variety throughout *global* civil society (Giulianotti, 2011a; 2011b; 2011c), and legitimizing recognition from the international community that has spawned an entire transnational SDP sector, has arisen from the public endorsement and encouragement of the UN to promote sport as a human right and the values it promulgates as an important vehicle towards development (Donnelly, 2008; Levermore, 2008). As early as 1959, the recognition of sport as a fundamental right was offered by the UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child. UNESCO's International Charter of Physical Education and Sport expanded upon this in 1978, describing sport and physical education as a 'fundamental right for all,' while the Convention on the

Rights of the Child in 1990 recognized the ‘right of the child to rest and leisure, to engage in play and recreational activities appropriate to the age of the child’ (Beutler, 2008).

It has only been more recently though – upon introducing the MDGs at the turn of the century – where the strategic aim for systematically and coherently encouraging sport to be utilized as a means to promote development and peace has emerged (see Beutler, 2008; Darnell, 2010; Giulianotti, 2011b; Levermore & Beacom, 2009). Upon formally recognizing sport in 2001 as a mechanism that could be used at the individual, community, national, and global levels to champion goals aimed at various key issues such as poverty reduction, universal education, gender equality, environmental sustainability, and combating HIV/AIDS, the UN appointed a Special Adviser on Sport for Development and Peace. In 2002, an Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace was tasked with constructing a report focused on measures by which to promote more systematic, strategic, and effective efforts of using sport in development and peace activities (Beutler, 2008).

Sport for the purposes of development and peace were at the forefront of the UN declaring 2005 as its International Year of Sport and Physical Education (IYSPE 2005) (Darnell, 2010; Giulianotti, 2010, 2011b), and the global development aspirations for sport became crystalized (Levermore & Beacom, 2008; United Nations, 2005):

The world of sport presents a natural partnership for the United Nations system. By its very nature sport is about participation. It is about inclusion and citizenship. Sport brings individuals and communities together, highlighting commonalities and bridging cultural or ethnic divides. Sport provides a forum to learn skills such as discipline, confidence and leadership and it teaches core principles such as tolerance, cooperation and respect. Sport teaches the value of effort and how to manage victory, as well as defeat. When these positive aspects of sport are emphasized, sport becomes a powerful vehicle through which the United Nations can work towards achieving its goals.

The idea of a human right to participate in sport and physical education was further acknowledged at the 2006 UN International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (Donnelly, 2008; Kidd, 2008). It continues to play a major role today in facilitating efforts by UNESCO, UNICEF, WHO, among others throughout the UN system, in promoting the SDP movement towards achieving the MDGs (Beutler, 2008; Donnelly, 2008). The SDP sector is now officially recognized through the UNOSDP, providing international legitimacy to many assertions that SDP initiatives strengthen the ability to achieve development objectives as well as a supportive influence in regions where these projects are implemented. Where other UN agencies encourage the use of sport for development, the UNOSDP was established in order to ‘explicitly connect sport to peace building, child and youth development, as well as to the ongoing struggles to achieve the MDGs.’ In this regard, sport has *officially* become mainstreamed into international relations, politics, and development (Darnell & Black, 2011).

While the UN recognizes that sport alone is not a panacea for development, they do assert the widely-held view that the power of sport offers significant benefits in facilitating the promotion of health as well as disease prevention (Armstrong, 2004; Beutler, 2008; Njelesani, 2011), gender equity and equality (Hayhurst, 2011; Kay, 2009; Klausen, 1996; Saavedra, 2009), social integration and the development of social capital (Burnett, 2006; Fokwang, 2009), peace building and conflict prevention/resolution (Beech, Rigby, Talbot, & Thandi, 2005; Giulianotti & Armstrong, 2011; Merkel, 2008; Schulenkorf, 2010; Sugden, 2008), post-disaster trauma relief and normalization of life (Allison, 1998; Dyck, 2011), economic development (Curtis, McTeer, & White, 2003;

Edmans, Garcia, & Norli, 2007; Perks, 2007), youth development (Calloway, 2004; Dyck, 2011; Ennis, Solmon, Satina, Loftus, Mensch, & McCauley, 1999; Nicholls, 2009), inclusion and integration of persons with disabilities (Beacom, 2009; Smith, Cahn, & Sybil, 2010), and social mobilization and collaboration (Huish, 2011) that have major impacts on the *success* of development (Levermore & Beacom, 2009).

Attempting to achieve these benefits are most often referred to as working towards the common good (Peacock, 2011), and is the main reason why the SDP sector has focused primarily on regions and individuals linked to poverty, poor health, human rights violations, natural disaster, and war and social conflict. The official recognition of the benefits attributed to sport from the UN has provided structure and legitimacy to the previously ‘often informal nature’ of utilizing the values of sport in civil society (Nicholls & Giles, 2007).

Sporting Skepticism

Although the benefits of SDP are often highlighted, the ‘mythopoeic status’ attributed to utilizing sport for development has often resulted in considerable backlash from scholars and practitioners who have spent a lifetime dealing with difficult developmental issues (Coalter, 2010; Swatuk, Motsholapheko, & Mazvimavi, 2011).¹³ A common theme throughout the recent literature is that ‘while considerable potential exists for the use of sport as an instrument for development,’ desired outcomes are not always guaranteed to be achieved accordingly (Kidd, 2011), and ‘the long-term impact of a wide range of interventions remains open to question’ (Akindes & Kirwin, 2009). For example, a recent

¹³ Found in Swatuk et al. (2011), Coalter (2010) describes *mythopoeic* concepts as ‘those whose demarcation criteria are not specific, but are based on idealistic and popular ideas that are produced largely outside of sociological research and analysis, and which “isolate a particular relationship between variables to the exclusion of others and without a sound basis for doing so.”’ Coalter is quoting Glasner (1977).

exploratory case study examining NGOs utilizing sport for HIV/AIDS prevention in Zambia showed how aspects of SDP inclusion actually inhibited the development process (Lindsey & Banda, 2011); this elaborates a major inquiry of concern posited by Nicholls (2009).

While understanding the benefits associated with SDP work allow for a positive exchange of ideas, Levermore and Beacom (2009) fully acknowledge that over-emphasizing the optimistic qualities of sport and merely documenting the benefits associated with SDP and the broader sport and development relationship can be viewed as an overly optimistic, functionalist perspective with the potential of straying into ‘nonempirical mystifications’ (Susser, 1992). This often has the – mostly unintended – consequence of simply reinforcing dominant notions of neo-liberal, hegemonic power relations within North-to-South, donor-recipient projects across the SDP sector (Darnell, 2010a). Indeed, the majority of SDP initiatives emerge from Global North institutions and are directed towards regions of the Global South, particularly those ravaged by warfare, social breakdown, and natural disaster (Giulianotti, 2010).

While bold collaborative efforts, such as Peace and Sport’s annual Forum, attempt to close the power-relations gap between the Global North and South, many people from the Global South often remain marginalized across the SDP sector (Darnell, 2010a; Giulianotti, 2010b; Nicholls, 2009; Tiessen, 2011). Whereas the potential for sport and the SDP sector to facilitate understanding between individuals, encourage dialogue between divergent communities, and breed tolerance between nations has certainly been shown to be valid, so too has the contradictory potential for promoting ideological

conformity, nationalism, militarism, principles of social exclusion and inequitable attitudes about gender, race, and disability (Donnelly, 2008).

Therefore, the use of sport by the SDP sector, for social and political reconciliation, must be recognized by scholars as having the potential to both ameliorate and exacerbate conflict and division (Darnell & Black, 2011; Lambert, 2007). This level of objectivity is the recommended approach for scholars investigating SDP in order to steer clear of anecdotal claims to the power of sport and remain stringently focused on emphasizing issues of human rights and socio-political struggles (Sugden, 2010). Darnell and Black (2011) warn that SDP cannot merely be considered an end-all-be-all ('add sport and stir') solution to development, and that scholars should examine the successes or failures of sport and SDP through explorations and analyses of its 'organization, implementation and, ultimately, participation.' This paper deploys such investigative techniques throughout its case study analysis of Peace and Sport.

CHAPTER 3: Analytical Framework of the SDP Sector

I. Historical Context

Giulianotti (2011b) suggests three historical stages best contextualize the SDP movement's emergence into global civil society. He claims that these stages highlight the significant role sport has played throughout modern history – for example, in shaping Global North-South relations – as an important socio-cultural and political-ideological mechanism. While certain aspects of each stage may overlap, definitive characteristics help distinguish each era and shape the current SDP sector.

STAGE 1

The first stage, identified as “Sport/Global Society 1.0: Sport, Colonization and ‘Civilization’” and comprising a date-range from approximately the late eighteenth to mid-twentieth century, represents what could be considered an era of enormous sport ‘globalization’ through colonization (Andrews & Ritzer, 2007).¹⁴ This stemmed primarily from the imperial reach and aspirations of British *colonial projects* that subsequently fostered modern-day popular sport forms (e.g., football [soccer], cricket, rugby, golf, horse racing, track and field, boxing, etc.), and inevitably established much of the ‘standardization, codification, and bureaucratization’ that embody the global governing of sport associated with contemporary sport institutions such as the IOC and FIFA (Andrews & Ritzer, 2007; Giulianotti, 2011b). This capacity of colonial imposition was able to contribute amply to the organic development of international society (Hobson, 1988); sport was often implemented throughout this era as a means for

¹⁴ The term *globalization* represents the ‘imperialistic ambitions of nations, corporations, organizations, and the like and their desire, indeed need, to impose themselves on various geographic areas’ (Andrews & Ritzer, 2007).

promulgating cultural values while civilizing indigenous peoples beyond their barbaric local customs (Levermore & Beacom, 2009; Mangan, 2006).

During what Hobsbawm (1989) referred to as the ‘Age of Empire’, Britain – as a forceful agent of globalization – diffused sport throughout the colonies as one aspect in seeking to impose itself, and its interests, economically, militarily, politically, and culturally, around the globe (Andrews & Ritzer, 2007). Such a consciousness of imperial and military destiny was engrained through sport at home, with British children heavily exposed to the perpetuation of empire through a framework of sports, curricular, and extra-curricular activities (MacKenzie, 1984). Therefore, used primarily as a coercive, civilizing mechanism of cultural genocide throughout the colonies, sport often embodied the immense power inequalities of the era (Giulianotti, 2011b; Levermore & Beacom, 2009).

For example, sport with ‘elite social habitus’, such as cricket, offered British colonial projects both a combined physical and moral activity as well as an exercise in the *art of being British* (Holt, 1989) that could be implemented as a ‘vehicle for embodying and imposing the physical and cultural superiority of the colonizer over the colonized’ (Andrews & Ritzer, 2007). Furthermore, association football became broadly exported by the roving employment of Britain’s sizeable working-class diaspora of manual laborers, along with the heavy influence from expatriate artisans, teachers, and cosmopolitans (Giulianotti, 1999). While this global policy of diffusing sport for the improvement, or *development*, of colonial populations expanded, these new sporting forms became adopted by the indigenous elite from regions such as India (MacKenzie,

1984), which offered tangible results by the 1930s for this internalizing system of athletic education (Holt, 1989).

It is with this long established ‘link between colonialism (imperialism) and development’ throughout academic literature (Levermore & Beacom, 2009; for example, see Heinemann, 1993; MacAloon, 2006) that many scholars today continue to offer wide-ranging skepticism. Many inquire just how far, if at all, the SDP sector has moved away from such traits of neo-liberal hegemonic imperialism and subordinate power relations between Global North and South (for example, see Black, 2010; Coalter, 2010; Darnell, 2010b; Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011; Hayhurst, 2011; Nicholls, 2009). Indeed, concepts of sport potentially having the ability to contribute to the civilizing process arose from this initial imperialistic diffusion of modern sporting forms across empire (Levermore & Beacom, 2009). Rist (2002) argued that these early colonial approaches have been at the cornerstone of contemporary modern development practices, often dominated by neo-liberal perspectives and institutions.

STAGE 2

Throughout the second stage, ranging from the 1940s to the 1990s and referred to by Giulianotti (2011b) as “Sport/Global Society 2.0: Sport, Nationalism, Post-Colonialism and Development,” sport had paradoxically evolved into a highly contested field in both a colonial and post-colonial context. Whereas a diffusion of the nascent universal sport order – illuminated in the first stage – resulted in the displacement of many local cultural traditions (and their replacement by, what were to them, alien sport forms), these local sporting cultures did not fully disappear; they instead evolved as ‘glocal’ forms of

indigenous expression (Andrews & Ritzer, 2007).¹⁵ For example, in colonized regions such as the Caribbean and India, the struggles of liberation were dramatized through cricket matches – in which victories over England played an inspirational role in developing social movements (Beckles & Stoddart, 1995). Appadurai (1996) notes the influence of cricket in India as central to the erosion of ‘colonial ecumene’, where the concept of India as an independent nation vastly emerged as a salient cricketing entity.

Both Beckles (1998) and the classic account of James (1963) vividly illustrate how cricket in the West Indies was inevitably transformed by the local populace from a powerful symbol of British colonial rule into their own expression of self-identification and ‘cultural resistance over the colonial power from whence the game originated’ (Andrews & Ritzer, 2007). The struggles and resistance of colonized populations in Africa, and the inevitable challenges to apartheid, were intimately related with grassroots sport (see Allison, 1998; Hoglund & Sundberg, 2008; Korr & Close, 2008; Wagg, 1995). Perkin (1989), perhaps over-optimistically, suggested that this revolving paradox also offered the British Empire a much more ‘friendlier’ decolonization process than other imperial powers had experienced. Nevertheless, sport became viewed as a potential tool for marginalized groups to resist dominant power relations (Kuper, 1994).

Following independence in numerous states across the Global South, the new indigenous elite from many of these nations became heavily integrated into the global governance of major sports, which led to an enormous growth in sporting institutions throughout this epoch (Giulianotti, 2011b). For instance, Goldblatt (2003) explains that from 1945 to 1980 the membership of FIFA expanded from 54 to 149. Throughout this

¹⁵ The term *glocal* is defined by Andrews & Ritzer (2007) as being the ‘interpenetration of the global and the local, resulting in unique outcomes in different geographic areas’.

period, global governing bodies of sport, such as FIFA, and institutions across the NGO fraternity tended to prioritize the *development of sport* and economic growth (Green, 2008), merely resembling the favored modernization policies of international institutions such as the IMF and World Bank (Giulianotti, 2011b; Houlihan & White, 2002). Still, sport engendered a keen sense of cultural and national identity that provided marginalized groups a global arena in the fight for social justice (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2007).

STAGE 3

During the final stage offered by Giulianotti (2011b), represented as “Sport/Global Society 3.0: Sport, Development and Peace” and ranging from the mid-1990s onwards, strong partnerships between charities, TNCs, national and intergovernmental organizations, NGOs, and sport institutions – through ideals such as the ‘Olympic Truce’ as well as CSR initiatives – began to emerge in a post-modern figuration (Burnett, 2010). Although themes of colonial, post-colonial, and traditional practices for the development of sport had still remained prominent – what Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) refer to as *colonial residue* within the SDP sector, a vast emergence of the new ethos of *sport for development* spawned bold collaborative efforts which have continued to spill across the transnational SDP sector today (Giulianotti, 2011c). This bottom-up approach – with a desire to increase credibility and ensure long-term sustainability of sport programs – focuses on building local leadership and strengthening community involvement (Coalter, 2009; Deane, 1998; Witt & Crompton, 1996). As Kidd (2008) noted, SDP is distinguishable from ‘sport development’ even though it is invariably a part of it.

PHASE 1 / Stage 3

Within this recent stage, Giulianotti (2011b) argues that the SDP sector has experienced two particular phases of development. The first phase, termed “Sport/Global Society 3.1”, involved the sudden and broad expansion of the SDP movement, particularly through short-term projects with relatively little focus on sustainability, monitoring and evaluation of work, international coordination, or knowledge transfer (Armstrong, 2007; Gasser & Levinsen, 2004). Almost exclusively sport-plus, these programs focused primarily on the education and training of sport; indeed, with noble intentions geared towards helping impoverished and marginalized peoples – mainly throughout Africa (Burnett, 2010; Coalter, 2009). Beyond anecdotal assertions of the value of sport, there was very little emphasis as to *why* such programs were successful or not (Pawson, 2006).

While the early SDP movement became flooded with such broad-objective initiatives, much of it was uncoordinated and too dependent on donor expectations and demands (Kidd, 2008). Even with the UN announcing a more directive-based path for SDP in the early 2000s, Giulianotti (2011b) recognizes this gradual phase as lasting up to and including the IYSPE 2005. This can primarily be attributed to the fact that it was not until the 2005 UN Business Plan for the International Year of Sport that the UN fully acknowledged a need for monitoring and evaluation and the selection of relevant impact indicators across the SDP sector (Coalter, 2009; United Nations, 2005).

PHASE 2 / Stage 3

Throughout the second phase, termed “Sport/Global Society 3.2”, SDP agencies have tended to provide more definitive objectives, which have meant greater differentiation and reflexivity amongst officials, and have allowed those across the SDP sector to

significantly expand its collaborative efforts and network (Giulianotti, 2011b). The UN played a significant role in initiating the path toward a transnational sector through legitimizing institutional practices of SDP. Today, global initiatives such as the annual Peace and Sport International Forum in Monaco provide one example of this effort from the SDP sector to exchange best practices and establish key objectives and viable solutions across the Global North-South divide. A better understanding of the political context in which SDP operates will illuminate the diversity of influence across this sector.

Political Context / Global Civil Society

Following Giulianotti (2011a; 2011b; 2011c), this paper situates the SDP sector firmly within the political context of global civil society, understood as the globalized variant of civil society and encompassing important institutional, normative, and political characteristics shaped by a broad range of institutional actors espousing diverse political agendas (Chandler, 2005; Giulianotti, 2011c; Kaldor, 2003; Keane, 2003). In this way, global civil society represents a highly contested policy platform or political *field* in which these highly diverse institutional actors ‘argue about, campaign for (or against), negotiate about, or lobby’ with ‘centers of political and economic authority’ regarding ‘the arrangements that shape global developments’ (Kaldor, 2003).¹⁶ The SDP sector, therefore, is viewed as a significant component (or sub-field) of global civil society (Giulianotti, 2011c), and its transnational characteristics and traits provide clarity as to the collaborative diversity.

¹⁶ Giulianotti (2011c) pulled from Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) in defining *field* as a “network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions.” Furthermore, social actors within fields are engaged in game-like relationships where each holds various forms of capital or power (Bourdieu, 1984).

While the concept of global civil society is highly contested, and can be understood in a variety of descriptive, strategically political, and normative ways (Keane, 2003), the key aspects for the purposes of this study, and in understanding the SDP sector as a whole, center around the complexity of institutional forms and interrelationships between them that formulate this sector's transnational characteristics. Therefore, the primary policy domains across the SDP sector are explained first (Giulianotti, 2011a), followed by the four main transnational themes that Giulianotti (2011c) identified through interviews with SDP officials.

II. Four Social Policy Domains

Across the SDP sector, Giulianotti (2011a) employs Weber's (1949) understanding of *ideal-type* in identifying the four primary social policy domains.¹⁷ Accordingly, he recognizes that various complex features of any such phenomena cannot possibly be accounted for in an ideal-type. For example, the broad-ranging network of an intergovernmental organization, such as the UN, may possess features that support a number of social policies. Despite the diverse complexity of a transnational SDP sector, his model does illuminate delineations across policy initiatives that help underlie relations between certain SDP institutions. For many non-sport institutions, such as TNCs and intergovernmental organizations, the SDP sector represents a diverse field with significant opportunities to engage with global civil society. Table 1 shows the four ideal-type SDP social policy perspectives in correlation with their respective institutions.

¹⁷ An *ideal-type* is explained by Weber (1949) as being "formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified analytical construct."

Table 1. Giulianotti's (2011a) Four Ideal-Type Social Policy Domains – SDP Sector

	Neo-Liberalism	Strategic Developmentalism	Developmental Interventionism	Social Justice
Institutions	Transnational corporations (TNCs) / corporate social responsibility (CSR)	National governmental agencies and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), sport federations	Mainstream nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)	New social movements and radical NGOs
Examples within the SDP Sector	Nike, Coca-Cola	United Nations, UNESCO, UNICEF, UNOSDP, FIFA, IOC, UK Sport	Right to Play, streetfootballworld, Football for Peace (F4P)	Clean Clothes Campaign, Nike Watch

1) *Corporate / neo-liberalism.* The terminology most often associated with descriptions of neo-liberal philosophy include ideas related to free markets, private enterprise, private property rights, state welfare reform (or incremental abolishment), and corporate deregulations that allow 'individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills' to flourish (Harvey, 2005). The contemporary ideology further embraces the borderless marketplace amidst a global private sphere (Clarke, 2004; Giulianotti, 2011a). Yet, one of the more overlooked neo-liberal social policies is that of heavily encouraged private philanthropy, which is posited as a potential answer to the vast inefficiencies of traditional development institutions – namely the state (Levermore, 2010).

Across the SDP sector, such policies are most-commonly asserted through CSR initiatives led by TNCs (Giulianotti, 2011b). Here, sport provides businesses with youth-driven global appeal (Smith & Westerbeek, 2007), which allow corporations to justify CSR initiatives as profitable marketing schemes (Kotler & Lee, 2005). Furthermore, the UN has strongly encouraged collaborative efforts between SDP and CSR through initiatives such as Manchester United's 'United for UNICEF' and the 'Global Compact'

(Giulianotti, 2011a; Levermore, 2010). Giulianotti (2011a) offers three ways in which CSR initiatives intersect with the SDP sector.

First, he explains that the SDP CSR movement's rapid expansion in recent years has largely been in response to new social movements and radical NGOs standing in harsh opposition to the egregious injustices as well as exploitative practices of corporations, such as Nike, Reebok, and Addidas (for example, see Klein, 2000; Smith & Westerbeek, 2007). Subsequently, most of these corporations have developed self-monitoring systems, and have emphasized – through strategic PR – an inherently voluntary, non-political business plan (Giulianotti, 2011a). Still, many concerns over SDP CSR initiatives are acknowledged throughout the academic literature (see Levermore, 2010; 2011b).

For example, Levermore (2010) borrowed from the four categories of CSR for development found in Ponte, Richey, and Baab (2009) to distinguish the relative 'engagement' of such SDP CSR initiatives. Most of the high-profile CSR strategies – centered on strengthening PR – only tended to lose sight of engaging with long-term structural issues and development problems, which often leads many to dismiss the use of sport in CSR as a disingenuous initiative to distract from corporate irresponsibility (Giulianotti, 2011a; Levermore, 2010). Corporate initiatives such as privatized self-monitoring also raise concerns over policies that appear to sidestep diplomatic regulatory measures and offer no binding accountability to public scrutiny or intervention aimed at halting the potentially destructive aspects of global capitalism (Rowe, 2005; Tonkiss, 2006).

Second, Giulianotti (2011a) notes that TNCs tend to prefer close collaborative efforts with the most pragmatic NGOs in order to finance and implement SDP projects. He explains that this donor role of CSR initiatives within the SDP sector allows for significant influence over project objectives, implementation and results-dissemination. For example, Standard Chartered Bank, which is among a number of corporate sponsors for the Magic Bus project, offers volunteer aids to local schools in order to help run the program (Levermore, 2010). Furthermore, mainstream SDP initiatives headed by FIFA garnered much of the media attention during the 2010 World Cup in South Africa and attracted a significant number of foreign corporate donors (Cornelissen, 2011). Also, the Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) program in Nairobi, Kenya collaborates with various domestic and foreign corporate donors such as the Ford Foundation, Telenor, and Sara Lee Kenya (Levermore, 2010).

Finally, and third, these collaborative arrangements often facilitate more systemic ties between TNCs pursuing CSR and national and intergovernmental organizations that are able and willing to assist with SDP programs (Giulianotti, 2011a). The primary example of this would certainly be the UN, IMF, and the World Bank heavily advocating for global partnerships with TNCs in efforts to strengthen SDP projects.

2) National and intergovernmental organizations / strategic developmentalism. For over a decade, Giulianotti (2011a) explains that the most significant influence of organizational power across the SDP sector has come from national and intergovernmental organizations, such as the UN, IMF, and the World Bank, pursuing strategic developmentalism. In particular, the UN's role in advocating for sport-based development programs has significantly increased the global influence of SDP initiatives.

For example, the development objectives spelled out in initiatives, such as the MDGs, shape mainstream policy across the SDP sector. Moreover, global institutional networks and knowledge transfer, through various SDP conferences and websites, have expanded beyond the UN system into global civil society. Giulianotti (2011a) uses three broad categories to situate these organizations within the SDP policy framework.

First, *intergovernmental organizations* have become heavily engaged in pursuing development objectives utilizing sport following the UN's public endorsement of this practice upon disseminating the MDGs at the turn of the century. As initiatives such as the IYSPE 2005 unfolded, strategic institutional SDP programs significantly increased (Beutler, 2008). For example, various UN agencies such as UNESCO and UNICEF have established their own SDP divisions that aim to assist projects and support institutional collaboration. Elsewhere, the NATO Public Diplomacy Division has supported a distance run across Central Europe since 2006 known as the NATO Partnership Running Festival (natofutas.hu), which has aspired to educate youth and attract sustainable partnerships. Moreover, the Council of Europe understands sport to promote their core values – namely 'democracy, human rights, and the rule of law' – and play a unique role in strengthening education as well as social integration and cohesion.¹⁸ For this reason, the Council of Europe has led the European Convention on Spectator Violence and the Anti-Doping Convention in order to act against such destructive aspects of sport (Council of Europe, 2011).

¹⁸ The European Sport Charter, which was adopted in 1992 and revised in 2001, provides the framework for sports policy that assures the values of sport will contribute to the fulfillment of the ideals and principles of the Council of Europe.

Second, Giulianotti (2011a) notes that *sport federations and institutions*, such as FIFA and the IOC, support and implement a large number of SDP initiatives.¹⁹ For example, the 1Goal Education for All initiative is an advocacy program supported by FIFA that pursues universal education and gender equality in the classroom (Cornelissen, 2011). In a collaborative effort with the NGO streetfootballworld, FIFA's global Football for Hope movement engages peacebuilding, health promotion, environmental issues, youth education, and anti-discrimination (Giulianotti, 2011a). For many years, the IOC offered support to the humanitarian SDP organization Right to Play, which disseminates programs across countries in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and South America. Moreover, Giulianotti (2011a) also recognizes sport federations at the national level that pursue SDP initiatives, such as the Jordanian Olympic Committee's Peace Through Sport program.

Third, much of SDP work is also supported heavily by *national governmental agencies*, such as the British Council, UK Sport, the US Agency for International Development (USAID), the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), Canadian Heritage, and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). Giulianotti (2011a) provides examples of UK Sport's international development division programs in sub-Saharan Africa promoting education, equity, HIV/AIDS awareness and good governance through sport, as well as the SDP project investments of Canadian Heritage and the CIDA. Elsewhere, the Australian Sports Commission delivers programs

¹⁹ Sport federations such as FIFA and the IOC are often viewed as public entities or NGOs due to regulatory/public functions they perform (see Giulianotti, 2004). However, Levermore (2010) instead classifies them as 'businesses', arguing that such institutions are commercial organizations at their core. Still, Giulianotti's (2011a) framework categorizes sport federations within the policy domain of *strategic developmentalism*, characterizing them as a global governing institution in line with the UN and other intergovernmental organizations.

funded by AusAID such as the Active Community Club, which has a central component of delivering sport programs to local schools across South Africa (Burnett, 2010). Also, recognizing the capacity of sport as significantly transformative, the US delivers vast support and aid to SDP projects around the globe. One example of this is the peacebuilding organization MercyCorps, which transcends political barriers in bringing people together from Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan in the Ferghana Valley Youth Basketball League (USAID, 2005). Moreover, various agencies throughout the South African government collaborated with FIFA to establish international development projects during the 2010 World Cup (Cornelissen, 2011).

3) *Mainstream NGOs / developmental interventionism.* The SDP sector plays host to a diverse array of mainstream NGOs. Whereas Kaldor (2003) insisted that mainstream organizations represent ‘tamed social movements’ complicit in only reinforcing neo-liberal social policy, Giulianotti (2011a) instead examines these organizations with reference to their modus operandi of implementing sport as a tool for developmental interventionism while also making note of some radical NGOs and those engaging with new social movements. Mainstream SDP social policy is often pursued with the support of outside development institutions in efforts primarily advancing the MDGs and global initiatives of the UN system. Primary goals for these sport-related programs include establishing long-term objectives while building collaborative partnerships across a diverse network. Giulianotti (2011a) identifies five distinguishing characteristics of mainstream NGOs across the SDP sector.

First, Giulianotti (2011a) distinguishes between the *sport-specific* and *generalist* focuses of SDP programs that mainstream NGOs implement. As noted, this is more

widely cited as Coalter's (2006) sport-plus and plus-sport differentiation of SDP programs. In Giulianotti's (2011a) terms, however, sport-specific organizations were founded specifically to undertake SDP initiatives while generalist organizations utilize a variety of interventionist development techniques that predate their SDP work. Second, he notes that mainstream SDP organizations range significantly in scale and power. For example, a larger transnational NGO, such as streetfootballworld, is strongly supported by FIFA and visible in more than 40 countries overseeing upwards of 80 local projects. Subsequently, he notes, an increasing political influence of such organizations across the SDP sector becomes alarming for small-scale NGOs (see Fokwang, 2009; Nicholls, 2009).

Third, mainstream SDP organizations implement projects with various methods, objectives and philosophies. For example, organizations pursuing an interventionist, neo-liberal, philanthropic approach may tend to structure partnerships with TNCs and intergovernmental organizations, whereas other organizations pursuing a less interventionist role may prefer to facilitate small-scale community development and strengthen the local leadership as to assess their own needs (Dyck, 2011; Giulianotti, 2011a). Furthermore, and fourth, organizations' ideological and political relations tend to vary significantly. While some generalist, or plus-sport, NGOs may pursue radical and progressive interventions highlighting social justice, campaigns against corporate abuses, or human rights (see Hayhurst, 2011), Giulianotti (2011a) posits that most mainstream organizations instead tend to favor *apolitical* and pragmatic SDP interventions. This non-political, value-neutral approach can often prove vital to building user group trust when

implementing peacebuilding projects in conflict-ridden regions (Kidd, 2008; Levermore 2008b).

Finally, SDP organizations have varying relations with donors. Large scale SDP organizations often have close partnerships with TNCs, national governments, international sport federations, and powerful intergovernmental organizations such as the UN and the World Bank. According to Giulianotti (2011a), these connections afford mainstream NGOs a privileged position at the proverbial decision-making table of the SDP sector. However, he recognizes the existing possibility of organizations becoming ‘co-opted,’ where decision-making independence is often exchanged for more ‘tamed’ initiatives and less autonomy (Kaldor, 2003; Phillips, 2007). Inevitably, tension amongst actors with separate interests does occur. This may be no more evident than in the scenario of the IOC severing ties with Right to Play in order to comply with a Vancouver Organizing Committee (VANOC) decision to ban the humanitarian-aid organization from being present at the Olympic Village during the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympics due to a sponsorship dispute (Starkman, 2008). For this reason, many smaller organizations remain wary of powerful donors potentially exerting too much influence over project objectives.

4) *New social movements and radical NGOs / social justice.* The final SDP social policy domain is identified by Giulianotti (2011a) to consist of new social movements and radical NGOs, primarily those situated in the Global North, in pursuit of *social justice*. Whereas the other policy domains were primarily defined by formal institutions; political activists, critical academics, and investigative journalists are among the diverse individuals and social networks that fill the policy-advocating space of the social justice

field. With little social capital and weak direct influence in shaping broad SDP policy, these groups tend to campaign large-scale public protests as the most effective means for transnational struggles over social justice to impact global economic and political powers (Farnworth, 2003; Held & McGrew, 2002). Giulianotti (2011a) suggests that new social movements and radical NGOs are symbolic examples of the resistance towards globally imposed neo-liberal corporate policies and contemporary military industrial complexes. Sport offers new social movements and radical NGOs an opportunity to directly challenge the political economy (Harvey, Horne, & Safai, 2009).

Within the SDP sector, the campaigns against human rights violations towards marginalized groups in sports apparel factories – led by new social movements, such as the Clean Clothes Campaign and Nike Watch – capture the critical social policy response of civil societies to the failures of nation-states, intergovernmental organizations, and TNCs. These campaigns have brought significant pressure on various institutions and TNCs to employ ethical monitoring and evaluations as well as cooperatively engage with the SDP sector (Giulianotti, 2011a). Elsewhere, the EduSport Foundation – a Zambian NGO – launched the Go Sisters initiative, which supports innovative educational, economic, sport, and cultural opportunities to females in Zambia and challenges the neo-liberal and patriarchal tendencies often embedded in SDP work (Hayhurst, MacNeill, & Frisby, 2011).

Giulianotti (2011a) notes that there lies a substantial disconnect from wider global civil society though, particularly where new social movements and radical NGOs across the SDP sector tend to primarily address Global North issues. For instance, many within the social justice field pose fervent opposition to IOC propaganda and power struggles

with the ‘Olympic Industry’ (Lenskyj, 2008). Moreover, some radical NGOs, such as Play the Game, have exposed corruption and human rights abuses in holding up the core values of its mission.²⁰ Still, others have highlighted abusive treatment of youth athletes within developing countries (Marcano & Fidler, 2002). Also, many social justice agencies advocate and pursue progressive policies emphasizing civil and human rights, as well as tolerance and ethical awareness (Giulianotti, 2011a). Yet, new social movements and radical NGOs lack any effective internal integration or network, and their relations amongst broader global civil society remain weak, which makes influencing mainstream SDP social policy much more difficult (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011; Giulianotti, 2011).

Levermore (2008b) claims that sport is capable of significantly contributing where traditional development has failed. Giulianotti (2011a) suggests that new social movements and radical NGOs are best situated to provide critical reflections, both of sport’s contributions and negative social effects. Moreover, Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) claim that sport is socially and politically ‘malleable’, and capable of adapting to an array of development initiatives and political ends. Therefore, they have argued that SDP is in a unique position to embrace social justice policies and establish a decolonizing praxis that supports struggles for self-determination and directly challenges corporate and/or state-sponsored hegemonic development forces (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011).

III. Four Transnationalism Themes

In strategically applying Vertovec’s (2009) six categories of transnationalism to interviews with SDP officials, Giulianotti (2011c) was able to identify four main transnational themes across the SDP sector; these included *transnational ethics*,

²⁰ Play the Game is a Danish NGO principled by a mission to ‘encourage democracy, transparency, and freedom of expression in world sport.’ See www.playthegame.org/about/our-goals.html

*transnational anthropolitics of practice, national and transnational social relationships, and transnational sector relationships.*²¹ Each of these themes contains various sub-themes more specific to SDP sector official’s perspectives and practices, which engage more in particular with Vertovec’s categories on transnationalism. Table 2 details each theme and sub-theme.

Table 2. Giulianotti’s (2011c) Main Transnational Themes and Sub-themes across the SDP Sector

Themes	Sub-Themes
Transnational ethics	Dual identity differentiation Microconnectivity Ethical universality
Transnational anthropolitics of practice	Reflexivity on criticism of SDP sector Contextualizes peace-building work Ethnocentric political engagement Gender
Transnational social relationships	Familial/parental groups Local communities Local political authorities
Transnational sector relationships within global civil society	NGO relationships Donors Relationships within SDP sector Relationships with development sector

1) *Transnational Ethics*. First, transnational ethics offer a critical *dual identity differentiation* of SDP work, where although it is acknowledged that the goals of sport-plus initiatives are not always mutually exclusive from those of plus-sport – and could even, at times, be mutually advantageous – the majority of SDP officials still view their

²¹ Vertovec (2009) identified six main ways in which ‘transnationalism’ tends to be used in social science; these dealt with (1) *social morphology*, such as networked relationships, (2) *type of consciousness*, such as dual or multiple national identities, (3) *mode of cultural reproduction*, such as fluid and hybrid cultural styles, (4) *avenue of capital*, such as through transnational corporations, (5) *site of political engagement*, such as international NGOs that promote human rights, and (6) *(re)construction of ‘place’ or locality*, such as ‘translocal’ communities and deterritorialized identities.

work as strongly promoting plus-sport initiatives focused primarily on more noble aspects of development (Coalter, 2006; Giulianotti, 2011c). Furthermore, convinced that sport provided an exceptionally valuable tool for bringing together conflict-ridden or divided communities, he suggests SDP officials promote *microconnectivity* through programs that facilitated new forms of ‘social morphology (new cross-community social ties), types of consciousness (new understandings of other ethnonational groups), political engagement (promotion of human rights and citizenship agendas in divided societies), and constructions of place (more inclusive conceptions of “territory” and place)’ (Giulianotti, 2011c).

Despite the *ethical universality* of projects, SDP officials across the field direct these initiatives with contrasting ‘conflict-realism’ and ‘harmonized-idealist’ approaches. While the conflict-realist approach argued for the importance of immersing participants in competitive contact sports that involve representative teams from rival communities, the harmonized-idealist model often utilized noncompetitive forms of play and promoted cross-community teams. For instance, Skateistan’s utilization of skateboarding across Afghanistan would be considered a harmonized-idealist approach, whereas many of the FIFA initiatives implementing competitive football across the SDP sector can be viewed as employing a conflict-realist approach. Giulianotti (2011c) mentions that the possibility of establishing new forms of ‘social morphology, consciousness, cultural reproduction, and senses of place among the SDP project users’ was ‘notably less optimistic’ with those projects employing a conflict-realist approach.

Assuming that such categories would continue to be shaped through competitive, and ‘obdurate social and ethnonational rivalries,’ SDP project officials using a conflict-

realist approach sought to cultivate participants as both self-aware and self-controlling within competitive environments (Giulianotti, 2011c). On the other hand, SDP officials utilizing a harmonized-idealist model believed that historical social divisions could be overcome by reconstituting these categories in order to produce fully transnational forms of identification.

2) *Transnational Anthropitics of Practice*. Second, the political and cross-cultural issues that emerge from interactions between SDP officials and different user groups are addressed through transnational anthropitics of practice. Giulianotti (2011c) identified within this transnational theme that SDP officials were highly reflexive when addressing the particular critiques of potential neocolonial or imperialistic development strategies. Whereas criticism of SDP practices from outside the development sector – or externalist criticisms – were often rejected with confident reaffirmations of the positive contributions of SDP projects, SDP officials reflected more fully on internal criticisms and became more willing to consider innovative strategies towards different forms of political and cultural engagement (Giulianotti, 2011c).

Through a sincere reflection on these critical issues, SDP officials were able to ‘contextualize their work within the broader peace-building and development process’ that inevitably allowed them to avoid *ethnocentric forms of direct political engagement* (Giulianotti, 2011c). It was discovered that in many cases a SDP approach simply publicizing the sport as an enjoyable recreational activity, rather than a patronizing imposition of peacebuilding, was able to strongly diminish any resentment local people and NGOs previously had of external agencies. Such an approach often leads to increased

engagement by local experts and builds trust and continuity amongst disparate communities that lends itself to potential broad collaboration and social cohesion.

The strongest, recurring subtheme that Giulianotti (2011c) identified across the SDP sector dealt primarily with issues related to *gender*. Described as the ‘Girl Effect’, Hayhurst (2011) explains that increased initiatives directed at adolescent girls highlight a belief by many SDP agencies that the untapped solution to poverty lies in the ability of sport to promote gender equality, challenge gender norms, teach confidence and leadership skills in females, assist in HIV/AIDS education, and contribute to the overall health and wellbeing of girls. The UN considers this development of female youth to be a catalyst towards ‘unparalleled social and economic change to their families, communities and countries’ in achieving the MDGs (Hayhurst, 2011). In attempts to achieve broad transnational development objectives laid out in the MDGs, such as inclusive female participation and gender equality, SDP officials are also tasked with balancing a respect and empathy for local cultural values in efforts not to alienate client groups (Giulianotti, 2011c).

Saavedra (2009) warns that attempts by the SDP sector to use traditional sport as a tool for empowering females may prove paradoxical given the often hegemonic masculinity of an arena where male privilege and power assert a peculiar dominance over women. In response to such concerns over the male-dominated nature of popular transnational sports, many SDP officials have been found to create innovative activities and games that include both boys and girls, as well as promote female participation through modifications of traditional sports (Giulianotti, 2011c). Where girls did heavily participate alongside boys, it was found that the dialogue and peacebuilding aspects

across these SDP programs benefited dramatically from such interactive engagement (Kay, 2009; Saavedra, 2009).

3) *Transnational Social Relationships*. Third, transnational social relationships describe aspects of relations between SDP project officials and partners that represent specific spheres of operational influence. The three groups identified as primary engagements for SDP project officials include *familial and parental groups*, *local communities*, and *local political authorities* (Giulianotti, 2011c). Initiatives emphasizing such relations tended to vastly increase participation, influence, collaboration, and sustainability.

Giulianotti (2011c) found that SDP programs placed enormous emphasis on crucial parental influences that inspire youth transformation, while also placing a keen focus on broader aspects of transforming parental and familial relationships and understanding towards the Other. For example, dialogue and participatory roles are established with local parents who may then consider their youth as a gateway generation for potentially resolving community divisions, while the children participating in such programs might return home sharing positive experiences to assist in parental and familial transformations. In Vertovec's (2009) terms, this encouraged broad transformations of consciousness, political engagement, types of social morphology, and reconstructions of place that strengthened the foundation of SDP work and established trust amongst community leaders.

The relationships SDP officials share with local communities emphasize not only the establishment and emergence of individual SDP projects, but, more importantly, its sustainability and exportation. For instance, the existing social morphologies of SDP officials prove to be an important asset when attempting to establish a community-based

program. Furthermore, Giulianotti (2011c) explained that popular SDP initiatives such as ‘training-the-trainers’ provides project officials the opportunity to build new social morphologies and types of consciousness within communities by instructing local participants on how to establish and manage SDP projects in their own communities. This ‘local ownership’ of SDP projects has the significant benefits of building community morale, accountability, and trust that facilitate sustainability (Kidd, 2011; Sugden, 2006).

In developing-nations across the Global South, relationships with political authorities are often pursued with a high level of caution from SDP officials. While some do build effective ‘pragmatic partnerships,’ most officials associated with smaller SDP agencies are reluctant to accept state-assistance offers in fear of possibly having to exchange their core project objectives (Giulianotti, 2011c).

4) Transnational Sector Relationships within the Global Civil Society. Finally, transnational sector relationships within the global civil society include SDP engagements between local and external NGOs; SDP relations with donors; relations amongst SDP agencies; and the relationships SDP agencies have with the broader development sector. These relationships tend to intersect multiple social policy domains, which can often have varying results.

In regards to *NGO relationships*, Giulianotti (2011c) found that local NGOs tend to provide larger external NGOs with direct links to influential gatekeepers and insider knowledge of local conditions in exchange for financial support and assistance with SDP project management and implementation as well as other resources. Employing Vertovec’s (2009) transnational categories, he suggests that these ‘mutual capital reciprocity’ relations function as avenues for transnational capital movements that pass

beyond an economic realm. For example, collaborative relations with local NGOs offer many global external NGOs the unique opportunity to connect with local stakeholders.

The relationship SDP organizations have with *donors* is described by Giulianotti (2011c) as double-edged. While SDP projects were often ensured sustainability through donor established transnational social networks, the core philosophy of many SDP organizations could potentially be jeopardized by differing ideological, financial, political, and strategic goals of donors. Here, Giulianotti (2011a; 2011b) recognizes, when constructing donor relations, such decision making autonomy is most often guarded by smaller agencies with focused initiatives.

Relations *within the SDP sector* were described through various divisions and hierarchies. For example, larger agencies tend to prioritize economic, political, and symbolic capital, and fail to expand expertise throughout the field. While some organizations, such as Peace and Sport, provide international conferences or how-to manuals in order to exchange best practices across the SDP sector, Giulianotti (2011c) discovered fragmentary or restricted relationships between a large portion of agencies in regards to communication, knowledge transfer, and complementary partnerships that resemble characteristics of Cooley and Ron's (2002) understanding of an 'NGO scramble.' He suggested that many smaller organizations fear the potential damage to the entire sector as a result of some larger agencies' reputations.

International SDP NGOs capable of constructing sustainable partnerships with a diverse array of influential local agencies and transnational development actors were found to share the strongest *relations with the wider development sector*. Giulianotti (2011c) notes many SDP officials report that these organizations often lack any priority

towards constructing social networks with other NGOs. Still, he suggests that enormous optimism abounds in SDP officials who are confident that this sector can create a replicable model for future development institutions. Essentially, development practices within global civil society can potentially be shaped by the broader contributions of SDP work.

IV. Three Ideal-Type Models of Peacemaking

Across the SDP sector, Giulianotti (2011b) found that peacebuilding projects encapsulate three distinctive ideal-types, including *technical*, *dialogical*, and *critical*. For this study, his ideal-type models of peacemaking were chosen for two important reasons. First, and in general, they illuminate an extremely significant aspect of the SDP sector framework that is focused specifically on this idea of peacebuilding. In terms of political and global prominence, it is arguably the most substantial theme pursued across the SDP sector (Giulianotti, 2011b; see Sugden & Wallis, 2007). For instance, the UN strongly encourages and endorses efforts to specifically harness sport as an interventionist tool for peace; such initiatives focus on solidarity and cohesion in order to facilitate tenable peace, gender equality, and harmonious dialogue (Giulianotti & Armstrong, 2011).

Sport and peace offer a unique relationship that is heavily pursued by national governments and institutions across global civil society (for example, see Levermore & Budd, 2004; Sugden, 2008). Further, positively influencing and encouraging peacebuilding through sport is at the heart of Peace and Sport initiatives (Bouzou, 2010). Therefore, and second, the focus on peacebuilding situates Peace and Sport at the forefront of policy initiatives driving the SDP sector and broader international relations. More specifically, these three models provide a context in which to place the

peacebuilding initiatives of Peace and Sport throughout Israel-Palestine that will be a main aspect of exploration in this case study.

As with the four main SDP social policy initiatives presented above, these three models follow Weber's (1949) ideal-type. As Giulianotti (2011b) explains, the specific peacebuilding characteristics of SDP work are encapsulated by these three models within 'idealized, homologous forms.' In line with the structural clarity of his overall writing style, he not only provides a detailed table of the three ideal-type SDP models of peacemaking, but also is very careful to note that variations will inevitably occur in actual SDP projects. Using Weber's (1978) argument, he assures that these variations 'enhance, rather than vitiate, the sociological insights.' Table 3 represents the primary features of Giulianotti's (2011b) ideal-type models of peacemaking in relation to common social heuristics he identified.

1) Technical SDP Model. Giulianotti (2011b) explains the technical SDP model type as following a positivistic, 'realist', instrumental philosophy. He suggests, under this model, that 'real' social problems afflicting certain societies are assumed to be objectively-identifiable by outside agencies, whose unbiased assessment of the situation uniquely qualifies them to identify and implement rational solutions. Understood as centering on utilitarian *intervention*, technical SDP initiatives often present the commitment to an incremental resolution of social problems.

Technical SDP program officials tend to closely *structure* the social interaction that occurs within *competitive* events utilizing *established sport* forms. These *scheduled clinics* usually select participants by *specified social units* such as age, gender, or residency, rather than accommodating distinctive local community and cultural factors.

Table 3. Giulianotti's (2011b) Three Ideal-Type Models of Peacemaking across the SDP sector

	<i>Technical</i>	<i>Dialogical</i>	<i>Critical</i>
Core objectives	Problem solving	Re-found social relations	Inter-communal transformation
Key themes	Directive pedagogy/measured outcomes	Dialogical pedagogy/new meanings	Andragogy/new communities
Managerial framework	Hierarchical	Umpire/leadership	Horizontal/fluid
Agency role	Intervention	Guided mediation	Facilitator
User groups	Specified social units	Specified community groups	Diverse community groups
Paradigmatic methods	Scheduled clinics	Training the trainers	Multi-day camps, exchanges
Socio-cultural tools	Established sport	Modified sport	New games/other cultural practices
Play contact methods	Structured	Integrated	Diffuse/self-directing
Client social relations	Competitive	Cooperative	Communitarian
Donor relations	Regulated	Correspondent	Autonomous
Sector relations	Instrumental	Strategic	Complementary
Monitoring and evaluation	Positivist	Multi-method/participatory	Participatory, complementary, critically reflexive

The SDP sector, as a whole, is understood as a pyramid of *hierarchical* knowledge transfer, flowing from the top-down; expertise is passed down from international institutions to CBOs and then on down to disparate individuals and user groups. It is what Nicholls (2009) refers to as the vertical hierarchy. This view subsequently infers implementation of a *directive pedagogical* method of communication between each tier of management.

As an acknowledgement of such hierarchies, Giulianotti (2011b) notes that the *regulation* practices of donors (often corporations) are accepted by technical model SDP

agencies. These regulations often become impositions for demonstrable results and the willingness to compete for contracts across the marketplace of development. Here, such a transnational environment tends to push institutions towards greater competition, where tense insecurities often result in an NGO scramble due to unmanageable institutional pressures and unsustainable imperatives (Cooley & Ron, 2002). Therefore, potential demonstrably beneficial *instrumental* relationships with other institutions across global civil society are often pursued by technical SDP agencies (Giulianotti, 2011b).

Hierarchical relationships with donors, corporations, governmental organizations, NGOs, and sport federations strictly emphasize the ability of technical SDP agencies to employ *positivist* techniques in their *measurement of objective outcomes* – especially those highlighting achievements towards the MDGs (Giulianotti, 2011b). As Levermore (2011a) explains, this logical framework – or logframe – approach dominates contemporary development evaluation; offering a highlighter method, where each component of a program is clearly linked with contributing to its objectives. Giulianotti (2011b) notes that many SDP agencies recruit IT specialists, who design advanced software that analyzes carefully documented data of a project. While typical quantitative measurements of intervention outcomes may be intended to enhance accountability and better guide project implementation, Bornstein (2006) warns that the fear of losing a program amidst the competitive development marketplace may result in systemic distortions of information in order to deceive donors.

Prevalent mostly throughout the late 1990s and early 2000s amongst externally-imposed institutions that had limited contextual knowledge or sensitivity towards conflict-ridden foreign cultures, the technical model can be linked to the Sport/Global

Society 3.1 phase of Giulianotti's (2011b) historical stages. Also, Giulianotti (2011b) suggests that the core characteristics in this technical model of SDP peacemaking initiatives has 'some continuities with the assumptions of Western superiority' that were evident throughout the colonial projects during the Sport/Global Society 1.0 stage.

2) *Dialogical SDP Model*. Following an interpretive, communicative philosophy, the dialogical SDP model type assumes social divisions and mistrust to be at the heart of conflict. Therefore, external agencies working under this model seek to confront 'foundational myths' of inter-communal conflict and bridge relations between divided communities by facilitating sustainable contact and meaningful dialogue with the Other (Nandy, 2002); this is understood as the *positive re-foundation of social relations* between peoples. When conflict does happen to arise, these agencies offer *guiding mediation* as 'independent (but decisive) mediators' to resolve any misunderstanding or disagreement (Giulianotti, 2011b). In time, *new meanings* of the Other are constructed through a *dialogical pedagogy* focused on engaging and teaching participants.

In pursuing fully *integrated* cross-community social relationships amongst *specified community groups*, Giulianotti (2011b) notes that SDP programs using the dialogical model are willing to *modify existing sports* in hopes that such inclusive methods will lead to *cooperative* relations between divided peoples. While Pickering (2006) agrees that mixed-team sport initiatives forge inclusive social relations, Vincent (2008) warns that cross-community social engagements may not always produce integrative results. Under the dialogical model, SDP agencies remain sensitive to this possibility and retain *umpire and leadership* roles in instances where the majority may attempt to dominate or diminish cooperative consensus building. Also, the *training the*

trainers technique allows SDP agencies employing the dialogical model to export their methods and expand program initiatives through local activists, who are afforded substantial autonomy in choosing the best way to implement these methods and whose voices are often more welcomed and respected within their communities (Giulianotti, 2011b).

Dialogical SDP agencies often employ *multiple methods* for monitoring and evaluation, which include both quantitative data gathering and qualitative *participatory* techniques that actively engage user groups (e.g., video-recorded participant interviews, documentary-style accounts, etc.). Project officials share *correspondent* relations with donors, while favoring *strategic* links with development NGOs as well as other institutions across global civil society. For example, although variably, a significant influence still exists from donors under the dialogical model towards the implementation of project objectives and methods. In contrast, the connections made with various development organizations tend to foster mutually beneficial collaborative efforts or long-term partnerships (Giulianotti, 2011b).

A dialogical approach is often evident in institutions across global civil society that share an on-the-ground working knowledge and a commitment to ‘medium-term peacemaking goals’ and building local political consensus (Giulianotti, 2011b). While distinctive political cultures and the socio-cultural creativity of disparate societies are certainly acknowledged within this model, the primary agenda for each program is ultimately set by Global North institutions. Recognizing this point, Giulianotti (2011b) therefore suggests such continuities lend themselves to the ethos of Sport/Global Society 2.0.

3) *Critical SDP Model*. The critical model approach is described by Giulianotti (2011b) as highly reflexive and critical towards SDP work. Under this model, local communities are credited with possessing the optimal knowledge and means to identify issues of conflict and develop appropriate strategies in response. Therefore, *inter-communal transformations* are pursued by SDP agencies that heavily *facilitate* grassroots efforts to strengthen communication, trust, and common interest amongst divided groups. In doing so, critical SDP agencies seek sustainable *new communities* that are fully inclusive. This model's *horizontal, fluid* understanding of institutional roles explain its *andragogical* approach towards communicating with and educating user groups, which Knowles (1984) suggests has the ability to foster responsible self-efficacy through meaningful empirical reflection.

Centered around *multi-day camps* and *multi-day social exchanges*, critical SDP programs bring together *diverse community groups* that stretch beyond inter-communal youth to include 'parents, families, friends, village elders, and so forth, who all contribute' to the *diffuse* and *self-directing* social contact across divided communities (Giulianotti, 2011b). These engagements are a beneficial result of immersing sport within *other cultural practices*. Also, because strengthening *communitarian* social relations is prioritized within these sporting events, critical SDP officials are unabashed in implementing *new games* and strategies that include distinctive community-building properties and lack the cultural baggage of established sport that might turn away the interest of disparate groups (Giulianotti, 2011b).

Giulianotti (2011b) suggests that a substantial amount of *autonomy* toward project objectives and methods is more likely to be granted under this model due to the fact that

donors must inevitably come to agreeable terms with the long-term aspirations of critical SDP agencies and the holistic strategies they employ to be successful. In building partnerships with other peacemaking institutions across global civil society, critical SDP agencies understand their work as *complementary* to such initiatives and also attempt to influence the strategies of divergent organizations. Furthermore, Giulianotti (2011b) identifies the monitoring and evaluation approaches used by critical SDP agencies as being *participatory, complementary, and critically reflexive*. These methods tend to strengthen credibility and improve project initiatives, yet have not been found to be prevalently or effectively implemented by mainstream NGOs throughout the SDP sector (Levermore, 2011a).

Giulianotti (2011b) suggests that a core emphasis of the critical SDP model to strongly encourage self-actualizing autonomy and empower user groups is an approach that shares continuities with the most progressive aspects of both the Sport/Global Society 2.0 and 3.0. Also, SDP agencies under the critical model are committed to fully engaging with local community groups as well as the diverse array of institutions in the field. Therefore, he argues that the social justice issues highlighted by new social movements or relatively radical NGOs are more likely to be engaged and implemented by critical SDP agencies. As Darnell and Hayhurst (2011) suggest, the willingness of mainstream SDP organizations to collaborate with critical agencies may offer a unique opportunity for the SDP sector to challenge limitations associated with traditional development strategies.

CHAPTER 4: Findings / Conclusion

Findings

Employing the above framework of the SDP sector to the context of this case study analysis of Peace and Sport, the findings in this chapter have been structured to correlate directly with Giulianotti's (2011c) limitations thesis. This exploration of Peace and Sport was undertaken in an effort to discover if and under what conditions might these limitations be addressed or overcome. Moreover, what SDP peacebuilding methods and social policy initiatives currently in practice through Peace and Sport might best be suited to accomplish such objectives?

This qualitative exploration of Peace and Sport initiatives throughout Arab communities in occupied territories of the West Bank will illuminate what peacebuilding methods Peace and Sport utilizes to implement project initiatives in this region. Through an understanding of the literature and framework above, a critical analysis can be made regarding the effectiveness of these methods to address Giulianotti's (2011c) limitations. Although this study was limited to only one of Peace and Sport's six locally-based projects around the world (Israel-Palestine), the findings below offer valuable insight into both the peacebuilding methods of Peace and Sport as well as the overall potential of broader SDP initiatives.

1) Technical Limitations. Peace and Sport was found to exemplify various characteristics of what Giulianotti (2011a) considers a relatively smaller, critical SDP organization, while also displaying multiple traits of a larger mainstream agency in regards to the scale of their transnational operations and the power of their global networking capability. They represent an innovative multifaceted initiative, which includes the principled

approach of establishing strategic partnerships and relations with a diverse array of transnational and local actors across global civil society. As one Peace and Sport official mentioned, “it is our objective and priority to build strong relations with anyone who works in an effort for peace.” In addressing *technical* project limitations, the unique ability for Peace and Sport to develop certain dialogical- and critical-model partnerships across various transnational fields plays a key role in their capability to prepare sustainable projects and combat such issues.

For instance, Peace and Sport was found to successfully establish long-term support for project implementation in their Israel-Palestine projects through a dual dialogical-critical model technique that generates tenable funding from partners. “The main objective for our locally-based initiatives in this region is *sustainable* peace [interviewee emphasis],” states one Peace and Sport official, “...strategic relations with both financial and equipment donors as well as development strategists become essential components in our efforts for long-term commitments.” They accomplish this mainly through a diversification of their funding partners and support network for any given project. These strategies can be found in their most recent initiative in the region; Chess for Leadership and Creativity (see Peace and Sport, 2010).

This recently established program utilizes chess as a tool for developing the leadership skills of vulnerable Palestinian youth, particularly young women.²³ It is implemented at five separate youth centers, each located in sensitive areas of Qatanna, Dhiesha (refugee camp of Bethlehem), Hebron, Dahiat El Sallam, and Kfar Akeb respectively. The local NGO Care Palestine manages the youth centers located in Qatanna, Dhiesha, and Hebron, while another local NGO, Jerusalem Suburb

²³ See www.chessdom.com/chess-for-leadership-and-creativity/

Communities, manages the youth centers located in Dahiat El Sallam and Kfar Akeb. The role of Peace and Sport has been complementary to the educational and development initiatives pursued by these two local NGOs in each community. As one official from Care Palestine stated, “they [Peace and Sport] provide assistance for sport-related funding, equipment, infrastructure, training, etc. This allows us to use games that interest the children and helps educate them.”

Peace and Sport describes the Chess for Leadership and Creativity program as a ‘pilot project, which could be duplicated and transformed into a National program for the Palestinian Chess Federation’ (Peace and Sport, 2010). Various project objectives were found to fuel these sustainability efforts. For example, across the five youth centers implementing this program, Peace and Sport established a target objective of minimum 200 (80% female) participants each year from January 2011 to January 2014. Within this timeframe, Peace and Sport has also established an objective to increase the percentage of social integration – described as the ‘% of participants going back to school or having a job’ – by 20% each year (i.e. 40% – Jan. 2011; 60% – Jan. 2012; 80% – Jan. 2013; 100% – 2014). Moreover, an objective has been outlined to increase the percentage of self-financing on the part of these local NGOs and youth centers up to 20% by 2014 (Peace and Sport, 2010).

Furthermore, Peace and Sport was found to act as a ‘coordination platform’ in initiating their various Israel-Palestine projects (Peace and Sport, 2010); essentially building strategic partnerships that might otherwise be difficult for these smaller local NGOs to establish individually. For example, the Chess for Leadership and Creativity project was established through a strategic plan that identified funding and support

partnerships which could ensure project sustainability. Peace and Sport coordinated with local Palestinian activists and government to determine an effective course of action for youth development, social cohesion, and inter-communal transformation. Upon a local consensus that identified chess as a powerful tool for offering intrinsic values towards achieving this action, Peace and Sport coordinated with the Palestinian Chess Federation and the World Chess Federation (FIDE) to initiate the project.

“Our partnership with these chess federations brought sustainability to our projects in the region,” stated one Peace and Sport official, who was referring to the ability of such partnerships to attract both the international investment group and equipment provider they subsequently partnered with for this project. Through corresponding efforts with such federations, Peace and Sport was able to pursue more autonomous opportunities for project implementation from donors on behalf of its local NGO partners. Peace and Sport’s diversifying role as a coordination platform significantly benefited the SDP work being done at each community youth center. They established strategic development objectives, secured long-term funding commitments for each local NGO, provided national and international support from chess federations, and solidified a partnership with an equipment provider.

Referring back to Giulianotti’s (2011b) three SDP models of peacemaking, Peace and Sport was found to utilize a dual dialogical-critical model within their Israel-Palestine project implementation. Regarding core objectives and key themes, they were found to pursue critical model inter-communal transformations throughout these Arab communities that will pave the way for productive future integration. Moreover, Peace and Sport focuses on dialogical model user groups (Palestinian youth, mostly female),

and employs a critical model view that the local leadership and participants are the keystone to creating such new communities. While their most recent program utilized a dialogical model form of chess – modified to accommodate local educational practices, other Peace and Sport initiatives in the region have incorporated critical model cultural practices and new games such as ‘le petit tennis’ (Peace and Sport, 2009).

In regards to SDP sector relations, Peace and Sport was again found to employ a multi-faceted approach. Self-described as a coordination platform, they pursued an enhanced level of autonomy for local NGOs to implement project objectives that follows a more critical model strategy. While offering critical model complementary sport initiatives to local NGOs to be implemented with currently established educational practices, Peace and Sport was found to pursue dialogical model strategic relations with national and international sport federations, governments, and donors. This multi-faceted approach has the ability to increase the potential for sustainability in both project implementation and financial support.

2) *Practical Limitations*. Throughout the course of the 2011 Peace and Sport International Forum in Monaco, the concept of alleviating *practical* project shortcomings was placed as one of the more widely discussed topics. Many SDP practitioners offered dialogue that included questions such as how can we collaborate more effectively with development agencies, how much more might we be able to learn about each other’s culture and different communities, and what efforts might allow marginalized individuals to become more involved in the decision making process. Indeed, these are essentially recognized as the most vital aspects of sustainable development. The position of Peace

and Sport regarding the importance of local knowledge and cultivation is clearly described by its Founder and President, Joël Bouzou:

The greatest error sometimes committed by NGOs and those involved in development is to arrive in the field with preconceived, cut-and-dried programs that do not meet local needs at all but have been drawn up in developed countries, far from the realities and specific context of each area. Local players are the keystone in all projects. They must be responsible for initiating programs, driving them forward and ensuring they endure. They must not merely be beneficiaries of such programs. (Bouzou, 2010)

As with their recent Chess for Leadership and Creativity project, the first action of Peace and Sport is to seek local knowledge and guidance from community leaders in addressing educational and development issues. “The question we raise in each community is: how can sport help the situation?” stated one Peace and Sport official in reference to their Israel-Palestine projects. It was further explained, “we pursue the involvement of the community in our projects because it is the local people who have the ability to positively influence local youth and surrounding communities.” Kidd (2011) asserts that local community consultation in the design and delivery of SDP projects is essential for sustainability and effectiveness.

Moreover, Peace and Sport pursues an *andragogical* approach that challenges the vertical hierarchy of knowledge transfer and facilitates grassroots development efforts that empower local communities.²⁴ “We do not establish local offices or desire to *lead* any project [interviewee emphasis]” explains an official for Peace and Sport, “This is not our objective. We work next to local stakeholders in helping them develop their own

²⁴ An andragogical approach consists of learning strategies focused on adults. As opposed to pedagogy, where the learner is heavily dependent upon the instructor for education and evaluation, andragogy affords the learner more responsibility and credibility to self-evaluate. An andragogical approach tends to establish a melting-pot of effective development ideas and open dialogue as opposed to a top-down instructional hierarchy. See www.floridatechnet.org/in-service/abe/abestudent/andravsped.pdf

peace-through-sport programs.” Peace and Sport’s locally-based initiatives are considered duplicable pilot-projects that are intended to guide best practices for future programs.²⁵

This andragogical approach establishes enormous trust between Peace and Sport and local communities as well as development agencies. Referring to projects in Dahiat El Sallam and Kfar Akeb run through the local NGO Jerusalem Suburb Communities, one local stakeholder asserted that “local members of the community have become empowered by these projects and accomplishments they can truly call their own. They [Peace and Sport] build a relationship with these people, who then become determined to further this work for peace.” Furthermore, the collaboration Peace and Sport has with non-sport development agencies in the region, such as local NGOs Care Palestine and Jerusalem Suburb Communities, is also in line with the critical SDP model’s horizontal, fluid understanding of institutional roles. One volunteer from the Chess for Leadership and Creativity project asserted that Peace and Sport aims to place sport at the service of peace education and social inclusion initiatives of such development organizations, further stating that Care Palestine “has many projects going on apart from chess, always educational oriented, towards parents, student and teachers.”²⁶

This local empowerment is also noticeable at the Forum. Amidst this research, various local activists and community stakeholders were interviewed at the Forum regarding their engagement with Peace and Sport. One local Palestinian activist involved with Care Palestine stated that “this event [the Forum] has allowed my voice, and the voice of my community, to be heard by global decision makers and political leaders.”

²⁵ See www.peace-sport.org/overview/presentation-of-our-locally-based-projects.html

²⁶ See www.whychess.org/node/2868

Another community leader working at the youth center in Qatanna suggested that Peace and Sport “provides the tremendous opportunity for communities to reach back out to [global] civil society.” The open structure of this Forum offers the potential to break down the hierarchical knowledge gap, and stirs a melting-pot of cultivated ideas regarding effective community development and peacebuilding strategies.

Along this same line, Peace and Sport strives to bring marginalized peoples, such as women, youth, and people with disabilities, to the decision-making table.²⁷ For example, in the weeks leading up to the 2011 Forum, Peace and Sport signed a Partnership Agreement with UNESCO at the 7th annual UNESCO Youth Forum in a collaborative effort to facilitate youth leadership. As one UNESCO Youth Ambassador stated during the Forum, “UNESCO is the only official forum within the UN system that has given the floor to young people in an institutional framework.”²⁸ Founder and President of Peace and Sport, Joël Bouzou, recognized the shared values of UNESCO, and further insisted that “young people living in unstable conditions should not just be considered as beneficiaries of social welfare projects, they must be respected co-owners and fully participate in decision-making processes that shape their future.” (“Peace and Sport joins forces with UNESCO,” 2011)

During the 2011 Forum, Peace and Sport organized a platform for this debate on a panel designed around the topic of youth leadership. Unique to this panel was that two young females associated with Jerusalem Suburb Communities were on stage discussing the important role of youth in development. Also included on this panel was the very well

²⁷ The 2011 Forum offered a workshop entitled *WORKSHOP C: How can disability sport contribute to the peace-building process?*, which discussed the inclusive social aspects of sport for people with disabilities and the impact this can have towards developing peace in disparate regions. See www.peace-sport.org/forum-2011/workshops.html

²⁸ See www.peace-sport.org/forum-2011/pleantry-session-forum-2011.html

respected and established scholar within the academic SDP literature, Simon C. Darnell. His statement below reflects the importance of youth leadership as well as the significance of a platform, such as Peace and Sport, which is able to provide the opportunity for youth to become actively involved with the development process.

Research suggests that we may now be entering a new era of youth driven social activism, and this is in many ways dispelling many of the negative stereotypes about youth that have permeated various cultures. The youth of today are active, they are engaged, they are self-actualized, and in many ways they understand the ways in which the world is constructed and the ways in which the world is operating better than many adults do. What this means within the world of sport is that we need to move towards policies and practices and research that talk to youth rather than talk about youth. I think this panel is a really good example of that. One of the ways in which we could really benefit the sport and peace movement is to spend more time listening to what youth have to say... There is a critical mass now of research that can demonstrate that providing opportunity for youth in and around sport and physical culture really does give young people the opportunity to build peaceful relations in and amongst themselves, and there is a desire [amongst youth] to do that.²⁹

This desire of Peace and Sport to bring everyone together to become involved in the decision making process was symbolized in such discussions at the Forum. For example, included on this *youth leadership* panel alone were two young girls from Israel-Palestine, one of the leading academic experts on SDP, an Executive Chairman of a Ghanaian youth program, and a female Youth Ambassador for UNESCO. Furthermore, the Forum also included a Special Session entitled *How the sports movement can pave the way for the future in the Middle East?*, in which the former Speaker of the Knesset was able to exchange peacebuilding initiatives with the Palestinian Ambassador to the UK alongside the former Under Secretary-General of the UN Department of

²⁹ See www.peace-sport.org/forum-2011/pleanry-session-forum-2011.html

Peacekeeping Operations.³⁰ Discussion deriving from this Special Session exemplified the peacebuilding collaboration that Peace and Sport pursues not only with its strategic partners, but amongst actors in the international community, global civil society, and local communities.

Employing Vertovec's (2009) terminology, Peace and Sport utilizes critically reflexive methods in disseminating its mission that facilitate new forms of *social morphology* (new cross-community social ties), *types of consciousness* (new understandings of other ethnonational groups), *political engagement* (promotion of human rights and citizenship agendas in divided societies), and *constructions of place* (more inclusive conceptions of "territory" and place). The open dialogue and mission pursued through the Forum encourages critical reflexivity when addressing both internal and external criticisms. Not only does this strengthen political and cultural engagement, but it has the potential to replace rhetorical affirmations with critical enlightenment and action regarding progressive SDP work.

3) *Political Limitations*. While technical and practical limitations of the SDP sector at least represent tangible issues that are potentially addressable at the surface, *political* weaknesses on the other hand are found laden throughout SDP initiatives and international development. This limitation presents an enormous threat to the integrity of development projects. It has been clearly presented throughout this paper that such colonial residue can often permeate the very foundation of SDP initiatives, which often jeopardizes any potential for peace or, at worst, simply ameliorates conflict and inequality. These repercussions have been discovered amidst sport-plus and plus-sport

³⁰ See www.peace-sport.org/forum-2011/special-event.html

projects alike. In this study, Peace and Sport was found to utilize a multifaceted approach that directly challenges this limitation at five different organizational levels.

It is important to note that Peace and Sport officials interviewed for this study have indeed consciously recognized the danger of embedded hegemonic power relations within their work. As with nearly all shortcomings, this is a necessary step in overcoming such hurdles. One Peace and Sport official eloquently stated the following: “The initiatives we [Peace and Sport] pursue, they must be fluent and not rigid. It has been seen too often the kind of damage that can be done when Westernized development organizations impose their own objectives on foreign communities. We must rethink how development is done and our role in pursuing it.” This statement captures Peace and Sport’s sincere sensitivity towards the cultural and political power relations that are described throughout the academic literature as highly concerning and the largest threat to future development. This keen recognition of such limitations has allowed Peace and Sport to develop the following strategies that ensure cultural sensitivity, social equality, and sustainability for projects in regions such as Israel-Palestine.

First, the *project implementation* of peacebuilding programs in regions such as Israel-Palestine exemplifies this dedication to do development differently. Peace and Sport does not attempt to overthrow any currently established local processes of development or rapidly force cross-community social engagement through sport. “We address the conflict differently; we do not attempt to impose any set of beliefs on any people” asserts an official from Peace and Sport overseeing projects in Israel-Palestine, “the situation [in Israel-Palestine] is very sensitive. Peace and Sport is neutral; we are not there to judge. We are just trying to find an appropriate way to address the issues through

sport.” This neutral approach is essential in a climate where any forced engagement has the potential to only antagonize hostilities. One official from the local NGO Care

Palestine stated:

Under the current political circumstances, most Palestinians usually do not want to go to Israel to play football or whatever. They usually say that if they would do that, it would mean that the situation is ‘normal’ and ‘acceptable,’ they usually do not like at the moment to promote this because it is even hard to pronounce the word *peace* when you are in Palestine. When you do hear of this concept, they ask “how could we speak about peace when we have Israeli soldiers in the streets?”

For Peace and Sport, it is recognized that “when ethnic tensions are still too intense, sport must first begin to be integrated on both sides in order to create the right conditions for a subsequent sporting meeting” (Bouzou, 2010). Hence, their approach in project implementation is found to represent one of social and cultural sensitivity. The illusory assumption that sport in-and-of-itself is the forebear to peace was simply not found to be present within the framework of this organization. Instead, what exists is a sober realization of what sport is capable of within the realm of development. One official for Peace and Sport, speaking in regards to Israel-Palestine projects, stated “we must not be naïve enough to proceed as if sport will solve the problem.” In essence, they do not view sport as the omnipotent cure, but instead as one key ingredient amongst many others.

Peace and Sport provides the opportunities for youth in this region that facilitate education and cultural understanding, which highly increases the potential to lead towards an integrative cohesion and coexistent peace. Local NGOs, such as Care Palestine and Jerusalem Suburb Communities, implement these education-based

development programs, and Peace and Sport merely complements this work with innovative dual dialogical-critical model strategies utilizing sport.

Second, the *Forum* provides a valuable platform to export this progressive message through collaborative efforts with decision makers around the world. The value of this platform lies in its neutrality and integrative structure that combats the SDP sector knowledge and power gap between the Global North and South. The most important aspect of this Forum is the encouragement of open dialogue and free debate amongst a diverse array of actors from various transnational fields, global decision makers, organizations, academics, communities, and individuals working for peace.

In order for sport to contribute to *rapprochement*, dialogue and reconciliation among peoples, it must be set going in this direction by an independent, transparent structure free of any political agenda, which cannot be suspected of serving particular interests of any kind. This is the price that has to be paid if we are to fully optimize the federating capacity of sport. Monaco is a neutral country, and therefore an impartial place in which to develop a structure intended to serve as a platform to federate ideas and drive initiatives. (Bouzou, 2010)

This annual event places the SDP sector, as well as international development initiatives, at the top of the global agenda. “Peace and Sport really represents a platform for bold initiatives in development, sport, international relations, and also peacekeeping” stated an official from the UNOSDP referring to the global impact of the Forum. Moreover, it initiates and consolidates partnerships that make local action more effective. As one official from an unnamed NGO in the Middle East mentioned, “we are encouraged by the dialogue here at the Forum. It has brought forth important methods and ideas for sustainable development that can be applied in our own work at the local level.”

In conjunction with core values of the Forum, the partnership agreement Peace and Sport recently signed with UNESCO lays out a strategic initiative to further expand best practices and diminish the knowledge gap:

The first actions undertaken as part of this partnership will be: to define an emergency response plan for post-conflict and post-disaster situations, using sport as a tool for social integration, mental resilience and overcoming trauma; to develop social entrepreneurship through sport; to manage an online database of best practices in peace through sport that can be duplicated by actors in the field (NGOs and associations); to monitor the impact of projects in order to improve effectiveness in the field; to set up a system for following the progress of recommendations made during international conferences on sport, peace and development, so that they are consistent and actions of various stakeholders are coordinated. (“Peace and Sport joins forces with UNESCO,” 2011)

Peace and Sport’s prime initiative with the Forum was found to be one focused on innovative and progressive techniques that ensure sustainability. For example, one of the important issues already scheduled to be discussed at the 2012 Forum will be *what can we envisage the position of sport to hold throughout the next 30 years in attempting to promote peace around the world?*³¹ Hence, the Forum can be better understood as the platform that guides post-colonial development strategies in the twenty-first century.

Third, Peace and Sport offers an important platform for professional, Olympic, and local athletes that strengthens the valuable role of these sports stars in global development initiatives. In 2009, Peace and Sport introduced the *Champions for Peace* club, which includes an expanding group that currently consists of over fifty athletes committed to serving peace. These athletes, who have joined forces with Peace and Sport in order to promote sport as a vehicle for peace, take action in various ways. For example, they are capable of mobilizing large fan-bases and sport networks to assist in

³¹ See www.peace-sport.org/images/pdf/PEACE_AND_SPORT_SOTCHI_2011_EN.pdf

additional resource collection for field projects, as well as actively raising awareness amongst key decision makers and potential investors. They also provide guidance in designing training programs and help train coaches in the field. Moreover, these athletes are role models, and therefore provide an important source of inspiration for the youth they meet living in extremely disadvantaged circumstances.

It was found that strategic initiatives help ensure that the message portrayed through these athletes is one congruent with the progressive development goals of Peace and Sport. For example, Peace and Sport heavily collaborates with the Jack Brewer Foundation, which has amongst its diverse initiatives the goal of introducing young professional athletes in the US to global humanitarian opportunities.³² Efforts such as this provide a key platform for US athletes to become global activists for peace. Peace and Sport strongly advocates peace activism from all athletes, and currently pursues such efforts throughout countries in Asia, Europe, and Africa.

The champions with the highest worldwide coverage are not the only role models in a position to exert influence and take action: all sportspeople are potentially excellent local ambassadors when it comes to conveying the ethics of sport. Irrespective of the scale and extent of their fame, champions have a privileged opportunity to transmit and disseminate the values of sport in their social environment. (Bouzou, 2010)

These champions provide Peace and Sport with a direct and valuable line of influence. For many regions around the world, these athletes are often the one connection people have with sport, meaning their impact will determine a lot of how sport is perceived and the potential influence it will have. One Peace and Sport official explained, “we must embrace the athletes and the important influence they have, because that is not

³² See www.thejackbrewerfoundation.org/programs-partnerships/programs/jbf-sports-for-development/peace-and-sport-international-forum/

going away. There must be a platform for these athletes to truly engage and advocate for peace and global development.”

Fourth, Peace and Sport recognizes that *academic research* plays a significant role in the progress and sustainability of SDP initiatives. It was found that they pursue intrinsic academic understandings of development in two ways. First, in 2010, Peace and Sport collaborated with the International University of Monaco in offering a master’s degree in Sustainable Peace through Sport.³³ This course of study offers ambitious youth the ability to develop innovative peacebuilding strategies to employ at both an inter-state level through sport diplomacy and an intra-state or community level tackling social issues and building cohesion. A student currently enrolled in this master’s program asserted, “it prepares students with a knowledge as to the core principles of Peace and Sport. The skills I have learned, I will be able to use them in the field, to further my studies, establish my own NGO one day, or approach other opportunities using sport for peace and development.”

The second approach found Peace and Sport heavily involved with examining relevant academic literature regarding development and welcoming scholars as an important contributor to share best practices at the Forum. As one Peace and Sport official noted, “within academic research there lies a tremendous body of knowledge that is vital to our efforts. These scholars have provided a clear roadmap in many ways as to the best-practices of development and using sport for peace. Why not try to learn as much as we can from this?” Peace and Sport recognizes, as McEwan (2009) did, that post-colonial concepts and approaches for development and development research must have a constant progression and continuously pursue best practices. The open dialogue at the

³³ See www.monaco.edu/masters/master-sustainable-peace-through-sport.cfm

Forum provides this opportunity for scholars to share research and best practices specific to sport, development, SDP, and international relations.

Finally, and fifth, Peace and Sport was found to be stringently adamant about addressing one of the most concerning aspects of SDP work: *monitoring and evaluation (M&E)*. It has been noted throughout this paper that such concerns over SDP project M&E have emerged from various sources across development and academia. As sport has become more relevant in international development projects, the demand and expectation for SDP to move beyond anecdotal assertions regarding the values of sport into more quantifiable ‘hard’ data has dramatically increased. Currently though, this demand has yet to be met with any sufficient supply of effective M&E across the SDP sector (Levermore, 2011b). It was found that Peace and Sport is attempting to meet this challenge head-on, both through open dialogue at the Forum and in their Israel-Palestine projects.

For instance, one of the major issues that was repeatedly brought up at the Forum was that of how agencies might be able to strengthen their M&E. Many speakers suggested that SDP projects should consider abandoning anecdotal rhetoric, while various practitioners presented innovative evaluative measures specifically designed for the SDP sector. Amidst this dialogue, the following was suggested by an official representing USAID:

Programs might strongly consider a balance. The individual success stories can and do help; they provide context and make an important connection while promoting the useful aspects of sport. But, organizations must also be held accountable and be able to present coherent research and evaluations; this is critical not only to providing clear data, but also in the ability to progress further research and development of this sector.

Through a dialogue of sharing best-practices, Peace and Sport is able to use the Forum as a platform for promoting ethical M&E measures across the SDP sector.

In their own projects across Israel-Palestine, Peace and Sport will be employing various M&E measures beginning in 2012. It is important to note that Peace and Sport on-the-ground initiatives in this region have only been implemented since 2009, which presented a stern limitation to any evaluative analysis of these initiatives attempted in this case study. Beginning in 2012, Peace and Sport will utilize an M&E approach similar to that of Giulianotti's (2011b) critical SDP model, where monitoring will be participatory and complementary and evaluations will be critically analyzed to improve future initiatives in these projects. This was captured in a statement offered by one of the lead-officials for Peace and Sport initiatives in Israel-Palestine:

There are two types of evaluation we will be doing. The first one is to assess the impact of our work in the field since 2008; we will use questionnaires for beneficiaries, educators, teachers, parents, etc. Second, Monitoring and Evaluation must also be taught to the local NGOs we work with. They are the ones in the end who must be able to make their own Monitoring and Evaluation to make their work more impactful. Our goal here is to create accountability at each level and learn new ways that we may be able to approach the situation more effectively.

These efforts on behalf of Peace and Sport reflect their principled emphasis on empowering local communities and developing innovative strategies for SDP effectiveness. As found throughout the academic literature and this study, the most important step in developing effective strategies is to first diminish negative aspects of sport that can plague projects with colonial residue that hinders any progressive social change. Critical model M&E becomes vital in the progression of these strategies for future innovation and project sustainability.

In regards to overall organizational objectives, Kaldor (2003) offers an important observation regarding mainstream NGOs that was strongly considered throughout the course of this research. Due to strategic partnerships with TNCs, global sport federations, and intergovernmental organizations that often direct or significantly influence project objectives, Kaldor (2003) suggests that mainstream NGOs are merely ‘tamed’ social movements complicit with pragmatic development objectives and unwilling to address severe social injustices. When questioned on this point, one Peace and Sport official replied “I can understand this assumption. We [Peace and Sport] remain pragmatic in developing our partnerships with global institutions, yet it is our goal in partnering with these institutions to engage them with local actors fighting for social change.”

While Peace and Sport is self-proclaimed *apolitical* and was found to pursue what has been considered more pragmatic SDP policy (in line with the MDGs) in their Israel-Palestine project, the ‘coordination platform’ role they play as an organization was found to offer an innovative connection between social movements and local actors pursuing social justice and the various transnational institutions throughout global civil society. For example, the 2011 Forum hosted an open platform for political activists, critical academics, and investigative journalists alongside diplomatic officials, sport federations, TNCs, and intergovernmental organizations in efforts to establish best practices for combatting various social injustices. It would be inaccurate to consider this a tamed initiative or declare that Peace and Sport holds no conscious interest or involvement with pursuing social justice.

Conclusion

This study set out to explore a recently established SDP NGO in relation to Giulianotti's (2011c) three main limitations across the SDP sector; *technical* limitations stemming from a lack of long-term funding and planning, *practical* flaws associated with cultural disconnect and poor collaborative efforts with local groups and non-sport development agencies, and *political* residue that merely re-inscribes hegemonic or subordinate power relations between the Global North and South. These technical, practical, and political weaknesses hinder any real progression of SDP work. In particular, they highly diminish any peacebuilding initiatives aimed at facilitating reconciliation and social cohesion. Employing Giulianotti's (2011a; 2011b; 2011c) framework of the SDP sector, this case study of Peace and Sport confirmed that SDP agencies are indeed capable of presenting firm challenges to these limitations and potentially emancipating themselves from such restraints.

Along with his three main limitations, Giulianotti's (2011a; 2011b; 2011c) framework provides the historical stages that have shaped the SDP sector; places SDP within the political context of global civil society; describes the four main social policy domains; identifies four transnational themes of SDP work; and categorizes three ideal-type models for peacemaking. This study was able to utilize this framework in situating SDP and Peace and Sport firmly amidst global civil society, development and peacemaking initiatives, and international relations. Moreover, this framework provided the primary analytical basis for case study research of Peace and Sport.

It was found in this study that the multifaceted model offered through Peace and Sport presents direct challenges to each of Giulianotti's (2011c) three main limitations of

the SDP sector at various levels. This was found to be done through a post-colonial, dual dialogical-critical model, progressive approach to development and SDP work, which resembles some principled elements of Darnell and Hayhurst's (2011) conceptual 'decolonizing praxis.' This progressive strategy is evident in both their locally-based project initiatives implemented throughout regions of Israel-Palestine, as well as in their structuring of dialogue and exchanges of best-practices at the annual Peace and Sport International Forum.

These direct challenges to Giulianotti's (2011c) limitations thesis provide valuable insight into how the SDP sector can establish project sustainability moving forward in the twenty-first century. The Peace and Sport model is important not only because it offers an innovative and tenable approach to development, but it also breeds a global political atmosphere of equality, inclusiveness, respect, accountability, and progress. Due to the large scale of their transnational network, Peace and Sport has allowed marginalized persons to directly impact the global debate regarding politics, development, and international relations. This progressive, counter-hegemonic approach provides an open platform for knowledge transfer across the SDP sector and academia that should be heavily embraced moving forward.

The broader significance of Peace and Sport is that while challenging many aspects of the SDP status quo, it also retains valuable traits of a mainstream NGO – namely the capability to implement various transnational operations as well as employ a global network that includes strong partnerships with UN agencies. Peace and Sport conveys an enormous commitment to building long-term partnerships and clear project objectives, encouraging peace activism from professional, Olympic, and local athletes,

establishing local community relations and trust, and encouraging academic research and scholastic innovation. Collectively, this strategy allows Peace and Sport to communicate its message to the entire SDP sector, and significantly influence progressive change across the global development arena.

While this paper offers only a singular case study analysis, the tenets of this model can be applied in future scholastic efforts. Moreover, it also represents a model that the entire SDP sector can benefit from and that other organizations can duplicate and implement. Indeed, Giulianotti (2011c) suggests that one of the most important angles for future SDP research to take is delving into more comparative analyses. This study of Peace and Sport provides SDP scholars with a distinct model to structure comparative analyses around. It will allow future research to examine whether other organizations possess either the standards set out by Peace and Sport that have been shown to challenge the status quo of SDP or an ability to complement or improve upon such strategies with innovative initiatives.

Although this study was limited due to a lack of field-research within regions of Israel-Palestine, the annual Forum provided the unique opportunity for this research to still flourish. This certainly speaks to the initiative of Peace and Sport to engage with academia and embrace research that will critically and objectively analyze the SDP sector and move SDP forward. While it was not necessary to interview project participants in this particular study, the insight they could have offered may have provided a more illuminating picture of the work being done in this region.

Furthermore, it is certainly plausible to suggest that a comparative analysis amongst the various Peace and Sport locally-based projects in disparate regions around

the world may have significantly benefited this research. Unfortunately, neither the research time nor the funding was in place to achieve this desired objective. Still, various decision makers and officials were interviewed in this study with regards to project implementation in Israel-Palestine, and the generalizability assertion that each project carries the same principled approach (regarding cultural sensitivity, project management, progressive objectives, etc.) remains indubitably valid. Invariably, the accomplishment with regard to this study lies in the establishment of a working model capable of addressing the most challenging limitations of the current SDP sector.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allison, L. (1998). Sport and civil society. *Political Studies*, 46 (4), 709-726.
- Andrews, D. L., & Ritzer, G. (2007). The global in the sporting global. *Global Networks – A Journal of Transnational Affairs*, 7 (2), 135-153.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Armstrong, G. (2004). The lords of misrule: football and the rights of the child in Liberia, West Africa. *Sport in Society*, 7 (3), 473-502.
- Armstrong, G. (2007). The global footballer and the local war-zone: George Weah and transnational networks in Liberia, West Africa. *Global Networks*, 7 (2), 230-247.
- Ateek, N. (1989). *Justice and only justice*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- Beacom, A. (2009). Disability sport and the politics of development. In R. Levermore & A. Beacom (Eds.), *Sport and international development* (pp. 98-123). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Beckles, H. (1998). *The development of West Indies cricket – volume 1: The age of globalization*. Jamaica/London: University of the West Indies Press/Pluto Press.
- Beckles, H., & Stoddart, B. (Eds.) (1995). *Liberation cricket*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Beech, J., Rigby, A., Talbot, I., & Thandi, S. (2005). Sport tourism as a means of reconciliation? The case of India-Pakistan cricket. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 30 (1).
- Ben-Meir, A. (2008). Reconciling Israel's core requirements for peace with the Arab initiative. *Rusi*, 153 (4), 40-45.
- Ben-Porat, A. (1998). The commodification of football in Israel. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 39 (4), 421-436.
- Beutler, I. (2008). Sport serving development and peace: Achieving the goals of the United Nations through sport. *Sport in Society*, 11 (4), 359-369.
- Black, D. (2010). The ambiguities of development: Implications for development through sport. *Sport in Society*, 13, 121-129.
- Bornstein, L. (2006). Systems of accountability, webs of deceit? Monitoring and evaluation in South African NGOs. *Development*, 49, 52-61.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bouzou, J. (2010). *La paix par le sport: quand le mythe devient realites*. Paris, France: Armand Colin / IRIS.
- Burnett, C. (2006). Building social capital through an active community club. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 41 (3), 283-294.
- Burnett, C. (2010). Sport-for-development approaches in the South African context: A case study analysis. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 32 (1), 29-42.
- Calloway, J. (2004). Leave no child behind: Recreation and sports – instruments for world peace. *Youth Studies Australia*, 23 (1), 35-41.
- Chandler, D. (2005). *Constructing global civil society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Clarke, J. (2004). Dissolving the public realm? The logics and limits of neo-liberalism. *Journal of Social Policy*, 33 (1), 1-27.
- Coalter, F. (2006). *Sport in development monitoring and evaluation manual*, UK Sport, 2006.
- Coalter, F. (2009). Sport-in-development: Accountability or development? In R. Levermore & A. Beacom, *Sport and International Development* (pp. 55-75). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coalter, F. (2010). The politics of sport-for-development: Limited focus programmes and broad gauge problems? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45 (3), 295-314.
- Cooley, A., & Ron, J. (2002). The NGO scramble – organizational insecurity and the political economy of transnational action. *International Security*, 27 (1), 5-39.
- Cornelissen, S. (2011). More than a sporting chance? Appraising the sport for development legacy of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 503-529.
- Council of Europe. (2011). *Sport conventions*. Retrieved January, 18, 2012, from the Council of Europe website, http://www.coe.int/t/DG4/sport/default_en.asp
- Crabbe, T. (2009). Getting to know you: Using sport to engage and build relationships with socially marginalized young people. In R. Levermore & A. Beacom, *Sport and International Development* (pp. 176-197). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Curtis, J., McTeer, W., & White, P. (2003). Do high school athletes earn more pay? Youth sport participation and earnings as an adult. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 20 (1), 60-76.
- Darnell, S. C. (2009). *Changing the world through sport and play: A post-colonial analysis of Canadian volunteers within the “sport for development and peace” movement*. (Unpublished PhD dissertation). University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Darnell, S. C. (2010a). Sport, race, and bio-politics: Encounters with differences in “sport for development and peace” internships. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 34 (4), 396-417.
- Darnell, S. C. (2010b). Power, politics and “sport for development and peace”: investigating the utility of sport for international development. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 27 (1), 54-75.
- Darnell, S. C., & Black, D. R. (2011). Mainstreaming sport into international development studies. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 367-378.
- Darnell, S. C., & Hayhurst, L. M. (2011). Sport for decolonization: exploring a new praxis of sport for development. *Progress in Development Studies*, 11 (3), 183-196.
- Dean, J. (1998). Community sports initiatives – an evaluation of UK policy attempts to involve the young unemployed – the 1980’s action sport scheme. In *Sport in the City: Conference Proceedings Volume 1*, Sheffield, July 2-4, 1998. Loughborough University/Sheffield Hallam University/The University of Sheffield, 140-159.
- Develtere, P., & De Bruyn, T. (2009). The emergence of the fourth pillar of development aid. *Development in Practice*, 19 (7), 912-922.
- Donnelly, P. (2008). Sport and human rights. *Sport in Society*, 11 (4), 381-394.

- Donnelly, P., Atkinson, M., Boyle, S., & Szto, C. (2011). Sport for development and peace: A public sociology perspective. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 589-601.
- Dyck, C. (2011). Football and post-war reintegration: Exploring the role of sport in DDR processes in Sierra Leone. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 395-415.
- Edmans, A., Garcia, D., & Norli, O. (2007). Sports sentiment and stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, 62 (4), 1967-1998.
- Ennis, C. D., Solmon, M. A., Satina, B., Loftus, S. J., Mensch, J., & McCauley, M. T. (1999). Creating a sense of family in urban schools using the "sport for peace" curriculum. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 70 (3), 273-285.
- Farnsworth, K. (2003). The anti-globalization/anti-capitalist movement: Challenging governments and corporations. In G. Taylor & M. Todd (Eds.), *Democracy and protest* (pp. 55-77). London: Merlin Press.
- Fokwang, J. (2009). Southern perspective on sport-in-development: A case study of football in Bamenda, Cameroon. In R. Levermore & A. Beacom, *Sport and International Development* (pp. 198-218). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gasser, P., & Levinsen, A. (2004). Breaking post-war ice: Open fun football schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Sport in Society*, 7 (3), 457-472.
- Giulianotti, R. (2004). Human rights, globalization and sentimental education: The case of sport. *Sport in Society*, 7, 355-369.
- Giulianotti, R., & Robertson, R. (2007). Sport and globalization: transnational dimensions. *Global Networks*, 7 (2), 107-112.
- Giulianotti, R. (2011a). The sport, development and peace sector: A model of four social policy domains. *Journal of Social Policy*, 40 (4), 757-776.
- Giulianotti, R. (2011b). Sport, peacekeeping and conflict resolution: A contextual analysis and modeling of the sport, development and peace sector. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34 (2), 207-228.
- Giulianotti, R. (2011c). Sport, transnational peacemaking, and global civil society: Exploring the reflective discourses of "sport, development, and peace" project officials. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 35 (1), 50-71.
- Giulianotti, R., & Armstrong, G. (2011). Sport, the military and peacemaking: History and possibilities. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 379-394.
- Glasner, P. E. (1977). *The sociology of secularization*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Goldblatt, D. (2003). *Football yearbook 2003-4*, London: DK Publishing.
- Green, C. (2008). Sport as an agent for social and personal change. In V. Girginov (Ed.), *Management of sports development* (pp. 129-145). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Harif, H. (2003). On the field of national pride. *Panım*, 25 (1), 4-9.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, J., Horne, J., & Safai, P. (2009). Alterglobalization, global social movements, and the possibility of political transformation through sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 26, 383-403.
- Hayhurst, L. (2011). Corporatising sport, gender and development: postcolonial IR feminisms, transnational private governance and global corporate social engagement. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 531-549.

- Hayhurst, L., MacNeil, M., & Frisby, W. (2011). A postcolonial feminist approach to sport, gender and development. In B. Houlihan & M. Green (Eds.), *Handbook of sport development* (pp. 353-366). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2002). *Globalization/anti-globalization*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Heinemann, K. (1993). Sport in developing countries. In E. Dunning, J. Maguire, & R. Pearton, *The Sports Process: A Comparative and Developmental Approach* (pp. 139-150). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hobson, J. A. (1988). *Imperialism: A study* (3rd Ed.). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1989). *The age of empire 1875-1914*. New York: Vintage Books
- Hoglund, K., & Sundberg, R. (2008). Reconciliation through sports? The case of South Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, 29 (4), 805-818.
- Hognestad, H., & Tollisen, A. (2004). Playing against deprivation: Football and development in Kenya. In G. Armstrong & R. Giulianotti (Eds.), *Football in Africa: Conflict, Conciliation and Community*, (pp. 227-251). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holt, R. (1989). *Sport and the British*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Houlihan, B., & White, A. (2002). *The politics of sports development: Development of sport or development through sport?* New York, NY: Routledge.
- James, C. L. R. (1963). *Beyond a boundary*. London: Stanley Paul.
- Kaldor, M. (2003). The idea of global civil society. *International Affairs*, 79 (3), 583-593.
- Kay, T. (2009). Developing through sport: Evidencing sport impacts on young people. *Sport in Society*, 12 (9), 1177-1191.
- Keane, J. (2003). *Global civil society?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kidd, B. (2008). A new social movement: Sport for development and peace. *Sport in Society*, 11, 370-380.
- Kidd, B. (2011). Cautions, questions and opportunities in sport for development and peace. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 603-609.
- Klausen, K. (1996). Women and sport in Scandinavia: Policy, participation and representation. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 19 (2). 111-131.
- Klein, N. (2000). *No Logo*. Toronto: Knopf.
- Knowles, M. (1984). *Andragogy in action*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Korr, C., & Close, M. (2008). *More than just a game: Football v apartheid*. London: Collins.
- Kotler, P., & Lee, N. (2005). *Corporate Social Responsibility*. London: Wiley.
- Kuper, S. (1994). *Football against the enemy*. London: Orion.
- Lambert, J. (2007). A values-based approach to coaching sport in divided societies: The football for peace coaching manual. In J. Sugden & J. Wallis (Eds.), *Football for peace? The challenges of using sport for co-existence in Israel* (pp. 13-33). Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Ltd.
- Lenskyj, H. (2008). *Olympic industry resistance: Challenging Olympic power and propaganda*. Albany, NY. SUNY Press.
- Levermore, R. (2008a). Sport: A new engine of development? *Progress in Development Studies*, 8, 183-190.

- Levermore, R. (2008b). Sport in international development: time to treat it seriously? *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 14 (2), 55-77.
- Levermore, R. (2009). Sport-in-international development: Theoretical frameworks. In R. Levermore & A. Beacom, *Sport and international development*, (pp. 26-54). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Levermore, R. (2010). CSR for development through sport: Examining its potential and limitations. *Third World Quarterly*, 31 (2), 223-241.
- Levermore, R. (2011a). Evaluating sport-for-development: approaches and critical issues. *Progress in Development Studies*, 11 (4), 339-353.
- Levermore, R. (2011b). The paucity of, and dilemma in, evaluating corporate social responsibility for development through sport. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 551-569.
- Levermore, R., & Beacom, A. (Eds.) (2009). *Sport and international development*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Levermore, R., & Budd, A. (2004). *Sport and international relations: An emerging relationship*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Liebmann, S., & Rookwood, J. (2007). Football for peace? Bringing Jews and Arabs together in Northern Israel. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Sports Studies*, 1 (1), 11-18.
- Lindsey, I., & Banda, D. (2011). Sport and the fight against HIV/AIDS in Zambia: A 'partnership approach'? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 46 (1), 90-107.
- MacAloon, J. (2006). Muscular Christianity after 150 years. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 23 (5), 687-700.
- MacKenzie, J. (1984). *Propaganda and empire: The manipulation of British public opinion 1880-1960*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mangan, J. (2006). Christ and the imperial playing fields: Thomas Hughe's ideological heirs in empire. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 23 (5), 777-804.
- Marcano, A., & Fidler, D. (2002). *Stealing lives: The globalization of baseball and the tragic story of Alexis Quiroz*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- McEwan, C. (2009). *Postcolonialism and development*. London: Routledge.
- Merkel, U. (2008). The politics of sport diplomacy and reunification in divided Korea: One nation, two countries and three flags. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 43 (3). 289-311.
- Nandy, A. (2002). Telling the story of communal conflicts in South Asia: Interim report on a personal search for defining myths. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25 (1), 1-19.
- Nicholls, S., & Giles, A. R. (2007). Sport as a tool for HIV/AIDS education: A potential catalyst for change. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*, 5 (1), 51-85.
- Nicholls, S. (2009). On the backs of peer educators: Using theory to interrogate the role of young people in the field of sport-in-development. In R. Levermore & A. Beacom, *Sport and international development*, (pp. 156-175). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Njelesani, D. (2011). Preventive HIV/AIDS education through physical education: Reflections from Zambia. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 435-452.
- Nujidat, G. (2007). A view from the Israeli sports authority. In J. Sugden & J. Wallis (Eds.), *Football for peace? The challenges of using sport for co-existence in Israel* (pp. 141-154). Oxford: Meyer and Meyer Ltd.
- Pawson, R. (2006). *Evidence-based policy: A realist perspective*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Peace and Sport. (2009). Programme d'éducation et d'intégration de la jeunesse vulnérable Arabe par la construction de centres citoyens dans des zones de non-droit. Retrieved from Peace and Sport website, http://www.peace-sport.org/images/stories/projetssurzone/israel-palestine/centres_citoyens.pdf
- Peace and Sport. (2010). Chess for leadership and creativity. "Chess for peace." (2011). *Chess for leadership and creativity*. Retrieved from Peace and Sport website, http://www.peace-sport.org/images/stories/projetssurzone/israel-palestine/Chess_for_leadership_and_creativity.pdf
- "Peace and Sport joins forces with UNESCO." (2011, October 19). Retrieved from Peace and Sport website, http://www.peace-sport.org/images/pdf/UNESCO_PEACE_AND_SPORT_PARTNERSHIP_ENG.pdf
- Peacock, B. (2011). 'A secret instinct of social preservation': Legitimacy and the dynamic (re)constitution of Olympic conceptions of the 'good'. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 477-502.
- Perks, T. (2007). Does sport foster social capital? The contribution of sport to a lifestyle of community participation. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 24 (4), 378-401.
- Pickering, P. M. (2006). Generating social capital for bridging ethnic divisions in the Balkans: Case studies of two Bosniak cities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 29 (1), 79-103.
- Ponte, S., Richey, K. A., & Baab, M. (2009). Bono's product (RED) initiative: Corporate social responsibility that solves the problems of "distant others". *Third World Quarterly*, 30 (2), 301-317.
- Redeker, R. (2008). Sport as an opiate of international relations: The myth and illusion of sport as a tool of foreign diplomacy. *Sport in Society*, 11 (4), 494-500.
- Rist, G. (2002). *The history of development – from western origins to global faith*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Rowe, J. K. (2005). Corporate social responsibility as business strategy. In R. D. Lipschutz & J. K. Rowe (Eds.), *Globalization, governmentality and government politics: Regulation for the rest of us?* (pp. 122-160). London: Routledge.
- Saavedra, M. (2009). Dilemmas and Opportunities in Gender and Sport-in-Development. In R. Levermore & A. Beacom, *Sport and international development*, (pp. 124-155). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sage, G. (1979). Sport and the social sciences. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 445, 1-14.
- Said, E. (2002). *The end of the peace process*. London: Granta.
- Schulenkorf, N. (2010). Sport events and ethnic reconciliation: Attempting to create social change between Sinhalese, Tamil and Muslim sports people in war-torn Sri Lanka. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45 (3), 273-294.

- Shor, E., & Yuval, Y. (2010). 'Play and shut up': The silencing of Palestinian athletes in Israeli media. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34 (2), 229-247.
- Smith, G., Cahn, A., & Sybil, F. (2010). Sports commerce and peace: The special case of the Special Olympics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89 (4), 587-602.
- Smith, A., & Westerbeek, H. (2007). Sport as a vehicle for developing corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 25 (7), 43-54.
- Sorek, T. (2005). Between football and martyrdom: The bi-focal localism of an Arab-Palestinian town in Israel. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 56 (4), 635-661.
- Sorek, T. (2007). *Arab soccer in a Jewish state: The integrative enclave*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Starkman, R. (2008, October 3). Right to Play group now on the IOC's hit list. *The Star*. Retrieved from <http://www.thestar.com/article/510933>
- Sugden, J. (2006). Teaching and playing sport for conflict resolution and co-existence in Israel. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 41 (2), 2006, 221-240.
- Sugden, J., & Wallis, J. (2007). *Football for peace? The challenges of using sport for co-existence in Israel*. Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Ltd.
- Sugden, J. (2008). Anyone for football for peace? The challenges of using sport in the service of co-existence in Israel. *Soccer & Society*, 9 (3), 405-415.
- Sugden, J. (2010). Critical left-realism and sport interventions in divided societies. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45 (3), 258-272.
- Susser, B. (1992). *Approaches to the study of politics*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Swatuk, L. A., Motsholapheko, M. R., & Mazvimavi, D. (2011). A political ecology of development in the Boteti River Region of Botswana: Locating a place for sport. *Third World Quarterly*, 32 (3), 453-475.
- Tonkiss, F. (2006). *Contemporary Economic Sociology*. London: Routledge.
- United Nations. (2005). *Business Plan International Year of Sport and Physical Education*. New York, NY: United Nations.
- United Nations Inter-agency Taskforce on Sport for Development and Peace. (2003). *Sport for development and peace: Achieving the United Nations Millennium Development Goals*. New York, NY: United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/sport2005/resources/task_force.pdf
- US Agency for International Development [USAID]. (2005). *The role of sports as a development tool*. Silver Spring, MD: USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC). Retrieved from http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnade352.pdf
- Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Vincent, L. (2008). The limitations of "inter-racial contact": Stories from young South Africa. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31 (8), 1426-1451.
- Wagg, S. (1995). *Giving the game away – football, politics & culture on five continents*. London and New York: Leicester University Press.
- Waxman, D. (2006). Israel's dilemma: Unity or peace? *Israel Affairs*,
- Weber, M. (1949). *The methodology of the social sciences*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Selection in translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willis, O. (2000). Sport and developments: The significance of Mathare Youth Sports Association. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 21 (3), 825-849.

- Witt, P. A., & Crompton, J. L. (Eds.) (1996). *Recreation programs that work for at-risk youth*. Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing Inc.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Jeremy Aaron Bellotti

EDUCATION

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| MA, Political Science /
International Relations
Indiana University
Indianapolis, Indiana | 2012 |
| Euroculture, Study Abroad
Université de Strasbourg
Erasmus Mundus / ITIRI (Les
Relations Internationales)
Strasbourg, France | 2010, Fall Semester |
| BA, Criminology
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida | 2006 |

HONORS, AWARDS, FELLOWSHIPS

- National Honor Society student recognized for excellence in scholarship, public service, leadership and character
- Voted NCAA Division I collegiate Team Captain and Athletic Director's Council Leader
- Leading Salesman of the Month 25 times (05/2006 – 01/2009)
- 15 vendor awards for top sales and promotional achievements
- Honored as Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs for Midwest Model EU 2010, analyzing EU policy initiatives and pending legislation as well as developing detailed legislative proposals
- Earned a legislative internship position at the Indiana State Senate, Spring 2011
- Selected on merit as Director of the Indianapolis Model UN, 2011-2012
- Co-Director of the 2012 Midwest Model European Union
- 2011 Indiana University Political Science department Research Assistantship honoree

FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

French

- ILR Level 2

Spanish

- ILR Level 1

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

International Affairs Division, Federal Emergency Management Agency 5/11 to 8/11
(FEMA),

US Department of Homeland Security, Washington, DC

International Relations Specialist

- Responsible for the development, coordination, implementation, and conduct of international emergency management initiatives
- Typical duties included: Providing assistance to the Director, International Affairs Division team and carrying out special assignments and research projects
- Supported country program managers on international emergency management issues
- Developed presentations and materials for disaster management knowledge exchanges and for delivery at major international meetings related to collaborative emergency management efforts with international partners
- Gathered, analyzed, and compiled background information and technical data from electronic and hard copy sources into final form for reports and summaries and for senior management
- Facilitated effective communication on international emergency management matters with industry, emergency management authorities, and with other FEMA and DHS offices
- Led presentations to international delegations regarding best practices and lessons learned in disaster management
- Represented the International Affairs Division at internal FEMA meetings on international emergency management programs
- Developed an authoritative source of information on how to provide international assistance during disasters
- Formulated policy or program recommendations, preparing papers and briefing materials, and collaborating with other agencies and foreign counterparts, as well as building team work relations with colleagues in the International Affairs Division
- Developed and preparing in-depth analysis of assigned issues at national, regional, and global levels

Indianapolis Model United Nations, Indianapolis, Indiana

2011 to 2012

Director

- Director of the overall preparation and proceedings of the oldest and most prestigious high school Model UN in the United States
- Initiated educational dialogue while exemplifying values of the United Nations through simulation of its most influential committees focusing on important, contemporary issues around the world

Indiana University Department of Political Science, Indianapolis, Indiana

8/11 to 5/12

Research Assistant

- Designing an efficient research plan and coordinating with various University libraries, the Library of Congress, and newspapers across the country
- Organizing research in order to facilitate project development for IU graduate professor

- Investigating certain biographical information on the particular research project subject

Peace and Sport, Monaco 2011

Volunteer Event Organizing Coordinator – NYC Marathon

- Organized Reception for Champions of Peace dinner with the Vice President of Peace and Sport, Chairman of Peace and Sport USA, several Champions for Peace, the Consulate General of Monaco, and the Ambassador of Monaco to the US
- Directed an official pre-Marathon run around Central Park with Olympic Champions
- Coordinated media relations for Olympic runners

National Institute for Fitness and Sport, Indianapolis, Indiana 10/11 to Present

Volunteer Program Coordinator and Fitness Specialist

- Research nutritional goals and develop fitness activities for youth ages 8-15
- Organize events that encourage youth development through participation in sport and extracurricular activities
- Educate youth about the benefits of a healthy lifestyle and values associated with sport

Indiana State Senate, Indianapolis, Indiana 12/10 to 5/11

Legislative Intern

- Gained practical knowledge of state government through active participation in the legislative process and worked directly with Indiana State Senators
- Researched past and present legislation in order to assist Senators in preparation for committee meetings

USF Athletic Director's Council for Athletic Affairs, Tampa, Florida 8/02 to 5/06

Council Leader

- Addressed important policy issues related to USF athletics and student athletes
- Developed key fundraising plan for the construction of a new athletic center and on-campus sports facility
- Implemented effective marketing strategies, encouraged relocation to the Big East Conference, and provided tutorial academic assistance for student-athletes
- Organized local fundraising/charity events and educational opportunities for Shriners Hospital for Children

Edwin Watts Golf Shops, Tampa, Florida 5/06 to 1/09

Head Sales Associate

- Extensive outside sales experience negotiating and securing new target markets for major golf companies in a worldwide industry
- Initiated a unique and hands-on marketing approach to attract new business and provide customers with the highest quality service and personal instruction
- Developed and maintained strong working relationships and an efficient level of communication with customers, supply vendors and colleagues

- Responsible for coaching, developing and encouraging excellence from a diverse sales team
- Managed the coordination of efficiency with sales associates regarding new product lines

University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida

8/05 to 3/06

Assistant to Sports Marketing Director

- Researched and developed advertising strategies for the University basketball program
- Developed dynamic in-game marketing strategies for local businesses