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Getting into the Game

Understanding the evidence for child-focused sport for development
Sport is a powerful means by which to engage all children in activities for personal and social development and to help them achieve their full potential. From an early age, sport provides children – including the most marginalized – with the opportunity to develop their physical abilities and health, to socialize, to build leadership skills and to learn as well as to have fun. Furthermore, to engage in play and recreational activities is a child’s right: The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (art. 31.1) clearly establishes “the right of the child to … leisure, to engage in play and recreational activities appropriate to the age of the child”.

To harness the power of sport, and in its role as a champion for children’s right to play, UNICEF has long been a proponent of sport and currently supports more than 263 Sport for Development (S4D) initiatives in 99 countries around the world. Yet, despite these many initiatives, S4D remains largely untapped as a tool to optimize outcomes for children, to help them access their rights and to contribute to achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and child-related United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). To remedy this situation, there is a critical need for high-quality research and evidence on how S4D initiatives work, what they achieve and how they can complement existing programmes and empower the most vulnerable children across the globe.

This report aims to address the dearth of evidence on the implementation and impact of S4D policy and programming for children. To do this, the report assesses, systematizes and maps existing evidence on S4D policies and programmes through desk-based research. Quality counts, so each chapter first assesses the evidence for its conceptual coherence, methodological and analytical strength, relevance/generalizability to the S4D field at large, and ethical considerations, before discussing the main messages and recommendations to come out of the evidence. The report represents the first stage in a two-phase research project that focuses on four key outcome areas closely linked to the SDGs: education, social inclusion, child protection and empowerment.

For each outcome area, the report sheds light on the strengths of child-focused S4D initiatives, the main challenges faced by the S4D sector, and recommendations for practitioners, policymakers and researchers to consider when designing and implementing programmes to improve the lives of children and young people. The intention is to strengthen the evidence base for cross-national learning and, through this, revive the global focus on S4D as a key intervention to address the needs and rights of children and young people in all countries.
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### Acronyms and Initialisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4D</td>
<td>Communication for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD</td>
<td>Culturally and linguistically diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBIM</td>
<td>Coaching Boys Into Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAPR</td>
<td>East Asia and Pacific region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAPRO</td>
<td>East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECAR</td>
<td>Europe and Central Asia region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECARO</td>
<td>Europe and Central Asia Regional Office (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAR</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESARO</td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>Gender and sexual minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>International Olympic Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACR</td>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACRO</td>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean Regional Office (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENARO</td>
<td>Middle East and North Africa Regional Office (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAY</td>
<td>Promoting Life Skills in Aboriginal Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>South Asia Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4D</td>
<td>Sport for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Sport for Development and Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPER</td>
<td>Sports United to Promote Education and Recreation (model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPSR</td>
<td>Teaching personal and social responsibility (model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN DESA</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, sanitation and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCAR</td>
<td>West and Central Africa region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCARO</td>
<td>West and Central Africa Regional Office (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Youth Experience Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES-S</td>
<td>Youth Experience Survey for Sport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is meant by sports, and why sports for children and for society?

Sport is any physical activity – participative or individual, organized or casual, competitive or not, and either rule-bound or unstructured – that represents a form of active play, active recreation or a game. In this report, the term ‘sport’ is not limited to nationally recognized activities, such as those with professional leagues, and is applied equally to indigenous games and sports.

For children, engaging in play and recreational activities is a right. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (art. 31.1) establishes “the right of the child to … leisure, to engage in play and recreational activities appropriate to the age of the child”. Beyond simply being a child’s right, sport and play appeal to children and, as such, are effective ways to engage children who might otherwise be hard to reach. Moreover, playing sport and engaging in diverse types of physical activity can provide opportunities for children and young people to develop agency and a sense of belonging in a group/community, to build leadership skills to nurture their learning and life skills, and to generate positive behaviours and attitudes. For children in fragile contexts, sport can play an even greater role in promoting safety and learning (Korsik, Ivarsson, Nakitanda and Rosas, 2013).

For societies more broadly, a wealth of evidence points to the potential of sports – through Sport for Development programming – to support the achievement of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) across a number of child-specific targets in SDG 3: Good health and well-being; SDG 4: Quality education; SDG 5: Gender equality; SDG 10: Reduced inequalities; SDG 11: Sustainable cities and communities; and SDG 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions.

What is Sport for Development?

Sport for Development (S4D) refers to the use of sport, or any form of physical activity, to provide both children and adults with the opportunity to achieve their full potential through programmes that promote personal and social development. S4D organizations use the appeal of sport as an inclusive means by which to provide children with the opportunity to develop their physical abilities and health and their social, educational and leadership skills, and, of course, to have fun. S4D initiatives come in diverse forms: from those that build personal and social development programmes around sport (sport-plus initiatives) to those that include sport as one of many approaches to achieving their social goals (plus-sport initiatives). Some programmes use a ‘sport-sport’ model that focuses simply on sports training or participation, e.g., playing with a professional club or school sports team, with no other principal objectives.

How popular are S4D for children initiatives?

Organizations at the international, national and local level are implementing sport initiatives as an instrument for children’s and young people’s development. Since the early 2000s, there has been considerable growth in the number of S4D initiatives around the world, as well as in the number of organizations using sport as part of their chosen intervention. For example, Beyond Sport, a global organization based in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, convenes a network of 2,140 organizations with over 2,985 projects in 148 countries – many of which target young people.

To get a better idea of the extent of child-focused approaches to S4D, this study undertook two surveys. The first gathered information reported by UNICEF country offices to determine how many S4D initiatives are implemented by UNICEF. This UNICEF Country Office Sport for Development Survey showed that UNICEF leads or supports 263 such initiatives in 99 countries, not counting those implemented by offices working in high-income countries (where many partnerships with sport organizations exist). The second survey, the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, sought information from independent organizations – including non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations, organizations led by young people, international organizations and government-led organizations – across the globe. To date, this survey has gathered data on the goals and implementation practices of 106 child-focused S4D programmes.
The need to strengthen the evidence base

While the numbers themselves show the extent of the popularity and use of S4D interventions, more needs to be known about S4D interventions for children, including what interventions work, how they work and for whom they work. The growth in the S4D sector has not been matched by a corresponding growth in research – and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of S4D initiatives in particular remains an important area of interest. The research has also failed to synthesize the current knowledge base, which hampers cross-national learning (UNICEF Civil Society Partnerships, 2015).

Unlocking the potential of sport initiatives to improve the lives of children and young people calls for high-quality evidence. Analysis of the existing evidence on S4D points to gaps in quality research and in data availability, including a lack of understanding of how S4D initiatives work (Whitley et al., 2018) and a need to further develop the research methods used in S4D (Schulenkorf, Sherry and Rowe, 2016).

The contributions and content of this report

To address the shortfall in evidence, this report aims to collate and strengthen the knowledge base in S4D, and in doing so provide the evidence needed to best position existing S4D initiatives in the suite of welfare interventions designed to improve children’s lives and to protect their right to engage in play and recreational activities. The report focuses on four key outcome areas for child development: education, social inclusion, child protection and empowerment. These outcome areas align with various SDGs and were deliberately selected to help link S4D evidence and action with efforts to achieve child-related SDGs (see Table 1.1).

For each outcome area, this report defines the area and links it to sport, before assessing: (1) existing evidence on the effectiveness of S4D in achieving goals for the outcome area; (2) promising practices in S4D in relation to the outcome area; (3) an evidence-based theory of change for the outcome area; and (4) recommendations to improve and strengthen research, policy and programming in the S4D sector to benefit the outcome area.

What evidence has been gathered and how

The findings in this report are a synthesis of findings from an integrative literature review – a systematic mapping of the available evidence – and from the two surveys of S4D programming within UNICEF and by organizations around the world (delivered in eight languages). Both the literature review and surveys were conducted with the aim of understanding the existing evidence in each of the four key outcome areas.

An integrative review was conducted to enable the research team to review studies that applied either qualitative or quantitative methodologies, or a mixed methods approach, with diverse data sources. More than 200 articles were reviewed for this report, of which around 100 articles were accepted and included in the final analysis across all the outcome areas. The evidence reviewed spanned the 10-year period 2007–2017 (including some research subsequently published in 2018) and was restricted to peer-reviewed articles, written in English or Spanish, about children and young people under 18 years of age or about programmes serving this age group. All articles reviewed were systematically mapped and synthesized according to specific criteria, including: primary objectives, enacting organization, year of initiative, target participants, sport, geographical location, study methodology, and results in relation to each of the four key outcome areas. In addition, the quality of research was evaluated for each article, based on three key criteria: conceptualization, internal validity of methods and analyses, and external validity/utility. Ethical considerations were also noted where possible. Most articles included in the analysis (80 per cent) were of high to medium quality.

The two aforementioned surveys were designed and developed to further inform the analysis and provide a richer description of what works, and what gaps in evidence exist, while in some cases validating the programme theories of change developed in each chapter. The UNICEF Country Office Sport for Development Survey was specifically designed to
gather relevant information from UNICEF regional and country offices on the types of S4D initiatives they lead or support. To find out what practitioners had to say about implementing S4D in practice, the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey surveyed a total of 106 child-focused S4D programmes around the world. This online survey of S4D programmes was used to gather additional information about programme design, implementation strategies, M&E systems, partnerships and funding as well as participant populations. Most S4D programmes were located in Africa, and within each region, programmes tended to be located in the higher-income countries, for example, in the Eastern and Southern Africa region, most S4D programmes were in South Africa. Programmes surveyed typically served early to middle adolescents (ages 10 to 14 years) for whom poverty was a common risk factor, and participants were most commonly recruited to S4D programmes via the use of sport itself.

**Sport can be a positive factor in children’s lives**

Evidence shows that well-designed S4D initiatives are improving the lives of children across the globe. Sports activities increase children’s access to, and participation in, initiatives and services – including for the most marginalized children – and thus promote equitable outcomes in learning, skills development, inclusion, safety and empowerment. That said, unlocking the full potential of sport initiatives to further improve the lives of children and young people calls for quality evidence to support advances in policymaking and programming. Analysis in this report – designed to summarize the quality evidence on programme design and implementation – points to diverse ways in which S4D initiatives can be improved.

**Improving programme design**

To achieve positive outcomes, the programme design and implementation plans for sport initiatives must be targeted towards specific objectives and/or strategies, for example, around education or empowerment. Across all four key outcome areas, the importance of context in programme design is key, which speaks directly to the need to understand both barriers to access and the needs of the community and individual children.

Adopting a multi-sectoral and co-production approach in programme design is key to addressing concerns and achieving complementarities at the community and system level. In other words, S4D practitioners should work with other sectors and children’s services to build complementarity, capacity and effectiveness.

**Strengthening the role of sports coaches and trainers**

Sports coaches and trainers have a crucial role to play in generating positive outcomes for children, as they can instil positive behaviour and act as role models. Safeguarding children, especially the most vulnerable, in and around sport initiatives is of immense importance and must be a priority in the training of S4D coaches and trainers. It is critical that the coaching and training staff involved in any S4D initiative have a diversity of experience that aligns with children’s needs.

**Building a culture of positive participation**

Evidence shows that special care should be taken to ensure that sport initiatives do not reinforce negative sociocultural attitudes and norms that present a risk to children or to the initiative’s goals. For example, S4D initiatives should not reinforce:

- sporting cultures that can normalize violence and/or negative power relations
- exclusiveness, whether because of peer behaviours or limited accessibility
- pervasive structural and social inequalities.

**Addressing risks and limitations to support outcomes for children and young people**

It is critical to note that sport is not the answer to all of the issues faced by children and young people, and practitioners must recognize both the advantages and limitations of S4D. Some of the evidence may even indicate negative effects on children as a result of their participation in sport initiatives, for example, child
protection risks, or contrasting gender equity effects of certain empowerment programmes. The survey results give an initial indication that S4D programmes that spend a greater proportion of time on sport tended to report more children withdrawing from the intervention. This speaks to the importance of directly addressing risks and of striking the right balance between the amount of sport and the amount of personal and social development involved in S4D interventions. Children may, in fact, go for the sport and stay for the support. Lessons learned from the literature review indicate that the very design of S4D programmes can make it challenging to distinguish the degree to which the sports activity itself is the reason for the observed programme effects.

Evidence for decision-making

Better research and data are needed to support decision-making in programming, policy and advocacy, and it is hoped that this report will stimulate further efforts in this regard. There is a need to develop more robust quantitative methods as well as effective impact evaluations that can contribute to the field of knowledge. It is essential to prioritize efforts to integrate children’s voices in evidence generation and to reflect children’s perspectives when setting programme goals such as multidimensional social inclusion.

Where next? Building Phase 2 of the child-focused S4D project and research

This project will continue to build the evidence base for S4D to empower policymakers and practitioners to meet the needs of all children they represent and support. At the same time, it will continue to raise awareness of the joint ambitions of the Barça Foundation and UNICEF to strengthen the global discourse on effective S4D programming.

Continuing this work will involve, among other things: developing and undertaking Phase 2 of the research; supporting the work of the Sport for Development for Children Working Group; and further adding to the evidence base by continuing to manage the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey and publish its data.

Building on the results of Phase 1 of the research, Phase 2 aims to illustrate the unique contribution of sport to development for child and young people using high-quality evidence from field research. The second phase will test the findings of this first phase of the research, including the various theories of change developed, and will involve analysis of secondary data collected via the S4D programmes identified in the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey. Primary data collection tool(s) will also be designed, piloted and refined to complement the secondary data analysis and to help understand the common characteristics and practices necessary for the transferability and scaling up of S4D initiatives in different settings (e.g., emergency and non-emergency contexts). This will involve meaningful consultation with young people, S4D experts and other stakeholders. In its final stage, Phase 2 will translate the knowledge acquired throughout the project into policy, practice and actionable recommendations for the Working Group.

The outputs of this report, and Phase 2 of the project, will support the goal-setting, tasks and outputs of each of the subgroups in the Working Group, including in relation to: (1) framework development; (2) advocacy; (3) M&E; (4) data collection; and (5) literature and case study development. Together with the members of the Working Group, the S4D project researchers will support the creation of a Sport for Development for Children Framework, which will provide the structure for S4D for children programmes to foster a stronger foundation to enable S4D organizations, sports clubs and foundations, and NGOs, among others, to better design, implement, monitor and evaluate S4D interventions for children.

Finally, to continue to build the evidence base on S4D programming, the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey will remain live.1

---

1.1 Introduction

To set the scene for this report – and explain the rationale, aims and methods applied in the research study – this chapter looks at who is currently active in the field of S4D (at national and international levels, in policy and practice), what they are doing and how this study will contribute to their work. To start with, however, ‘sport’ must be defined, as must ‘Sport for Development’.

‘Sport’ is any physical activity – participative or individual, organized or casual, competitive or not, and either rule-bound or unstructured – that represents a form of active play, active recreation or a game. In this report, the term ‘sport’ is not limited to nationally recognized activities, such as those with professional leagues, and is applied equally to indigenous games and sports. All children can engage in sport and play as a right, for fun and for skills development.

‘Sport for Development’ refers to the use of sport, or any form of physical activity, to provide both children and adults with the opportunity to achieve their full potential through programmes that promote personal and social development. S4D programmes serving children may use sport in different ways. Some programmes use a ‘sport-sport’ model that focuses simply on sports training or participation, e.g., playing with a professional club or school sports team, with no other principal objectives. In the field of S4D, however, it is common for programmes to adopt either a ‘sport-plus’ or ‘plus-sport’ approach (Coalter, 2011, 2006). Sport-plus initiatives, whose chief focus is sport, also build personal and social development programmes around sport activities to achieve development goals. Plus-sport programmes, on the other hand, include sport as one of many approaches to achieving their social goals, such as education or behaviour change, and use sport mainly to attract participants.

The remainder of this chapter is organized as follows: section 1.2 maps UNICEF work in the area of S4D; section 1.3 provides an overview of previous synthesis studies and how these helped to set the aims of this work; section 1.4 introduces existing frameworks for work by international organizations in the area of S4D; and sections 1.5 and 1.6 complete the chapter, by looking respectively at the study’s theoretical frame and analytical plan.

1.2 UNICEF and sport for children: Lessons from the field

Since 2000, UNICEF has advocated for the role of sport, recreation and play in child development from early childhood to adolescence, in areas such as health, education and social inclusion. During the initial stages of UNICEF involvement in the field of S4D, a report supported by existing research highlighted the multiple potential benefits of sport (UNICEF, 2004). These potential benefits include: better health; preparation for learning; reduced stress and depression; improved confidence and self-esteem; improved learning and academic performance; reduced likelihood of smoking
and illicit drug use; and reduced crime. Evidence from actual case studies showed, however, that the positive effects of sport participation were limited to: improving children’s ability to cement friendships; providing children with a quality education; and helping to raise awareness among young people about HIV/AIDS. Such results illustrated that sport was more likely to be associated with short-term individual-level outcomes for children rather than long-term development goals.

Another UNICEF study looked at the potential unintended negative impacts of sport such as violence, seeking to demonstrate that “violence prevention, child protection and measures to safeguard the well-being of children are generally not yet embedded in sport delivery systems” (UNICEF, 2010, p. 23). It highlighted gaps in understanding, including around types of violence such as psychological abuse and trafficking, and the need for education programmes for coaches, athletes and other stakeholders. Findings from the study also demonstrated the need for more research in developing countries and regions on child protection in sports as well as for an evidence-based framework for violence prevention policies, particularly those relating to the protection of gender and sexual minorities (GSM), ethnic minorities, child athletes and children with disabilities. The report also called for data disaggregation to increase the representativeness and precision of the evidence, and for better M&E systems and research partnerships to ensure high-quality evidence.

Initial efforts by UNICEF to strengthen the evidence base in S4D for children led to the development – in collaboration with UK Sport and Magic Bus UK – of an M&E manual for S4D (Coalter, 2006). The manual reviewed and synthesized case studies from India (Mumbai), Kenya, Zambia and Zimbabwe to help examine the processes that are important for effective S4D programme design, implementation, delivery and results. It provided a clear set of standards for the development and assessment of M&E systems in S4D. The key message of that implementation framework was

---

Figure 1.1. UNICEF Strategic Framework on Sport for Development

Note: Blue text indicates main focuses of this report. Source: Authors’ elaboration, based on UNICEF (2011).
that participatory process evaluations guided by clear programme theory and logic models could add value for S4D programmes (e.g., in terms of needs analysis for capacity building). In this way, Coalter’s (2006) M&E manual goes beyond the questions of ‘why sport’ and ‘what works’ to address how S4D works.

UNICEF subsequently developed a strategic framework for S4D for children (see Figure 1.1). It also published a guide to implementing S4D programmes, both to more widely introduce the use of sport as a tool for development for children and to map existing knowledge to avoid duplicate work (Barrie and Guerrero, 2013). In addition to covering cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, social inclusion and participation, the guide outlined how the various dimensions of sport and play (physical, mental, emotional, social) have a differential impact on child development outcomes (e.g., the social aspect of sport contributes to trust, empathy, respect and tolerance of others). The guide also included useful strategies for promoting inclusion (e.g., making changes to equipment, rules or environment; use of public arenas; same-sex programming; parental involvement). The UNICEF framework and guide clearly show once again that while pathways may exist between children’s participation in sport and development goals, much more is known about the individual child development outcomes associated with sports participation.

Across UNICEF, country offices have implemented 263 S4D initiatives across 99 countries and 7 UNICEF global regions (see Figure 1.2). The UNICEF Country Office Sport for Development Survey expanded on the last internal S4D mapping report (UNICEF, 2015) and

Figure 1.2. Locations of S4D programmes led or supported by UNICEF country offices and National Committees

Notes: Results are based on analysis of UNICEF documents and UNICEF Country Office Sport for Development Survey results. For a breakdown of the number of programmes by country, see the online annex at <www.unicef-irc.org>. Not shown: Joint regions (e.g., Eastern Caribbean = one programme).

Box 1.1. UNICEF Country Office Sport for Development Survey: Summary results

In which regions are S4D programmes found?

- Latin America and Caribbean: 23%
- Europe and Central Asia: 17%
- East Asia and Pacific: 20%
- Eastern and Southern Africa: 19%
- East Asia and Pacific: 17%
- Middle East and North Africa: 13%

What are the focus areas of S4D programmes?

- Education: 31%
- Child protection: 17%
- Social inclusion: 16%
- Health: 6%
- Empowerment: 6%
- Communication: 6%
- Peace building: 6%
- Adolescent: 6%
- Other: 6%

Many S4D programmes have several partners, who do they partner with?

- 59% ministries of education
- 46% NGOs
- 41% ministries of youth and sport
- 40% sport clubs and associations

Which S4D outcomes are common to different regions?

Strengths of S4D approach
- 20% Broad national audience/call for sport
- 16% SD policy and practice
- 15% Technical/Staff capacity
- 13% Material resources/infrastructure
- 10% Other

Challenges of S4D approach
- 24% Fundraising
- 18% S4D policy and practice
- 15% Technical/Staff capacity
- 8% Other

Notes: Results are based on analysis of UNICEF documents and UNICEF Country Office Sport for Development Survey results.
surveyed UNICEF country offices on their use of S4D programming to achieve child development outcomes. The advantages and opportunities of using S4D programming most frequently reported by UNICEF country offices included: sport being valued more by society and/or reaching a broader audience; governments paying greater attention to sport; and the existence of strong partnerships between the country office and government, private sector businesses and civil society in support of S4D programming.

While these numbers and reported strengths show the extent of the popularity and use of S4D interventions, more needs to be known about the effectiveness of S4D interventions for children.

1.3 Overview of existing research evidence

Several systematic reviews and various grey literature published on S4D provide some further insight into why sport is important for child development, the challenges that S4D presents and recommendations of how to move forward. This information was useful in determining the focus of the literature review for the present study (see section 1.3.6).

1.3.1 Why is sport important for child development?

There is clear consensus that sport can have positive impacts on child development outcomes. The types of outcomes achieved varied across the evidence, however, and – as indicated by the findings of each of the chapters of this report – the outcomes may be determined by the type of sport used, the setting for the intervention and other key programming levers. Nevertheless, recent reviews of the S4D literature reveal a relationship between children’s and young people’s participation in sport and various types of personal and social development outcomes, including life skills (e.g., self-efficacy, confidence, self-esteem), social cohesion, education outcomes, psychosocial outcomes and physical health and well-being (Coalter and Taylor, 2010; Langer, 2015; Schuënkorff et al., 2016; Evans et al., 2017; Jones, Edwards, Bocarro, Bunds and Smith, 2017). Moreover, S4D can be an important intervention for the most vulnerable children, as sport can contribute to their emotional, cognitive and social skills (Hermens, Super, Verkooijen and Koelen, 2017).

Furthermore, S4D evidence from both the literature review and programmes surveyed as part of the present study indicate that child development outcomes can also align with and link to the SDGs, including SDG 3: Good health and well-being; SDG 4: Quality education; SDG 5: Gender equality; SDG 10: Reduced inequalities; SDG 11: Sustainable cities and communities; and SDG 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions (see Table 1.1). For reference, specific SDG targets that have been identified as being clearly aligned with the advantages, successes and potential of S4D programming evidenced in the report are outlined below (see Table 1.1).

For example, a recent impact evaluation of the UNICEF Just Play programme in the Pacific Islands region focuses on the power of sport to promote positive health changes, the inclusion of women and persons with disabilities, and enhanced teaching by and inspiration and engagement of practitioners (UNICEF, 2018). Child development outcomes covered in the impact evaluation report include: health and wellness; gender equality; social inclusion; water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH); child protection; and emergencies, with a focus on how these outcomes connect to selected SDGs. Results show that engagement with the Just Play programme has resulted in a 35 per cent improvement in child protection (e.g., safety after natural disaster, although scores remained low), a 29 per cent improvement in health and wellness (i.e., WASH), a 20 per cent improvement in social inclusion (e.g., celebration of differences) and a 19 per cent improvement in gender equality (e.g., boys enjoy playing football with girls) (See Box 4.2 for further information on the Just Play programme).

1.3.2 S4D outcomes reviewed in this report

To organize the contribution of this report, four broad outcome areas were selected to reflect common trends in both S4D programming and child development outcomes, as supported by existing evidence. These key outcome areas, which are the focus of each review chapter, are: education, social inclusion, child protection and empowerment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Area</th>
<th>Sustainable Development Goal</th>
<th>Specific Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>SDG 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all</td>
<td>4.1 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social inclusion</strong></td>
<td>SDG 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls</td>
<td>5.1 End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries</td>
<td>10.3 Ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome, including by eliminating discriminatory laws, policies and practices and by promoting appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable</td>
<td>11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies</td>
<td>16.8 Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child protection</strong></td>
<td>SDG 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages</td>
<td>3.5 Strengthen the prevention and treatment of substance abuse, including narcotic drug abuse and harmful use of alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable</td>
<td>11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies</td>
<td>16.2 End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowerment</strong></td>
<td>SDG 5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls</td>
<td>5.5 Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries</td>
<td>10.2 By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies</td>
<td>16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The selection of these outcomes is justified for two reasons. First, as noted above, the evidence examined for this introductory chapter strongly suggests that education, social inclusion, child protection and empowerment are important S4D outcomes, both in terms of why sport is important for child development and what works, and also in terms of risks associated with S4D for children (especially in terms of child protection, e.g., protecting children from violence in sports). Finally, the focus is on these individual-level child development outcomes because, as the existing literature shows, there is an expectation-evidence gap in terms of sport’s contribution to larger development goals. Nevertheless, throughout the report emphasis is placed on the contextual factors important not only for individual child development, but also for the development of better worlds for children.

Second, the UNICEF Country Office Sport for Development Survey showed that the top three focus areas for S4D initiatives supported by UNICEF are: education, social inclusion and child protection, with health and empowerment tied for fourth place (for a full list of target outcomes for S4D programming by region as reported by UNICEF country offices, see Annex 1.A). Empowerment was selected over health because it is linked to other focus areas such as adolescent development and Communication for Development (C4D). Also, other United Nations agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) are already leading efforts on research linking sport and physical activity, and physical education to health.

1.3.3 What works when using sport for child development?

Imperative to the success of child-focused S4D interventions are several contextual factors, including features of the sport itself, features of the sport/community environment, and programme design. For example, Evans et al. (2017) found evidence that team sports, less competitive sports settings, and greater hours of sports participation are linked to positive psychosocial outcomes among young people. In addition, research has also shown that conditions conducive to the acquisition of life skills in sports contexts include: problem-solving opportunities, a sense of belonging, positive peer relations and positive youth-adult partnerships (Hermens et al., 2017). On the last point of youth-adult partnerships, Jones et al. (2017) also found that in sports settings such as communities and schools, contextual assets include coaches, peers (sport and non-sport) and other adults (familial and non-familial).

Other factors associated with impactful S4D programming include: contextually and culturally sensitive approaches that use participatory techniques (e.g., dialogue and multi-level partnerships); targeted goals and trained staff; long-term funding; and a sense of safety (Webb and Richelieu, 2015). Similarly, Schulenkorf et al. (2016) found some key patterns emerging from research on successful S4D programming that may be useful for theory building. These include: the presence of positive role models and change agents in the programme; the use of participatory approaches, the need for intentional design, especially when integrating development targets/social outcomes; the provision of safe spaces for community engagement; and the need for committed funds and empowerment (i.e., the transfer of power to local contexts for sustainability).

1.3.4 What are the research-related challenges in using sport to promote children’s and young people’s development?

From a research perspective, key challenges to using sport to promote the development of children and young people include both the quality of the available research evidence and the existing scope and direction of the research field at large.

1.3.4.1 Quality of research evidence

Systematic reviews point to the major challenge presented by the issue of weak evidence, or a lack of evidence, in the field of S4D. For example, Langer’s (2015) systematic review focused on Africa found that although there was evidence to support positive associations between sports participation and individual outcomes, there was no evidence to support a link with development indicators or goals. Using an evidence gap map, Langer (2015) shows that S4D initiatives in Africa
tend to focus on ‘low-hanging fruit’ (intermediate outcomes that focus on short-term individual-level outcomes such as changes in knowledge, skills and attitudes) and lack the long-term follow-up to determine whether desired impacts on development have been met. Based on these results, Langer (2015) concludes that the S4D field is out of sync with the typical development study’s focus on what works. Thus, S4D research needs to improve its ability to demonstrate what works, why it works and for whom it works (Langer, 2015).

Jones et al. (2017) add that often insufficient information is provided about the programme theory to fully comprehend the ‘how to’ in terms of which activities and strategies work and what resources and capacities are needed to support them. Similarly, in their evaluation of six different S4D programmes, Coalter and Taylor (2010) found that it was possible to identify what happened (e.g., modest increases in self-efficacy, self-esteem, positive gender attitudes and HIV/AIDS awareness) but not why it happened or how it happened. Therefore, Coalter and Taylor (2010) caution against attributing such outcomes solely to sport, since they are more likely the result of a range of activities and experiences provided by the programme. In addition, caution may need to be exercised when using an approach that emphasizes individual-level change without considering the structural limitations that are responsible for the issues faced (Coalter and Taylor, 2010). Some of the specific challenges that make evaluating the impact of S4D programmes difficult include: a lack of coherent programme theories; poorly defined outcomes; a lack of expertise and training in M&E; and a high turnover among NGO staff (Coalter and Taylor, 2010).

There is also a high risk of bias in research reporting (e.g., mismatch between research design, methods and analysis) among the evidence base in research on sport and psychosocial outcomes (Evans et al., 2017). Some research even suggests that the study methods used may have affected the results to some extent. For example, in one systematic review, qualitative studies were less likely than quantitative studies to report emotional life skills (indicating a possible disclosure issue). This is important because qualitative studies tend to dominate the field (Schulenkorf et al., 2016). But quantitative studies could also introduce bias, for example, by focusing on life skills that interest funders or on outcomes that the programme was designed to achieve (Hermens et al., 2017).

The type of journal also matters in relation to the outcomes reported. One integrative review shows that non-sport journals pay more attention to individual outcomes, while sport journals pay more attention to assets available in sport contexts and features such as the specific sport or type of sport, duration of participation, and level of competitiveness (Hermens et al., 2017). Sport journals, however, demonstrate a lack of focus on longitudinal individual outcomes, focusing instead on the relationships among sport attitudes or the relationship between sports participation and youth development outcomes (Jones et al., 2017). Therefore, even though most S4D research tends to use multiple methods selected from the full range of questionnaires/surveys, interviews, focus groups, documentary analysis, observations, etc. (Schulenkorf et al., 2016), there is a need to reduce the risk of bias in the conduct and reporting of research.

1.3.4.2 Scope and direction of the research field

Differences in the scope and direction of S4D research create challenges for establishing consensus in what works and how. For example, whilst some authors use evidence to argue that sport can contribute to development goals (e.g., diplomacy; Jackson, 2013; Nygard and Gates, 2013), others criticize the underlying theory that the “indoctrinating sport-related values into child athletes” will result in these values being transferred to community contexts where they can influence friends and family (Webb and Richelieu, 2015, p. 278). The expectation that sports interventions will naturally ‘spill over’ to have positive community effects is problematic because evidence suggests that the implicit transfer approach has not been effective in achieving S4D aims (Webb and Richelieu, 2015). Indeed, more explicit steps to achieving this transfer need to be set out. Simply put, for S4D to achieve its development goals, the scope of research in this field needs to be more practical, evidence-informed and focused. S4D research also tends to be dominated by psychological or sociological theories such as positive
youth development, self-determination theory, achievement goal theory, social cognitive theory, identity theory and social capital theory (Jones et al., 2017; Schulenkorf et al., 2016). These theories from North America may not be the only relevant theories, however, and it is unclear whether these theories are simply driving research objectives or whether the evidence truly supports the relevance of these particular theories to S4D outcomes (Jones et al., 2017). For example, Lindsey (2017) contends that S4D has much to learn from development studies, while Schulenkorf et al. (2016) suggest there is a need for capacity building among S4D programming officers and researchers in low- to middle-income country contexts as well as for more research on disability and gender equality. Furthermore, even when positive youth development has been the research focus, the study of risk behaviours and, to a lesser extent, depression dominates the field, with fewer studies about positive contributions (Jones et al., 2017). Taken together, these patterns and observations suggest that S4D research calls for greater generation of theories, a positivist approach and more inclusive coverage of child development issues.

A lack of consensus in the literature around the definition of sport further complicates these theoretical issues. Webb and Richelieu (2015) theorize a ‘sport complexity spectrum’ that moves from less regulated forms of sport such as play and amateur sports to more regulated forms such as professional sport, mega-sporting events and sport used to promote nationalism. There is a need to understand the implications that these various conceptualizations of sport have for S4D outcomes among children.

### 1.3.5 Recommendations for overcoming research challenges

Despite the significant challenges, there are many options for improving the quality of evidence and the scope and direction of S4D research. To avoid what Coalter (2015) calls a ‘displacement of scope’ – when results from sport contexts are overgeneralized to communities and wider society – researchers should integrate sport and non-sport contexts as subjects of research inquiry (Jones et al., 2017). Evans et al. (2017) also suggest modelling for complexity of participation patterns (e.g., using person-centred methods such as latent class analysis, which shows common patterns of overlap in experiences, known as ‘classes’ within data, and can be useful for designing targeted interventions) to better understand, and isolate from other programme effects, the specific contribution of sport. Meanwhile, some authors also advocate examining the differences in outcomes based on implicit versus explicit transfer of skills, informal versus organized sports, and participatory approaches that involve various stakeholders (e.g., policymakers, sports organizations, coaches and parents) versus ‘one-man shows’ that involve a single organization or programme (Hermens et al., 2017).

According to Webb and Richelieu (2015), the following three key ingredients are required to support impactful S4D ventures: contextual intelligence, multi-level partnerships and focused targets. There is also room for more interdisciplinary approaches, and for better understanding of the surrounding context to enable available resources in communities to be tapped into through collaborative research/programme design approaches (Jones et al., 2017). The use of high-quality evidence to inform programme development and advocacy efforts is also critical (Evans et al., 2017). In particular, the development of programme theory allows for formative evaluations that better address questions of how and why, in addition to identifying entry points for capacity building (Coalter and Taylor, 2010).

### 1.3.6 Problem identification

The preliminary summary of the existing research evidence shows that although much more is known about what works than previously thought (at least for individual development), there remain substantial challenges facing the S4D field in terms of evidence for, coherence in and scope of practice (see Figure 1.3). This leads to the identification of important research questions such as: Is the existing knowledge about what works actionable and transferable across contexts (i.e., does it include information on how it works and for whom)? And, importantly, how can this information about what is known to work be leveraged to create more efficient planning tools for designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating S4D programmes for children?
Before this report can begin to address such questions and provide answers for children's development through sport by proposing evidence-informed frameworks for S4D practice for children, it is important to briefly examine the contributions of existing frameworks put forward by other international organizations.

1.4 Existing frameworks

As well as the recommendations proposed by large-scale reviews of the literature, there are existing frameworks developed by international organizations that are useful in providing some direction for the improvement of S4D research (for a list of research and reports on S4D published by international organizations, see Annex 1.B).

The United Nations Action Plan on Sport for Development and Peace (2016) identified work required in four main action areas to increase sport's contribution to the achievement of the SDGs: development of a global framework, policy development, resource mobilization and evidence generation. The main objectives of the global framework include stakeholder involvement, sharing of best practices, alignment with the SDGs, and advocacy. The aims for policy development are to integrate sport into other policies in the development sector and to bridge the gap that sometimes exists between framework design and implementation. The framework also proposes that resource mobilization should emphasize allocation of sustainable funding for multi-sector collaboration.

Figure 1.3. Summary of existing research evidence for problem identification

Source: UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti (2019). Based on evidence from literature reviewed for this chapter.
address cross-cutting issues such as human rights, gender, disability and health; and work to effectively address the downsides of Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) initiatives. Lastly, the goal for evidence generation is to apply common standards and methods in research practices, the results of which should then be systematically disseminated on sharing platforms.

Following the 2017 closure of the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP), the United Nations organization now leading work on S4D is the United Nations Department for Economics and Social Affairs (UN DESA). In 2018, UN DESA convened several experts in the S4D field to write discussion papers to inform revisions to the United Nations Action Plan on Sport for Development and Peace and its alignment with the UNESCO Kazan Action Plan. The Kazan Action Plan (UNESCO, 2017) aims to bridge the gap between S4D policy and implementation, acting as a “tool for aligning international and national policy … with the UN 2030 Agenda”. It comprises five actions or goals to be developed/achieved: an advocacy tool; a series of measurement indicators; safeguarding standards and guidelines; a focus on women and sport; and a clearing house for the sharing of policy framework implementation.

WHO also has a global action plan framework that embraces a systems-based approach to increasing physical activity levels across all age groups and all settings (WHO, 2018). The global action plan – called More Active People for a Healthier World – seeks to mobilize sport, rather than S4D specifically, to mitigate the incidence of non-communicable diseases linked to inactivity (e.g., type 2 diabetes), and targets SDGs 4, 5, 10, 11 and 16.

The International Olympic Committee (IOC) has an implementation guide for its Sport and Active Society programmes, which links to three different levels of outcomes, as supported by research evidence: individuals’ physical and emotional well-being, effective public expenditure and happier communities.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) also has an S4D implementation framework, specifically for refugees, which notes that multi-sector collaboration and participatory approaches are key to the success of S4D programmes in refugee camps (Korsik, Ivarsson, Nakitanda and Perez Rosas, 2013). Meanwhile, the Commonwealth Secretariat has developed policy, advocacy and measurement frameworks that link sport to the SDGs (e.g., 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 16 and 17) and is working toward the development of measurement indicators as called for by the Kazan Action Plan (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2018; Lindsey and Chapman, 2017; Dudfield and Dingwall-Smith, 2015; Kay and Dudfield, 2013). While these existing S4D frameworks address child development outcomes to varying degrees, none of them were developed specifically for children.

An exception is the separate frameworks and guidelines developed by WHO for schools sports, children and adolescents (WHO, 2017, 2010, 2008), which recommend that children aged 5–17 years get a minimum of 60 minutes of physical activity each day. They also recommend that adolescents participate in structured physical activity in schools and communities, but sport is just one example of physical activity in those frameworks and is not the central concern. One of the aims of this report is to provide more detailed and actionable programme theories tailored to specific child development outcomes associated with sport.

1.5 Providing answers for children through evidence-informed S4D programming

To provide answers for children through S4D programming, this report addresses two key components of the United Nations Action Plan on Sport for Development and Peace by moving toward a global framework for children and by strengthening the evidence base. Following the review of the available literature on S4D for children and the results of the two surveys (the UNICEF Country Office Sport for Development Survey and the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey), it was noted that there is currently no comprehensive tool to support evidence-informed programme design, implementation and evaluation of S4D programmes that aim to specifically address issues faced by children.

To address this omission, each of the chapters of this
report presents a theory of change for the relevant child outcome: education, social inclusion, child protection and empowerment. These evidence-based theories of change will inform the future development of a toolkit for S4D programmes serving vulnerable children and young people, based on Barça Foundation and UNICEF’s Sport for Development for Children Framework. The toolkit will then serve as a planning tool to guide programme design, implementation, delivery and M&E for programmes serving vulnerable children.

1.6 Methods and analytic strategy

An integrative literature review was conducted to systematically map the available evidence across the four key outcome areas: education, social inclusion, child protection and empowerment (participation). In addition, a global UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey was conducted to examine practices among child-focused S4D programmes around the world. The survey analysis complements the evidence found in the literature.

1.6.1 Integrative literature review

In an integrative literature review, rigorous approaches are applied to problem identification, literature search, data analysis, data evaluation and the modelling of evidence synthesis (for the steps, see Figure 1.4). The integrative review method is particularly useful when reviewing studies that employ various methods, for example, both qualitative and quantitative research that uses diverse data sources ranging from cross-sectional and experimental data to case studies, policy reviews and conceptual papers (Whittemore and Knafl, 2005). Therefore, integrative reviews may be particularly suited to the study of ‘emerging’ fields such as S4D (Jones et al., 2017; Schulenkorf et al., 2016). Moreover, the particular strength of the integrative review that is most relevant to this report is its utility in developing models informed by evidence synthesis such as theories of change (Whittemore and Knafl, 2005), which is a major objective of this report.

More than 200 articles were reviewed for the present report, of which around 100 total were accepted and included in the final analysis for each chapter. The evidence reviewed spanned the 10-year period 2007–2017 (including some research subsequently published in 2018) and was restricted to peer-reviewed articles or studies about children and young people under 18 years of age or about programmes serving this age group.

The literature search was conducted using seven research databases: ERIC (Education Resources Information Center), JSTOR, ProQuest, EBSCOhost, ScienceDirect, Scopus and SPORTDiscus. Additionally, the team searched archives of sport-specific journals such as Sport in Society, International Review for the Sociology of Sport, Sport Management Review, Journal of Sport Management, European Sport Management Quarterly, Journal of Physical Education and Sport.

Figure 1.4. Integrative literature review method
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Source: Adapted from Whittemore and Knafl (2005).
Articles published in a language other than English, French or Spanish were excluded. A shortlist of search terms was created, focusing on common terms related to sport, sport for development, children, youth, education, social inclusion, child protection and empowerment. Searches often turned up only a small number of relevant articles, however, which the team identified by screening titles and abstracts. To address this shortfall, several follow-up strategies were employed: keywords in relevant articles were used to refine subsequent searches; relevant citations found in the literature were followed up; and other specific criteria were added to help diversify the pool of articles surfaced, for example, to include a wider variety of geographical locations and intervention settings (e.g., schools, youth clubs, communities). Further details specific to each key outcome area reviewed are included in the relevant review chapter.

1.6.2 Systematic mapping and synthesis of evidence

Articles that met the inclusion criteria were read closely and systematically mapped based on specific criteria. The criteria used to categorize and analyse data included:

- primary objectives of the programme
- organization(s) responsible for enacting the programme (lead organization and others)
- origins of the programme (e.g., youth-led, community-led)
- target participants (i.e., characteristics and number)
- sport/activity employed
- way in which sport is used (sport-plus, plus-sport, sport-sport, physical education)
- location (city, country, number of sites, school vs community setting)
- evidence of M&E of programme
- study methods
- sample size
- programme theory identified
- sport policy (local, regional or national) referred to in text
- overall results achieved by programme
- alignment of programme with specific outcomes (education, social inclusion, child protection, empowerment) or cross-cutting issues (e.g., gender, health).

The quality of research evidence was evaluated using a rating scale that assessed the conceptualization, internal validity of methods and analyses, and external validity/utility of reviewed studies (for a detailed explanation of the rubric, see Annex 1.C). In an integrative review, comprehensive and purposive sampling is prioritized, which can lead to the inclusion of evidence of variable quality (Whittemore and Knafl, 2005). In a few instances, articles considered to be of low quality were nevertheless included because they concern research about programmes serving under-represented populations such as young people in developing countries (Nicholls, Giles and Sethna, 2011). Even though the evidence quality was low in these few instances, the programmes themselves demonstrate ‘promising practices’, as supported by other high-quality literature included in the review. Most articles included in the analysis (80 per cent) were of high to medium quality.

Finally, the systematic mapping of the evidence helped to determine trends and gaps in the research in regard to why sport is important for child development outcomes, what works, what challenges exist and recommendations for addressing these challenges. Therefore, mapping the evidence led to the identification of the common assumptions, inputs, strategies, activities, outcomes and impacts associated with S4D for children, and these were then synthesized into theories of change for each key outcome area. The emphasis on theories of change is important. As Hartmann and Kwauk (2011) propose, S4D programmes that implement interventions should contribute to development through positive change rather than merely replicate or uphold the status quo. By building evidence-based theories of change around the existing evidence,
this report seeks to directly inform planning for positive change in existing and new child-focused S4D initiatives in each of the key outcome areas.

1.6.3 Survey of S4D programmes

To further inform the analysis, an online survey of child-focused S4D programmes worldwide was conducted (UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey). Survey data were used to gather additional information about programme design, implementation strategies, M&E systems, partnerships and funding as well as participant populations. This information was then analysed using Microsoft Excel and IBM SPSS Statistics software to generate descriptive statistics, which are presented in the following chapter.

Taken together, these approaches align with the main objective of this report: to strengthen the evidence base in S4D for children in order to provide evidence-informed answers to improve outcomes for children’s education, social inclusion, protection and empowerment through sport.
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Annex 1.A. Target outcomes for S4D initiatives implemented by UNICEF country offices, by UNICEF regional office area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF regional office area</th>
<th>UNICEF country office</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Social inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment (participation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe &amp; Central Asia Regional Office (ECARO)</strong></td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNICEF country office</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>Child protection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social inclusion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Empowerment (participation)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Asia &amp; Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO)</strong></td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-country Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook Islands (New Zealand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micronesia (Federated States of)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Niue (New Zealand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tokelau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>UNICEF country office</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td>Empowerment (participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern &amp; Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Latin America &amp; Caribbean Regional Office (LACRO)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolivia (Plurinational State of)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Caribbean Multi-country Programme</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Middle East & North Africa Regional Office (MENARO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>UNICEF country office</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Social inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment (participation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>UNICEF country office</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Social inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment (participation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### West & Central Africa Regional Office (WCARO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>UNICEF country office</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Social inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment (participation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: All references to Kosovo in this report should be understood to be in the context of United Nations Security Council resolution 1244 (1999).
Annex 1.B. List of international organizations which have also produced reports on S4D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International organization partner/year of publication</th>
<th>Name of research report</th>
<th>Research question/topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO, 2014</td>
<td>World-wide Survey of School Physical Education</td>
<td>How is physical education implemented in schools, regarding curriculum, resources (teachers and equipment), equity and inclusion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO, 2008</td>
<td>Innovative Practices in Physical Education and Sports in Asia</td>
<td>What innovations exist to move beyond centralized national physical education curriculums in Asia and better address varying needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO, 2017</td>
<td>Maximizing the Power of Sport</td>
<td>How to leverage sport to achieve positive development outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR, 2013</td>
<td>Implementing Sports in Refugee Camps</td>
<td>What works when implementing S4D programmes in refugee camps, and what resources are needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF, 2004</td>
<td>Sport, Recreation and Play</td>
<td>What are the benefits of participation in sports, recreation and play for child development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF (2011)</td>
<td>UNICEF Strategic Framework on Sport for Development</td>
<td>What is the most strategic way to design, implement, monitor and evaluate effective S4D programmes for children and youth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF (2013)</td>
<td>Guide to Sport for Development</td>
<td>What are the important considerations in S4D programming for children?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF (2015)</td>
<td>Sport for Development (S4D): Global Trends, Challenges, Gaps and Opportunities (see shared folders for link)</td>
<td>How to communicate messages about effective programming strategies without reinventing the wheel and creating duplicate work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF (2017)</td>
<td>The Power of Sport: Mapping the impact of the Just Play Sport for Development Programmes in the Pacific (see shared folders for link)</td>
<td>What if we could advance play further to benefit children even more?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF (2010)</td>
<td>Protecting Children from Violence in Sport</td>
<td>What are the gaps in knowledge and child protection systems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO (2011)</td>
<td>Global Recommendations on Physical Activity for Health</td>
<td>What are the benefits of physical activity for the health and well-being of children and youth aged 5–17 years? What amount and types of physical activity are needed to reap benefits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO (2017)</td>
<td>Global Accelerated Action for the Health of Adolescents (AA-HA!)</td>
<td>Includes data and statistics but not a research report as such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC (n.d.)</td>
<td>Sport and active society programmes: A guide to implementation</td>
<td>What are the programme’s objectives and key avenues to success? How is the programme communicated and evaluated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organization partner/year of publication</td>
<td>Name of research report</td>
<td>Research question/topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC (2015)</td>
<td>Active after schools community programmes</td>
<td>The small section on supporting evidence seems to ask: What are the benefits of sport and physical activity for individuals, communities and wider society?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC (2017)</td>
<td>IOC Gender Equality Review Project</td>
<td>How to “push gender equality globally” with “action-oriented recommendations for change”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Paralympic Committee (2017)</td>
<td>International Paralympic Committee Annual Report 2017</td>
<td>Refers to the low incidence of doping at the 2017 youth sport Paralympics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Human Rights and Business (2017)</td>
<td>Rights Through Sport: Mapping “Sport for Development and Peace”</td>
<td>Who are the key players in SDP, and what are they up to? What has been the role of the United Nations over time? What are some human rights approaches to SDP programming?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Labour Organization (ILO; 2018)</td>
<td>Women’s and Youth Empowerment in Rural Tunisia</td>
<td>What is the status of women and youth empowerment/disempowerment in Tunisia?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO (2006)</td>
<td>Beyond the Scoreboard: Youth employment opportunities and skills development in the sports sector</td>
<td>How is sports participation associated with employable skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Secretariat (2013)</td>
<td>The Commonwealth Guide to Advancing Development through Sport</td>
<td>How can sport be used to advance various development objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Secretariat (2015)</td>
<td>Sport for Development and Peace and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>What are the specific SDGs to which SDP is related?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Secretariat (2017)</td>
<td>Enhancing the Contribution of Sport to the Sustainable Development Goals</td>
<td>What policies should be implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Secretariat (2018)</td>
<td>Measuring the contribution of sport, physical education and physical activity to the Sustainable Development Goals: Toolkit and model indicators - Draft for review v1.0</td>
<td>How can sport policy be accurately aligned to the achievement of the SDGs, and then assessed for effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Secretariat (2018) (with Laureus Sport for Good Foundation)</td>
<td>Sport for Development: The Road to Evidence</td>
<td>How do S4D interventions compare with non-sport youth development interventions, across the four outcomes of interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of European Football Associations (2018)</td>
<td>Football and Refugees: Addressing key challenges</td>
<td>What are the best practices when integrating refugees into football associations, clubs and activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Watch (2012)</td>
<td>“Steps of the Devil”: Denial of Women’s and Girls’ Rights to Sport in Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>What are women’s experiences of participation, or prevention from participation, in sport and physical activity in Saudi Arabia?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic Relief (2011)</td>
<td>Comic Relief Review: Mapping the research on the impact of Sport and Development interventions</td>
<td>How to improve problem identification, knowledge generation and knowledge use in S4D?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1.C. Research evidence quality rating guide

Each article reviewed for inclusion in this report was assessed against the selected criteria and then categorized according to its additive score: high, 5–6 points; medium, 3–4 pts; low, 1–2 pts; and indeterminable, 0 pts. Ethics considerations were assessed separately, with studies scoring 0–3 pts based on the detail and appropriate procedures relating to a study’s ethical process. The categories are explained below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sub-category and score</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Indeterminable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization</td>
<td>Current study</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>None of these three criteria are met (0 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research questions and/or hypotheses are well defined and drawn from a sound, evidence-based theoretical or conceptual framework (3 pts)</td>
<td>The relevant conceptual underpinnings of the issue are fully explained (2 pts)</td>
<td>Topic, purpose and study rationale are clearly stated (1 pt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal validity of chosen methods and analyses</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Analytical strategy</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>None of these three criteria are met (0 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The research design, sampling, procedures and measures are appropriate for the study, and ethical methods have been applied responsibly and correctly, with a well-articulated rationale given for the selection of the methods (3 pts)</td>
<td>Analyses conducted are suitable for answering the research questions/testing the hypotheses (2 pts)</td>
<td>Relevant data and evidence are presented in a clearly labelled and understandable (easily digestible) format (1 pt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External validity and utility</td>
<td>Conclusions and recommendations</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>None of these three criteria are met (0 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A concise summary of the conclusions that can be appropriately drawn from the research evidence, and of the relevance of the research to the wider field, presented in a way that highlights utility for other researchers, practitioners or policymakers (i.e., is translatable and/or actionable) but does not overstate the study’s importance or generalizability (3 pts)</td>
<td>Limitations to the interpretation of evidence presented and to the applicability of the study findings are stated transparently, and alternative interpretations are also presented (2 pts)</td>
<td>Explanations of findings are coherent and consistent with the study conceptualization, as demonstrated by reference to the specific research questions and/or hypotheses (1 pt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethically responsible research ratings (3pts maximum)</td>
<td>In addition to a separate section on ethical considerations and procedures, researchers provide verifiable evidence (e.g., institutional review board study code and date of approval) that the study received proper oversight from an established review board (3 pts)</td>
<td>Includes a separate section with a clear exposition on ethical considerations and the procedures followed to ensure ethically responsible research (2 pts)</td>
<td>Includes very brief information (one or two sentences) on research ethics (1 pt)</td>
<td>No mention of research ethics in the article (0 pts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2
Sport for Development in practice: Voices from the field

The voices of practitioners need to be heard in order to better understand the mechanisms by which S4D programmes operate. This information was often missing from research articles, precluding analysis and synthesis of implementation factors based on the literature review alone. As part of the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, practitioners around the world were asked to provide details about their programmes, particularly in regard to objectives, design, partnerships and funding as well as participants. This chapter reviews the key statistics and findings to emerge from the survey.

2.1 Introduction: Where, why, how and for whom does Sport for Development work?

It is important to know where, why, how and for whom S4D is effective, to get a proper grasp of its effects in context, its processes of implementation and its capacity requirements. Mapping these results across countries – to better understand their variation – specifically aims to assess and inform cross-country applicability and global learning in the field of S4D. This chapter presents the findings of the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, providing some insights into the objectives, design, partnerships and funding as well as the participants – and the programmers themselves – of more than 100 S4D initiatives worldwide.

Using purposive sampling, a total of 106 child-focused S4D programmes around the world were surveyed to find out what practitioners had to say about implementing S4D in practice. This sample was proportionally similar to a global sample of 2,985 S4D programmes and thus the survey findings are broadly generalizable (for further detail about the survey methods, see Annex 2.A).

Following the presentation of the main findings of this exercise, this chapter presents the survey findings section by section, based on the following questions:

- Where are S4D programmes located?
- Who do S4D programmes serve?
- Why is sport being used, and what works?
- How do the programmes work?

Main findings of the report include:

- Most S4D programmes were located in Africa, and within each region, programmes tended to be located in the higher-income countries, for example, in the Eastern and Southern Africa region, most S4D programmes were in South Africa.
- Programmes surveyed typically reported serving adolescents aged 10 to 14 years for whom poverty was a common risk factor and who were attracted to participate in programmes because of their use of sport. Nevertheless, practitioners recognized the need to engage more with parents, as their disapproval could lead to participants dropping out later in the process.
- Sport is used because it appeals to children and is an effective way to convene people. Practitioners reported that, much more than simply improving children’s sports participation and skills, they also hoped to enhance children’s soft skills and empowerment and reduce negative behaviours. Sport (especially football) was used as the main attraction, which when integrated with non-sport activities, helped to promote positive values.
- Programmes reported that they were moderately effective to very effective in meeting their sport and non-sport objectives. Yet this perception was mostly
based on self-evaluation rather than on more objective external evaluation. Programmes reported using M&E in a variety of ways, but mainly for strategic planning, providing feedback and reporting to funders. Additionally, it was through the M&E process that initiatives gained insights about the need to strengthen family and community ties.

- Practitioners reported staff strengths including staff relationships with children, especially when both were from the same community, and job-related challenges including lack of incentives and lack of career development and training opportunities. Programmes reported hiring mostly male sports coaches aged 25–35 years, which could point to the need for more gender diverse hiring/training practices.

2.2 Where are Sport for Development programmes located?

According to an analysis of data available on the Beyond Sport website, 2,140 unique organizations operate 2,985 S4D initiatives across 148 countries. The UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey yielded a sample of 106 child-focused S4D programmes across 47 countries (see Figure 2.1).

The majority of S4D programmes (70 per cent) surveyed for this report were located in high-income countries (34 per cent) or upper middle-income countries (36 per cent), with only 21 per cent of programmes located in lower middle-income countries and just 9 per cent in low-income countries. In comparison, of the global sample of S4D programmes listed on the Beyond Sport website, a total of 26 of these programmes were pan-regional and thus omitted from further regional analysis. Not all S4D programmes in the global sample served the target age group of children under 18 years of age. See: Beyond Sport, <www.beyondsport.org>, accessed 10 March 2019.


---

Figure 2.1. Location of S4D programmes surveyed by the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey

the majority (54 per cent) are located in high-income countries, with 17 per cent in upper middle-income countries, 18 per cent in lower middle-income countries and 11 per cent in low-income countries. In short, the Beyond Sport global sample of S4D programmes includes more initiatives in high-income countries than the sample of child-focused S4D programmes collected by the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey (see Figures 2.2 and 2.3).

Differences in the proportions of programmes by country income ranking between the two samples were tested using the N-1 chi-squared test (Campbell, 2007; Richardson, 2011). Results showed that when comparing proportions in the present sample of surveyed S4D programmes to the Beyond Sport global sample, there were mostly no statistically significant differences, with a few exceptions. Based on these results, the present sample is broadly representative of the global populations of S4D programmes.

Most of the S4D programmes surveyed for this report were located in Africa (33 per cent), with 27 per cent of the total located in the Eastern and Southern Africa region (ESAR) and 6 per cent in the West and Central Africa region (WCAR). The African country with the most S4D programmes to respond to the survey – with 16 programmes in total – was South Africa, one of the few upper middle-income countries on the continent.

4 The present sample of surveyed S4D programmes includes larger proportions of programmes in: upper middle-income countries in ESAR, $\chi^2(1) = 4.41, p = .04$; lower middle-income countries in SAR, $\chi^2(1) = 4.13, p = .04$; upper middle-income countries in ECAR, $\chi^2(1) = 3.87, p = .06$; and, finally, upper middle-income countries in LACR (specifically in South America), $\chi^2(1) = 24.63, p < .001$. 

Notes: Percentages based on a sample of 106 responses, presented by continent and UNICEF region. Differences in percentages/totals in charts due to rounding error and omission of pan-regional programmes that cannot be categorized under a single region.

Similarly, in the Beyond Sport global sample, 30 per cent of S4D programmes are located in Africa, with 23 per cent of the total located in ESAR, 6 per cent in WCAR and 1 per cent in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). Meanwhile, South Africa again has the highest number of programmes, with a total of 242, followed by Kenya, with 147 programmes. The countries with the highest number of programmes overall, however, are the United States of America and the United Kingdom (630 and 529 programmes respectively), meaning that most programmes (51 per cent) in the Beyond Sport global sample are located in regions where UNICEF National Committees are found.

The patterns that emerged from the analysis of the sample collected for this study (and, to a certain extent, the Beyond Sport global sample as well) suggest a paradox: Although S4D is perceived as a low-cost intervention, programmes in low-income countries are less represented in both samples. Because many S4D programmes in the survey sample specifically target children facing poverty, however, other factors beyond the cost of implementation, including more macro-level costs such as sports infrastructure or an adequately trained workforce, need to be considered.

**Figure 2.3. Income rankings of regions and continents where S4D programmes are located (global sample)**

Note: Percentages based on a global sample (n=2,985), presented by continent and UNICEF region.

Source: Beyond Sport (2018). Based on analysis of data from its online programme listing.
2.3 Whom do Sport for Development programmes serve?

2.3.1 Programmes most frequently targeted participants in the 10–14 years age group who were both boys and girls and for whom poverty was the most common risk factor.

Survey results suggest that S4D is largely seen as an intervention for children ages 10-14, as on average, across the regions, 50 per cent of participants were in this age group (see Figure 2.4). Both young people aged 15–18 years and children aged 5–9 years each accounted for 16 per cent of the participant population, on average, across regions. In every region but one, programmes served more child participants than participants over 18 years of age. The exception was the Europe and Central Asia region (ECAR), in which almost 80 per cent of programme participants were over 18 years of age; in comparison, each of the other regions reported this age group as comprising no more than 18 per cent (ESAR) of participants. Six per cent of participants in WCAR were aged under 5 years – a proportion five times greater than any other region with data.

Regarding participants’ genders, programmes overwhelmingly offered initiatives for both boys and girls together (77 per cent of all initiatives), followed by a much smaller percentage offered for mostly boys or only girls (each 7 per cent). A still smaller percentage of initiatives targeted mostly girls (5 per cent) or only boys (2 per cent).

Overall, 63 per cent of S4D programmes named poverty as a key risk factor faced by child participants, followed by violence (46 per cent), health (37 per cent) and ethnic discrimination (36 per cent). The type and commonality of risk factors reported varied widely by region, however (see Figure 2.5).

Poverty was among the most common child risk factors reported by S4D programmes in ESAR (33 per cent), South Asia (SAR; 24 per cent), WCAR (46 per cent) and high-income countries (26 per cent). Violence was the risk factor most commonly reported by programmes in the Latin America and Caribbean region (LCAR), at 31 per cent; learning disabilities was the risk factor most commonly reported by programmes in ECAR, at 33 per cent; and the risk factor of ethnic discrimination was reported as often as poverty by programmes in SAR, at 24 per cent. To some extent, it makes sense that poverty is the major risk factor reported by S4D programmes, because sport is often seen as a low-cost intervention, making it a go-to form of programming for children from low-income neighbourhoods with high rates of poverty.

2.3.3 The draw of sport itself serves a common tool for recruiting children

Programmes are most likely to use sport itself and also safe and secure spaces to attract participants. Again, the
Figure 2.4. Proportion of children and adolescents of various ages in S4D programmes by region


Figure 2.5. Risk factors faced by children in S4D programmes across regions

three programmes in ECAR looked different to the rest of the survey sample, in that they tended not to use nutrition as an incentive and relied more on field trips and travel to recruit participants in comparison to programmes in other regions (see Figure 2.6).

The use of financial incentives was not common, although they were used somewhat in SAR and WCAR, both of which had a high proportion of programmes located in lower middle-income countries. This finding is surprising, given that poverty was reported as the number one risk factor facing children in the S4D programmes surveyed. The reluctance to use financial incentives does, however, make sense from a motivational perspective. According to the ‘over-justification hypothesis’, if intrinsic motivation is already high (i.e., children have an inherent interest in sport itself), adding extrinsic rewards like financial incentives may actually serve to reduce motivation (Deci, Koestner and Ryan, 1999).

2.3.4 Distance, weather, household duties and family disapproval are among reasons for participant attrition, and engaging families was the most commonly suggested improvement for recruitment/retention.

Participants leaving S4D programmes tended to have both external and personal reasons for attrition (see Figures 2.7a and 2.7b). In regard to external reasons for participant attrition, programmes overall were most likely to list distance of travel to the programme and unfavourable weather or climate conditions. With regard to reasons for attrition linked to the participants themselves, programmes overall were most likely to list...
household duties and family disapproval in first or second place, with loss of interest coming a close third. It is possible that such reasons are related: Parents may disapprove because they want children to stay at home and perform household duties, or they may have concerns about their child’s safety and security as a result of the long-distance travel involved or adverse weather conditions. For programmes in regions such as ECAR and MENA, loss of interest in the programme was perceived as playing a larger role in attrition rates – which may suggest that participants’ interest in sport, which draws them to the programme in the first place, eventually wanes. Alternatively, it could be that in these regions, participants lose interest in the non-sport aspects of the programme.

Regarding improvements in recruiting and retaining participants, most programmes responded that greater engagement of family members was needed. This makes sense given that family disapproval was among the major reasons for attrition. In regions in such as ECAR and EAPR, however, respondents were more likely to suggest adaptation of sports to participants’ needs as a useful strategy for improving participation numbers (see Figure 2.8).

This makes sense in the case of ECAR, as loss of interest in the programme was the main reason given for attrition. As for EAPR, only one programme responded to the question about reasons for attrition, citing work conflicts as the sole reason; other EAPR programmes recommended adapting sports, however, and suggested family engagement as another means for improvement.

---

**Figure 2.7a. External reasons for attrition**

**Figure 2.7b. Personal reasons for attrition**

*Note:* No data was available for Middle East and North Africa.  
Figure 2.8. Recommendations for improving recruitment/retention across regions


Figure 2.9. Reasons for choosing sport to address child development needs

2.4 Why sport and what works?

2.4.1 Programmes choose sport as an intervention mainly because of its appeal to children, its ability to convene others and its perceived effectiveness

Programmes were asked to name their top three reasons for choosing to use sport as an intervention for children. Most programmes across the regions listed sport’s appeal to children (72 per cent of programmes), the power of sport to convene groups of people (70 per cent) and the perceived effectiveness of sport (68 per cent). This pattern was pretty much the same within each region (see Figure 2.9). One exception was the EAPR programmes, which gave support from the community as the top reason for choosing sport.

2.4.2 Most programmes hope to increase children’s participation and skills in sports but also have non-sport objectives such as the development of soft skills

It was typical for S4D programmes in the survey sample to have both sport and non-sport objectives (see Figures 2.10a and 2.10b). The most commonly reported sport objective was to increase children’s participation in sport (72 per cent of programmes), followed by the development of sport skills (48 per cent). This pattern tended to be similar within regions, although for programmes in MENA and EAPR, quality access to sport produced an almost identical response rate to development of sport skills.
Across the regions, the most commonly reported non-sport objective was to develop children’s soft skills (62 per cent of programmes), followed by empowerment of children (57 per cent) and reduction of negative behaviours (53 per cent). There were some different patterns across regions, with some regions such as MENA, SAR and WCAR placing slightly or even significantly greater emphasis on promoting social inclusion, and ESAR placing greater emphasis on providing safe places and promoting health and well-being.

2.4.3 Programmes report that they are very effective in meeting their objectives

In addition to selecting the sport and non-sport objectives that most closely aligned with their initiatives’ design, respondents were asked to share, in an open-response format, their initiatives’ main target goals. They were also asked to describe how effective they believed their programmes to be in meeting these sport, non-sport, and target goals. Overall, S4D programmes tended to score similarly highly in terms of their perceived success in meeting sport, non-sport and

Figure 2.11. Mean scores for meeting sport, non-sport and target goals across regions, values for non-sport goals shown

![Graph showing mean scores for meeting sport, non-sport and target goals across regions.]

Note: Scale used to report extent to which goals were met: 1 = Not at all effective; 2 = Slightly effective; 3 = Moderately effective; 4 = Very effective; 5 = Extremely effective.

5 The results of a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test showed that this observed difference among regions in perceived effectiveness in meeting non-sport objectives was statistically significant, $H(7) = 16.43, p = .02$. 
target goals (see Figure 2.11). Across regions, on average, most programmes rated themselves as being very effective in meeting sport goals ($\bar{x} = 3.02$), non-sport goals ($\bar{x} = 3.02$) and target goals ($\bar{x} = 3.06$) (mean perceived effectiveness in meeting non-sport goals are written in the figure next to each bar graph). Scores from ECAR programmes tended to be lower than scores from programmes in other regions, however, especially the score pertaining to non-sport objectives. It is unclear why programmes in ECAR scored themselves lower on meeting non-sport objectives, which were mostly to promote inclusion and empowerment (especially for children with disabilities).

To help understand the factors that may be related to programmes’ perceived effectiveness in meeting goals, correlation tests were conducted using Kendall’s tau-b correlation. Results showed that practitioners’ perceived effectiveness in meeting sport objectives and their perceived effectiveness in meeting non-sport objectives were moderately and positively related to each other ($\tau_b = 0.37$, $p < .001$). This suggests that S4D programmes that are effective in meeting sport objectives are also likely to be successful in meeting non-sport objectives, and vice versa.

A couple of interesting patterns emerged along the sport versus non-sport divide, however. Having a larger number of highly educated sports staff (coaches with advanced degrees) was related to a lower perceived effectiveness in meeting non-sport objectives ($\tau_b = -0.22$, $p = .03$). Similarly, the more often programmes used physical tests to monitor and evaluate participants’ progress, the lower their self-reported scores on effectiveness in meeting non-sport goals ($\tau_b = -0.20$, $p = .03$). Taken together, these results could suggest that a strict sporting focus may have negative implications for success in meeting non-sport goals.

For target goals, S4D programmes that reported a larger number of child participants (under 18 years of age) tended to also score higher on perceived effectiveness ($\tau_b = 0.22$, $p = .02$). Additionally, the more likely programmes were to agree that sport was the primary tool they used to achieve goals, the more effective they believed they were in meeting target goals; though this relationship was not statistically significant, it can be described as ‘approaching’ significance ($\tau_b = 0.14$, $p = .08$). ‘Approaching’ significance also describes the relationship between a programme’s global (lifetime) budget and its perceived effectiveness in meeting target goals ($\tau_b = 0.16$, $p = .09$).

Taken together, these results could suggest that while sport may be important for achieving target goals, S4D programmes that have access to bigger budgets and which have the ability to recruit more children are more likely to have greater perceived effectiveness in meeting target goals. Nonetheless, it must also be noted that perceived effectiveness assumes a high degree of reflection by organizations, awareness of a larger picture than the daily implementation of activities, and willingness to be critical. As such, perceived success should not be taken as objective evidence for the effectiveness of programmes.

2.4.4 Programmes are three times as likely to conduct self-evaluations than external evaluations

On average, S4D programmes tended to believe that M&E helps them to improve a lot; however, they also most frequently reported that internal teams are responsible for developing M&E (64 per cent of programmes; see Figure 2.12). Evaluations led by external organizations which may be perceived as more impartial and credible, were used by only 22 per cent of programmes. Compared to other regions, SAR and WCAR reported a slightly higher proportion of programmes (31 per cent and 33 per cent respectively) using an M&E process set by their donors or funders.

2.4.5 Programmes survey parent feedback less often than participant and staff feedback

In general, S4D programmes responded that they surveyed child participants and staff every three to six
Figure 2.12. Processes for developing programme evaluation across regions

Note: Only one out of four programmes in MENA answered questions on M&E.

Figure 2.13. Frequency of administration of child, parent and staff surveys across regions

Note: Scale used to report frequency of administration of surveys: 0 = Never; 1 = Yearly; 2 = Every six months; 3 = Every three months; 4 = Once a month; 5 = A few times a month; 6 = About once a week.
months, but surveyed parents less often, from every six months to once a year (see Figure 2.13). Within each region, the main pattern – surveying children and staff more frequently than parents – tended to be the same. Programmes in ECAR tended to survey staff even less often than programmes in other regions, however – at between once a year and never. It could be possible that the lower perceived effectiveness in meeting non-sport goals among programmes in ECAR is related to this infrequent surveying of staff, but the correlation between these two variables is not statistically significant.

2.4.6 Programmes use M&E in a variety of ways but mainly for strategic planning, providing feedback and reporting to funders

Information gained from the M&E process was most often used by S4D programmes for strategic planning (62 per cent of programmes), followed by providing feedback to staff (60 per cent) and in the preparation of annual reports to funders (58 per cent) (see Figure 2.14). Meanwhile, programmes were least likely to report posting M&E information to websites (24 per cent).

Taken together, these findings could suggest that programmes view M&E more as a private process for their own benefit and that of their funders, rather than as something for public consumption. Similarly, it was surprising that relatively few programmes (30 per cent) reported using M&E information for marketing purposes. It is possible, however, that such decisions may depend on whether or not evaluation results portray the programme in a positive light.

These patterns were similar within each region except MENA, where the one programme that responded to this survey item reported that it used M&E only for reporting to funders.

A longer-term objective regarding M&E is for programmes to seamlessly integrate these systems into
Figure 2.15. Insights for improving programmes gained from M&E process across regions


Figure 2.16. Sports offered by S4D programmes across regions

Programmes reported that M&E processes gave them insight into ways to improve their initiatives. These insights most frequently included strengthening connections to key external stakeholders such as families and communities (58 per cent of programmes); engaging with schools (31 per cent); improving programme staff quality (34 per cent) or infrastructure (26 per cent); and improving coordination with donors or funders (29 per cent) (see Figure 2.15). But fewer programmes reported that M&E provided insights into the types of sport or non-sport activities they should be providing. This could suggest that programmes were less likely to open up for discussion how the programme is designed, or less likely to perform process evaluations.

Programmes in WCAR and MENA tended to report a less diverse range of improvements based on insights gained from M&E than programmes in other regions, but this is at least in part because only so few programmes in either region responded to this survey item (three of the six WCAR programmes; one of the four MENA programmes).

2.5 How does it all work?

2.5.1 Football is the most popular sport in S4D programmes, and sport is a hook to promote positive values through integration with non-sport activities

As part of the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, respondents were asked about as many as five sports initiatives that they managed. Across all programmes surveyed, football was named as the most commonly applied sport (130 individual responses), accounting for 42 per cent of total responses, and was the most popular sport in all regions with the exception of MENA (see Figure 2.16). After football, the option selected most often was ‘other’ sports – an option that includes athletics, boxing, chess, netball, mind games, Para sports, rugby, sailing, skateboarding and surfing – which accounted for 25 per cent of responses. While in most regions programmes reported using just a few sports, those in ESAR and LACR stand out as using a wide variety of sports.
Programmes tended to strongly agree that they used sport as a ‘hook’ to draw in their participants ($x = 4.01$). There was a weaker consensus among programmes that sport was a tool to convene participants ($x = 3.69$) and respondents typically neither agreed nor disagreed that sport was the primary purpose of the programme ($x = 3.01$) (see Figure 2.17a).

In addition, programmes tended to more strongly agree that they used sport to promote positive values (influence children’s knowledge, attitudes and behaviour) and that they adapted sport activities to facilitate the integration of non-sport activities (both $x = 4.40$), but typically neither agreed nor disagreed that they used sport in emergency settings ($x = 3.11$) (see Figure 2.17b). Comparing regions, however, programmes located in EAPR and MENA were slightly more likely to agree that they used sport to respond to needs in emergency settings ($x = 3.75$ for both). Differences across the regions were not statistically significant, however.

2.5.3 S4D programme sessions tend to take place before or after school and twice per week or more

Most programmes across regions (33 per cent overall) reported scheduling activities before or after school, with relatively few programmes (16 per cent) indicating that activities were scheduled during regular school hours. Exceptions were found in WCAR and EAPR, where most programmes scheduled activities on the weekend, and in ECAR, where most programmes scheduled activities during school holidays.

In regard to meeting frequency, programmes most frequently met twice per week or more (50 per cent). Very few programmes (2 per cent) met less than once per week. This observation varies somewhat within regions, however. For example, half of programmes in EAPR (50 per cent) reported meeting once per week, while the proportion of programmes meeting less than once per week was higher in ECAR (33 per cent) and in WCAR (17 per cent) than in other regions.

---

**Figure 2.17a. Basic use of sport**

**Figure 2.17b. Applied use of sport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Scale used to report degree to which respondents agreed or disagreed that each basic and applied use of sport fit their programme’s approach: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neither disagree nor agree; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree.

**Source:** Sport for Development Programming Survey (2018).

---

6 Scale used to report use of sport as a ‘main attraction’ or ‘hook’: 5 = Strongly agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly disagree.
Most programmes (63 per cent of them) reported sessions typically lasting 1–2 hours, with the next most popular response being ‘less than 1 hour’, as reported by 15 per cent of programmes (see Figure 2.18a). Programmes were least likely to report sessions of more than 5 hours, with just over 2 per cent of programmes reporting 6–8 hour sessions. In terms of other arrangements for session length, one programme reported occasionally offering longer sessions, and one programme reported having a full-day schedule, as it is a school and football academy rolled into one. There were a few slight differences within regions: in SAR, most programmes reported shorter sessions of less than 1 hour, and there was an even split between 1–2 hour sessions and 3–5 hour sessions among EAPR programmes.

Regarding how session time was divided between sport and non-sport activities, programmes reported that, on average, children spent about 67 per cent of the time on sport activities and 33 per cent of the time on non-sport activities (see Figure 2.18b). This split varied by region, however, with children in programmes in ECAR and MENA spending considerably less time on non-sport activities (17 per cent and 15 per cent respectively). Meanwhile, programmes in EAPR, SAR and WCAR reported that children spent more than 40 per cent of session time on non-sport activities. The results of a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test showed that the observed differences across regions were statistically significant both in terms of time spent on sport, $H(7) = 18.93$, $p = .01$, and time spent on non-sport activities, $H(7) = 15.99$, $p = .03$.

Additionally, the survey results show that to achieve non-sport goals, S4D programmes must complement sport activities with other meaningful activities (i.e., by embracing either the sport-plus or plus-sport model), as the correlation between programmes’ perceived effectiveness in meeting non-sport objectives and the...
time spent on sport ($\tau_b = -.16, p = .06$) versus non-sport activities ($\tau_b = .17, p = .05$) was found to be ‘approaching’ significance. It makes sense that giving more time to activities that are ‘on target’ positively relates to the achievement of specific goals. Furthermore, the results also suggest that programmes that spent more time on non-sport activities and less time on sport activities may have had fewer participants drop out in the last year. The proportion of time spent on sport activities was positively related to participants leaving ($\tau_b = .201, p = .086$), while the proportion of time spent on non-sport activities was negatively related to participants leaving ($\tau_b = -.192, p = .099$).

2.5.5 Programmes that spend time on non-sport activities mostly focus on lessons about empowerment and antisocial behaviour

In general, the top three non-sport activities conducted by S4D programmes were empowerment lessons (51 per cent of programmes), lessons to reduce antisocial behaviour (49 per cent) and lessons to promote inclusivity (45 per cent). These focus areas align well with the key outcome areas of this report, with the exception of education. Only 17 per cent of programmes engaged in academic lessons or tutoring, making this the least frequently reported non-sport activity (see Figure 2.20).

Meanwhile, there was some variation in this area within regions. For example, the three ECAR programmes reported focusing mostly on other non-sport topics (such as social adaptation, independence, work habits and character development) and programmes in ESAR focused mainly on health. Only one of the four programmes in MENA responded to this survey item, hence the lack of variation in responses.

2.5.6 Programmes are most likely to hire sports coaches to work with children, and they tend to be mostly male, aged 25–35 years and have a tertiary-level education

Across the regions, programmes employ a variety of staff, mostly sports coaches (75 per cent of...
programmes) but also school teachers (64 per cent), peer leaders (58 per cent) and community leaders (56 per cent). This pattern tended to be fairly consistent within regions as well. Because programmes most often reported hiring sports coaches, the team investigated further to understand more about the characteristics of this specific staff type.

In terms of gender, sports coaches tended to be mostly male, as reported by 28 per cent of programmes, but 25 per cent of programmes reported a gender balance among their sports coaches. Only four programmes reported an all-female sports coaching staff, however. Programmes most frequently reported having coaches between the ages of 25 and 35 years (39 per cent of programmes), with the next most common age group being 18 to 24 years (20 per cent of programmes). Just one programme reported having coaches over 45 years of age. This pattern could suggest that, while youthfulness of coaches is important, so too is expertise – especially since a higher percentage of programmes reported that coaches typically have a tertiary-level education (30 per cent of programmes) than those who reported lower levels of educational attainment among coaches. A smaller proportion of programmes reported that coaches had only an upper secondary-level education (22 per cent of programmes) but it was rare for programmes to report coaches as being educated only to lower secondary level (6 per cent) or primary level (4 per cent).

A breakdown of S4D programme staff by type, and of the socio-demographic make-up of coaching staff, across regions in all cases, is presented below (see Figures 2.21a to 2.21d).

There was a lot of variation between regions in terms of coaching staff socio-demographics. Programmes in WCAR and ECAR were more likely to have an all-male coaching staff than those in other regions, while programmes in SAR and MENA were more likely to have an all-female coaching staff. Programmes in SAR and in countries with UNICEF National Committees hired a higher proportion of younger coaches (18–24 years) than programmes in other regions. Also, WCAR and EAPR

---

**Figure 2.20. Non-sport activities across regions**
Figure 2.21a. Types of staff at S4D programmes

Figure 2.21b. Gender of coaches

Figure 2.21c. Age of coaches

Figure 2.21d. Education level of coaches

tended to have a higher proportion of programmes with coaches educated to upper secondary level than other regions.

2.5.7 Staff’s greatest strength is their relationships with participants, but lack of incentives and lack of career development and training opportunities presents challenges

Staff strengths reported by programmes included staff relationships with participants (58 per cent of programmes), their residence within the community (50 per cent) and their sport expertise (43 per cent). Being a former programme participant was the staff strength least often indicated by practitioners (25 per cent of programmes). This pattern was similar within all regions (see Figure 2.22a). One slight exception was that a higher proportion of programmes in EAPR than in other regions reported staff being former participants as a strength.

In contrast, staff challenges reported by programmes included lack of incentives (45 per cent of programmes), lack of career development opportunities (31 per cent) and lack of training opportunities (29 per cent). There were some regional differences in this area (see Figure 2.22b). A higher proportion of programmes in SAR than in other regions reported lack of transportation as a challenge for staff. Additionally, a higher proportion of programmes in EAPR reported lack of materials as a challenge as compared to other regions.

2.5.8 Programmes with bigger budgets tend to be located in regions with countries with higher income rankings

On average, across regions, S4D programmes reported global (lifetime) budgets slightly in excess of $1 million US dollars (mean: $1,043,500) and annual costs of approximately $300,000 (mean: $299,908) (see Figure 2.23). Programmes in LACR often reported higher-than-average budgets (over $1 million) and costs (over $500,000) than programmes in other regions, but programme budgets in UNICEF National Committee countries averaged twice as much as LACR programme budgets, even though costs were about the same.

For all other regions, global budgets for programmes tended to be less than $600,000, with annual costs averaging $125,000 or less. Programmes in ECAR tended to receive the least funding. These patterns were further analysed based on country income rankings (results not shown) and it was found that, with the exception of programmes in EAPR and WCAR, the larger budget programmes were typically located in countries with higher income rankings. In both EAPR and WCAR, however, the larger budget programmes were located in countries with the lowest income rankings.

2.5.9 Most S4D programme funding comes from NGOs such as international organizations and businesses, as well as from foreign governments

Regarding funding sources, the top three NGO funders reported by programmes were international organizations (39 per cent of programmes), business enterprises (39 per cent) and private foundations (33 per cent) (see Figure 2.24a). Only one programme each from MENA and ECAR responded to this survey item, hence the other regions appearing to have more diverse NGO funding streams. Meanwhile, the top source of government funding for programmes was foreign governments (24 per cent of programmes), followed by national ministries (16 per cent) (see Figure 2.24b). Programmes in WCAR and EAPR were least likely to report being funded by foreign governments (funding from local government was more likely), even though this is where a considerable amount of their funding came from.

Figure 2.23. Average global budgets and annual costs for programmes by region


7 Outliers – programmes with a USD$10 million budget or costs – were omitted from the sample for this analysis. These programmes were located in WCAR (n=1) and UNICEF National Committee regions (n=2). Unless otherwise stated, all amounts shown are in US dollars (USD).
Figure 2.24a. Funding from NGOs by region


Figure 2.24b. Funding from government by region
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Annex 2. Survey methods

Sample, procedures and measures

Using a cross-sectional survey design, a snowball sample of S4D programme practitioners \((n=106)\) from around the world was obtained. An online questionnaire was created for the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey in consultation with subject matter experts in the S4D field. Additionally, feedback on the project was provided by the research management committee and the approval of an internal ethics review board was obtained to ensure ethical research conduct and protection of research participants.

The questionnaire design was first tested by practitioners from two programmes and then translated and back-translated into eight languages (Arabic, Chinese [Mandarin], English, French, Hindi [Urdu], Portuguese, Russian and Spanish) to enable it to reach as broad a global audience as possible. The survey comprises six sections: Organization profile; Programme description and objectives; Programme design; Partnerships and funding; Programme participants; and Additional information, with 66 questions in total.

The online UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey was distributed via email to contacts in UNICEF regional and country offices, who then distributed the survey more widely in their respective locations with the help of programming partners in the S4D field. In addition, the survey was distributed to those programmes mentioned in articles included in the literature review and to others learned of through networking opportunities at international S4D meetings and events. The purposes of the survey are explained at the beginning at the questionnaire. Participants were informed that the survey would take 35–40 minutes to complete online.

The online survey remains open to responses with the aim of increasing the sample size for Phase 2 of the research project.

Analysis plan

First, to assess the validity of our survey sample, the proportions of programme coverage in terms of global region, continent and country income ranking were compared to a publicly available global sample of S4D programmes (available on the Beyond Sport website)\(^8\). Descriptive statistics were then calculated to present cross-regional comparisons of information about where programmes were located, populations served by the programmes and practitioners' perspectives on what works and why as well as details of how programmes are run and how sport is used by S4D programmes.

Next, one of two non-parametric tests was conducted, where appropriate, with the test selected according to the levels of measurement of different variables in the present dataset. The non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test for comparison of ranked means was used to assess whether any observed regional differences were statistically significant, if variables were at least at the ordinal level of measurement or higher (e.g., expectations of success in meeting sport, non-sport and target goals).\(^9\) Meanwhile, the non-parametric Kendall’s tau-b correlation test was used to examine the statistical significance of relationships among variables of the ordinal level of measurement (e.g., the relationship between expectations of success and staff composition and time spent on sport activities).

Strengths and limitations

A reasonable degree of confidence in the external validity of the results in this chapter can be expected.

---

\(^8\) The Beyond Sport list of programmes is updated regularly and is available at http://www.beyondsport.org/Network

\(^9\) Items measuring expectations of success, though measured on Likert-type scale were considered rank-ordered variables and used with non-parametric tests for the purposes of this report because they were each based on a single-item rather than combined as a scale to measure some latent variable (as is often the case for interval-level variables). This conservative analytical step was taken to enhance reliability of results.
Although the present sample was comparatively small – at only approximately 4 per cent of the global sample of S4D programmes documented on Beyond Sport – statistical tests of proportions revealed that the present sample showed similar proportions of S4D programmes to the global sample in regard to distribution across global regions, continents and country income rankings. Purposive sampling methods helped to ensure that the survey reached a broader number of countries in which S4D programmes operated. Sometimes this resulted in uneven numbers for regional groups, however (e.g., 16 programmes in the Eastern and Southern Africa region, but only 3 programmes in the Europe and Central Asia region). Nevertheless, this uneven representation across regions was also a trend in the global sample of S4D programmes, and thus the survey sample realistically portrayed the S4D landscape.

Due to the length of the online questionnaire, however, response rates for items toward the end of the survey were often lower than response rates for items presented earlier on. This issue can be addressed in the future by removing non-essential items from the questionnaire and by randomizing the order of survey items (by section) to enhance the average response rate across all items.
Chapter 3
Education and Sport for Development for children

Sport and education are closely interlinked, whether through physical education curricula, sports teams in schools or participation of children in sport activities in community settings beyond the school playground. Evidence suggests that sport can be used as a tool to achieve quality education (SDG 4) through the design and implementation of education-focused S4D programmes for children and young people. Such programmes can also support the achievement of decent work and economic growth (SDG 8) for young people. Education-focused S4D programmes can benefit students, schools, and families and communities through improved student engagement in school; improved student attendance; better student relationships with teachers; the enhanced reputation of the school; and support for the transition of young people beyond school to work. Despite these positive findings, education-focused S4D programmes face several challenges, including the risk of further exacerbating the behaviours, attitudes and norms already set in the school and community; objectives that are too ambitious and beyond the capacity of the available resources; and a lack of research on the role of education with and through sport. This chapter provides several recommendations on how to address these challenges.

3.1 Introduction: Education and sport

Since 2008, there has not been a great deal of improvement in the (re-)engagement of school-aged children into the education system: The share of out-of-school children of primary school age has decreased by 0.5 percentage points in the past 10 years – from 9.4 to 8.9 per cent from 2008 to 2018 – and the share of out-of-school adolescents of lower secondary school age has declined by just 0.2 percentage points in recent years, from 16.1 to 15.9 per cent from 2012 to 2018 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). According to the most recent figures available, from 2016, an estimated 263 million children aged 6–17 years remain out of school and more than half of them (138 million) are aged 15–17 years (UNESCO-UIS, 2018). Moreover, many students are at risk of dropping out of school for many reasons, including a lack of school engagement, difficulty in accessing school, disenchantment with future opportunities, opportunities or obligations outside of school (e.g., child labour) and/or violence in and around school. Countries also face the challenge of ensuring that their children and young people develop – through a quality education – the competencies and skills to transition into life beyond school. As policymakers, academics and practitioners aim to address these issues, finding new and innovative approaches to teaching and learning are needed to achieve better educational outcomes.

The evidence on S4D reviewed in this chapter indicates that sport is an innovative approach that can be used as a tool to contribute toward achieving educational outcomes for children and young people. Well-designed education-focused S4D programmes are shown to: increase student engagement in school; improve the attainment of life skills such as empowerment, self-esteem and leadership skills; and foster better student relationships with teachers; the enhanced reputation of the school; and support for the transition of young people beyond school to work. Despite these positive findings, education-focused S4D programmes face several challenges, including the risk of further exacerbating the behaviours, attitudes and norms already set in the school and community; objectives that are too ambitious and beyond the capacity of the available resources; and a lack of research on the role of education with and through sport. This chapter provides several recommendations on how to address these challenges.
To better understand how sport can be used as a tool to achieve greater educational attainment for all and to improve the transition from school into adult life, this chapter reviews the available literature to explore: (1) the parameters that define education and why the use of sport supports improved educational outcomes; (2) the strategies that work in sport for education; (3) the challenges faced when implementing education-focused S4D programmes; and (4) recommendations for practitioners, policymakers and researchers on how to improve education with and through sport. The final section of this chapter summarizes the findings through an evidence-informed theory of change for education-focused S4D. The main messages drawn from the evidence reviewed in this chapter are summarized immediately below.

Key findings

- Education-focused S4D programmes have the potential to address the challenges that education systems face by contributing to positive educational outcomes – such as student engagement, attendance and overall enjoyment of school, and improved student behaviour and relationships with teachers and peers – which is key for a positive teaching and learning environment.

- In high-income countries, evidence indicates a positive link between education-focused S4D programmes and academic performance, while other evidence reviewed suggests that indirect positive outcomes – such as better concentration and more alertness in class as well as better health – may also improve academic performance.

S4D programmes that work for education are those that do the following:

- Create a positive teaching and learning environment where participants and educators have the opportunity to engage in problem identification and problem solving to enable critical thinking around the challenges that they and their communities face.

- Recruit, train and develop quality educators – whether they are teachers, coaches, trainers or mentors. Educators need to be able to facilitate positive relationships, support young people and teach the key competencies and skills. Their salary and benefits are other key factors that need to be considered.

- Meaningfully engage key stakeholders and local experts, including participants, families, communities and schools, to meet programme goals. In one example, a programme brought past participants back again as mentors and coaches, to apply their contextual knowledge and experience for the benefit of others.

Challenges to the educational outcomes of S4D programmes include the following:

- Designing and delivering a programme without the input of local experts and stakeholders such as schools. This may result in learning materials that do not meet the needs of participants/teachers, implementing educators failing to deliver the programme correctly, or children finding themselves placed in a group with their bully.

- Overreach in setting objectives and in attempting to meet multiple social goals rather than prioritizing goals based on target-group needs. Education-focused S4D interventions that encompass other goals can create challenges for the S4D organization in terms of staff capacity and available resources.

- Lack of research on and clarity around how sport can play a greater role in achieving educational outcomes, particularly in regard to academic performance.

Policymakers and S4D practitioners seeking to improve education can try the following promising practices:

- Strengthen the capacity of S4D organizations to deliver pedagogy aligned to clear, realistic objectives that reflect the financial, human and material resources available as well as the expectations and conditions of participants and educators. To this end, encourage engagement with local schools – physical education may provide a platform by which to strengthen engagement with and the impact of S4D programmes.

- Experiment with the design, delivery, implementation and funding of S4D programmes to sustain long-term educational engagement and ensure ownership of the projects by participants and communities by seeking to achieve long-term outcomes. S4D programmes also
need to better understand how to maintain positive outcomes through post-programming activities.

- Improve on the available research tools to help better understand how organizations achieve educational outcomes (by type of outcome) and promote a culture of evidence-informed practice that aligns with and feeds into the improvement of S4D programmes. Longitudinal research can also be aligned with practice to assess sustained impacts and effects and to support S4D programmes.

### 3.2 What is education in the context of S4D?

In this report, education is defined as the ability of children and young people to learn and gain the knowledge, skills and competencies they need to achieve and succeed, irrespective of their gender, ethnicity, socio-economic background or other circumstances. Educational outcomes can refer to levels of proficiency in academic or non-academic subjects, enrolment and completion rates, out-of-school rates and life skills attainment levels, among other things. To understand how outcomes can be achieved, education can be framed around four key components:

- **Content (what):** Education can be focused on ‘traditional’ subjects such as literacy, mathematics and science, and can include technical knowledge for specific trades and for life skills such as leadership and autonomy. The focus of this chapter is traditional content, while life skills are covered in chapter 6.

- **Pedagogy (how):** This refers to how the knowledge, skills and competencies are taught and transmitted to the learner. How information and concepts are taught can vary depending on the capacity of the teacher and the materials available.

- **Teacher (by whom):** Teaching of knowledge, skills and competencies – or guidance toward and facilitation of the acquisition of these – can occur between a learner and a teacher, mentor, trainer or coach, or even between a learner and her or his peers.

- **Setting (where):** Learning can happen anywhere, at any time and at any age or education level. It can occur in formal settings, like schools and learning centres, or in non-formal settings such as on the sports field among players, in the home or on the job.

Understanding these components can provide a foundation from which to discuss education-focused S4D programmes and the specific characteristics of such programmes that can facilitate positive educational outcomes.

In defining education, it is also important to discuss its role and approach within the context of development. To achieve development, Sen (1999, cited in Rossi and Jeanes, 2016) suggests that people, including children, young people and the community at large, need the capabilities to understand what they “can do and what they can be” (Rossi and Jeanes, 2016, p. 485). To do so, several authors in the S4D literature reviewed for this chapter suggest a context-focused approach to development and to education such as Paulo Freire’s critical pedagogy (Mwaanga and Prince, 2016; Rossi and Jeanes, 2016; Spaaij, Oxford and Jeanes, 2016; Nols, Haudenhuyse, Spaaij and Theeboom, 2018).

Although critics have acknowledged the faults of critical pedagogy (see Nols et al., 2018), it provides an approach that the authors noted can be found in S4D programmes. This type of education requires both learner and teacher to engage in dialogue and learning by reflecting on their own situation and conditions to identify and solve a problem: in short, to build agency and become leaders of change. Sport is used as an educational tool for behavioural change (Hartmann and Kwauk, 2011) and, according to Giulianotti (2011), the most effective approach to S4D programming tends to occur in small community-based organizations where reflection on the wider context is necessary to be better able to address the structural social issues faced by children and young people. Such programmes work by creating a connection to context and by allowing children to actively and meaningfully engage in their learning – and in the programme design – for more transformative action to take place, which can also create a pathway toward development. Close reflection on context, of course, has consequences for the way in which the teacher, coach or mentor engages with and teaches participants (see section 3.4.2).
3.3 How are sport and education linked?

The most obvious link between sport and education can be found in most schools, which ensures that sport has an expansive reach that extends to almost all students around the world. In many countries, physical education forms part of school curricula. According to a recent survey by UNESCO (2014), almost 99 per cent of primary schools globally have compulsory physical education for both girls and boys. This figure drops slightly, to 88 per cent, in secondary schools. In practice, however, the share of schools implementing physical education may be much lower, depending on several factors such as the resources available to a school (including teachers) and the value that decision-makers place on physical education compared with other subjects and activities (UNESCO, 2014). Schools unable to offer physical education themselves may contract outside services, for example, through NGOs or private companies, creating an opportunity for a different type of programming to be made available to schools (Svensson, Hancock and Hums, 2016).

The evidence also links education and sport by looking at the diverse ways in which education has been used alongside sport activities. Education for sport can refer to the acquisition of personal knowledge and skills through social learning that occurs alongside peers/adults – in many cases about topics such as health, gender, inclusion and equality (Spaajji et al., 2016). How this occurs with sport can be summarized by the work of Peter J. Arnold – who explored education and movement – which has since been applied to sport and physical education (Brown, 2013). Arnold suggests that education and movement are linked in three distinct forms: education about movement (i.e., the learning about movement); education through movement, which refers most closely to physical education and uses physical activities as a tool to reach another objective such as social learning; and, finally, education in movement (i.e., the learning of the body and its movement while participating in a physical activity) (Brown, 2013; Svensson et al., 2016). This chapter will focus on ‘education through sport’ as well as an additional term that comes from analysis of the different programmes – ‘education with sport’. This term reflects a weaker connection between education and sport to convey a lower degree of integration than programmes labelled as education through sport.

At the international level, sport and education were linked during the Fifty-eighth Session of the United Nations General Assembly, when Member States considered “the role of sport and physical education as a means to promote education, health, development and peace” (United Nations General Assembly, 2003, p. 1). This raised the profile of sport as a key instrument by which to achieve development goals, including those in education, and contributed to the proliferation of S4D programmes (Svensson et al., 2016). The resolution called for governments and stakeholders to “promote sport and physical education … as a tool for health, education, social and cultural development”, as well as to “strengthen the cooperation and partnership” between key stakeholders, including family, school and communities (United Nations General Assembly, 2003, p. 2).

3.4 What does the evidence say?

As international organizations, policymakers and key stakeholders around the world increasingly believe in the power of sport as a means by which to progress development in many policy sectors, including education, the need for evidence-based policies and programming becomes imperative. Identifying what the evidence says about education and sport can give decision-makers around the world a clearer understanding of how they can use sport as a new and innovative tool to effectively achieve educational outcomes.

This section addresses the evidence on education and sport by bringing together the findings from 31 articles in the literature on education and sport (all were identified as medium- to high-quality evidence, see Annex 1.C). Many of the articles included focused on high-income countries, including Belgium, Germany, Israel, the United Kingdom and the United States. Other articles included focused on programmes for low- or middle-income countries, including Belize, Cameroon, Kenya, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Samoa, South Africa and Zambia. Two of the 31 articles had a global focus.

As is common in S4D literature, most of the articles used qualitative methods; in some cases, a mixed methods...
approach was used, in which qualitative methods were complemented by analysis of survey data or baseline results. (For further details about the articles included, see Annex 3.A.)

Not all of the articles reviewed for this chapter focused directly on traditional subjects such as mathematics or literacy. Nor did all of them aim to achieve educational outcomes such as improved attendance rates and academic performance. Some articles looked at education-focused sport programmes that had health education as a key objective, and many articles also focused on life skills – and more specifically on soft skills (which are also a focus of chapter 6). Several of the articles reviewed also had a focus on the training, pedagogy and development of coaches, mentors and trainers, given how important these roles and training are to the success of S4D programmes.

3.4.1 Why is sport important for education?

As entire countries, policymakers and key stakeholders aim to achieve the SDGs, exploring the role of sport in the achievement of educational outcomes may provide a new tool that decision-makers can use to meet key targets such as those under SDG 4: Quality education:

- Target 4.1: By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education
- Target 4.2: By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education
- Target 4.4: By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship
- Target 4.7: By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development
- Target 4.c: By 2030, substantially increase the supply of qualified teachers.

Sport may also be a useful tool for responding to the challenges that young people face in attaining decent work and economic growth (SDG 8) and to support the achievement of Target 8.6: By 2020, substantially reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, education or training.

S4D programmes aim to achieve educational and employment outcomes, but evidence suggests that the use of academic activities is less common than the use of other non-sport activities. Of the 106 programmes surveyed in the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, 18 stated that they aimed to achieve an educational outcome and 14 aimed to ‘develop employability skills’ among participants. It is important to note that survey participants were also asked whether programmes included a non-sport activity, and academic lessons or tutoring was the non-sport activity reported least often (17 per cent of programmes). In addition, UNICEF itself engages in various programmes: 122 of the 263 S4D programmes supported by 99 UNICEF country offices were identified as having some sort of education-focused S4D initiative, with about 24 per cent of the 122 programmes located in the Eastern and Southern Africa region (ESAR). It is clear from the programmes identified that sport is being used for educational purposes.

The available evidence shows that well-designed S4D programmes create positive experiences for children and young people both in school and beyond the school playground. The evidence indicates several educational outcomes and non-educational outcomes that can be achieved through education and sport programmes (for further discussion about the importance of programmes focused on education and employment to address social inclusion, see section 4.2.1).

3.4.1.1 Improved engagement in school

The available evidence indicates a link between participation in sport and student engagement in school. Using data from the Health Behaviour in School-aged Children 2014 study, Badura et al. (2016) found that adolescents in the Czech Republic who participated in sport and another activity, such as art, performed better on education-related outcomes including school engagement, handling school-related stress, and academic achievement. Data on adolescents who only participated in sport also indicated better educational outcomes, although these findings were not statistically
significant. An analysis of data from the United States, taken from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (the Add Health study), indicated that all adolescents enrolled in Grades 7–12 (aged 12–19 years) who participated in sports had a higher sense of school belonging over a one-year period (Toomey and Russell, 2012).

Moreover, an analysis of Korea Youth Panel Survey data from 2003 to 2006 also found that adolescents who participated in extra-curricular activities related to sport showed lower levels of aggression over time compared with those who only participated in physical education (Park, Chiu and Won, 2017). This was particularly relevant in the case of female adolescents (Park et al., 2017). Reduced aggressive behaviour in school can translate into better engagement in school and in the classroom with peers and school staff. Participants in S4D programmes also indicated their enjoyment in participating in the initiative and in school. For example, a preliminary study of a rugby initiative in Papua New Guinea indicated that both staff and students enjoyed their classroom rugby league sessions as well as the literacy resources provided. They indicated that the context was both fun and engaging (Sherry and Schulenkorf, 2016). Sandford, Duncombe and Armour (2008) also indicated that students participating in the HSBC/Outward Bound project and in the Youth Sport Trust/Sky Sports Living for Sport programme in the United Kingdom were happier in school and showed engaged behaviour in lessons. It is important to note, however, that the authors cautioned that some of the findings may be context-specific and individualized (Sandford et al., 2008).

3.4.1.2 Attendance and academic performance

Analysis of available data from high-income countries indicates positive links between sport, academic performance and other educational outcomes. According to Coakley (2011), much of the evidence positively linking sports participation to academic achievement and other educational outcomes is from the United States, where sports participation is institutionally linked, and therefore positive results may be strongly linked to a context in which playing sport is part of the school culture. The present review identified several programmes in the United States. For example, a five-month S4D initiative in a high school, involving participation in a sports club and attendance monitoring, which reduced absenteeism among truant students (Marvul, 2012). Svensson et al. (2016), following a review of S4D organizations in urban settings, also found positive educational results among participants, although individual results varied based on teacher evaluations.

Similarly, another article identified for this chapter analysed evidence from Germany on the effect of sports club participation on skills development among children aged 3–10 years using data from the German Health Interview and Examination Survey for Children and Adolescents (KiGGS). This analysis also found that sport had positive effects on children's school outcomes, in terms of overall school grade achieved (Felfe, Lechner and Steinmayr, 2016).

The evidence reviewed for this chapter from other parts of the world is ambiguous, however. In their analysis of panel data from the Young Lives Survey, Pawlowski, Schüttoff, Downward and Lechner (2018) found no statistically significant effect between participation in sport and improved education indicators (e.g., reading, school enrolment) for children in Peru. As the authors suggest, the differences in outcomes may be related to the quality of the school system and sport activities in Peru – children may not have access to quality infrastructure or sport classes. Moreover, the authors suggest that the outcomes measured may be individual, whereas those outcomes that are achieved relate to the group.

Evidence from S4D programmes also indicates indirect links between sport and academic achievement. Burnett (2014) suggests that the relationship between S4D programmes and improved school attendance can be due to the better health and fitness outcomes that children and young people achieve from participating in sport – i.e., children feel better and they can go to school. Evidence from S4D programmes also indicates that participation in S4D programmes can improve concentration levels and enable children to be more alert, which may positively affect their academic performance (Bailey et al., 2009; Burnett, 2014).
3.4.1.3 Better relationship with teachers

S4D programmes indicated that a better relationship with teachers a key component of a successful teaching and learning environment. Teachers participating in South Africa in the Mighty Metres programme, a school-based running initiative, reported better relationships with the participants as well as trust and enjoyment, as they had to be outside to deliver the activity (Burnett, 2014). Sandford et al. (2008) also found that participants in the two aforementioned United Kingdom-based programmes, both of which targeted disaffected young people, had improved relationships with teachers as well as with programme peers. The relationships that teachers develop with students are further explored below (see section 3.4.2.2).

Schools can also benefit from participation in S4D programmes. For example, Burnett (2014) found that schools in South Africa branded as Jointly Achieving Growth schools were recognized for sport activities and gave school staff a positive image, particularly in the case of a farm school that competed against schools in more affluent, predominantly ‘white’ communities – which, given the history of apartheid in South Africa, can mean a lot.

Families can also benefit from child-focused S4D programmes that engage in education activities. For example, Jeans (2013) described how families were also engaged in different ways so that they too could learn about the programme and the topics covered, in this case HIV/AIDS. As a school-based sport programme, Mighty Metres in South Africa awarded students with medals and certificates that were then shared with parents, who would proudly share their children’s accomplishments with neighbours, family and friends. This recognition from parents and other family members can boost children’s confidence levels and positively affect their self-esteem. The initiative also provided parents with the opportunity to join the programme community and engage in ‘fun day’ activities (Burnett, 2014).

Despite the possibility of positive links between sport and education, Burnett (2014) highlights the importance of reflecting on negative unintended consequences that can develop such as “having to share incentives with family members and experiencing conflict in communities where gang activities create a context of ubiquitous violence” (Burnett, 2014).

Moreover, previous studies have linked sports participation with substance abuse and delinquency (e.g., Fauth, Roth and Brooks-Gunn, 2007, cited in Toomey and Russell, 2012; also, see chapter 5). Participation in sport as well as sport culture may provide access to negative and hostile cultures that can hurt young people, especially marginalized young people. This would suggest that instead of supporting the achievement of educational outcomes, sport may do quite the opposite. There are opportunities to adapt S4D programmes for specific participant groups and therefore it is important to understand the context in which this negative effect is occurring.

3.4.2 What works when using sport for educational outcomes?

Key characteristics of education-focused S4D programmes identified in the literature could help to strengthen S4D programmes and the effects that they can have on the education of children and young people. The following section brings together lessons learned from the literature on sport and education and complements the findings with some examples. The sections focus on: (1) learning from education-focused S4D programmes; (2) teaching by quality coaches, trainers and mentors; and (3) engaging local expertise and stakeholders.

3.4.2.1 Learning from education-focused S4D programmes

Key factors that the literature suggests are effective when designing programming for education through and with sport include the factors outlined below.

Learning environment of S4D programmes

The learning environment in which S4D programmes are delivered can have an impact on what resources are available as well as influence the extent to which information about participants can be shared. Partnering with schools to develop S4D programmes (even as part of physical education) can provide access to resources (e.g., qualified teachers, sports pitches) as well as
supplement what is learned in the S4D initiative and in
the classroom (Spruit, van Vugt, van der Put, van der
Stouwe and Stams, 2016; Schulenkorf et al., 2016).
Moreover, Armour and Duncombe (2012) suggest that
school-based programmes should be critically vetted and
evaluated by schools and teachers before being used in
schools with students.

The learning environment also refers to the relationships
between participant, teachers and peers that can support
children’s and young people’s personal development and
provide opportunities for collaboration and engagement.
The learning environment within S4D programmes (e.g.,
team or group activities) can provide opportunities for
these types of relationships to develop. The literature
highlights the importance of ensuring that children and
young people have opportunities for collaborative work
as well as for reflection (Armour, Sandford and
Duncombe, 2013; Spaaij et al., 2016). Team or group
activities within sport can provide the space for dialogue,
discussions and exchanges to occur. For example, in an
HIV/AIDS education initiative, participants were given the
space to recognize and discuss the problem they faced
as well as to think of solutions together as a group,
which encouraged awareness of and reflection on the
participant’s circumstances. Participants suggested that
the team sport component enabled this to occur
naturally (Jeanes, 2013).

Giving participants the ability and tools to be able to
develop strong relationships is key. This includes working
with participants to empower them to choose activities
and to set and review their own progress in order to give
them ownership and increase their active participation in
the programme (Armour et al., 2013; Mwaanga and
Prince, 2016). It is important, however, to highlight the
need for safe spaces, in particular when addressing
marginalized young people (see chapter 5).

Curriculum and learning materials
The way in which information is delivered can play a role
in how children and young people engage with the
material and, ultimately, how well they achieve the
educational objectives of the initiative. For example,
League Bilong Laif, a rugby S4D programme in Papua
New Guinea, used reading books that included rugby-
related stories and mathematics examples that used	rugby players’ statistics and other relevant league data
(Sherry and Schulenkorf, 2016). One of the challenges of
the programme, however, was that the materials were
Australia-designed, which teachers found unsuitable for
the context. This example illustrates the importance that
S4D programmes must ascribe to context, as well as the
importance of working with teachers, coaches and
others to ensure that the educational needs of the target
audience are being met.

Schools may be given the opportunity to adapt a
programme to best fit their needs. In South Africa,
Mighty Metres was implemented in different ways:
Schools and teachers could adapt the programme to be
integrated into the school curriculum or include it as an
extra-curricular activity (Burnett, 2014).

While most of the literature reviewed in this chapter
does not address physical education, it is important to
note that it may provide an avenue by which to influence
not only the health outcomes of students but also their
educational outcomes. The analysis of data from the
Republic of Korea on adolescents indicates that physical
education did not affect their aggressive behaviour; this
may be related to the focus given to other school
subjects as well as to the quality of the physical
education classes, which may be monotonous, and the
activities, which may be limited to just sport (Park et al.,
2017). Modifying the physical education curriculum may
provide an opportunity for decision-makers to improve
the impact that it has on students.

Feedback and reflection
It is important to ensure that S4D organizations are
reflective of their practice and adapt their programmes to
the specific learning needs of different audiences.
Teachers, coaches, trainers and mentors should have the
capacity to adapt programmes to the particular context
and to students’ needs and abilities. A review of
education-focused programmes in the United States
found that directors highlighted the flexibility of their
programming to address participants’ differing needs
through the use of differentiated instruction and
individualized support (Svensson et al., 2016). Armour et
al. (2013) also highlighted the flexibility offered to schools
and teachers in the two UK programmes to address
disaffected young people. A key feature of both
programmes was that they allowed teachers to select the students who would participate and also let them tailor the activities to best meet those participants’ needs. Adapting a programme in this way, however, requires that educators have the necessary skills to do so.

Flexibility in planning and teaching also requires educators to be reflective of their practice in order to improve their teaching and coaching as well as the implementation of the S4D initiative. Reflective practice, which can form part of critical pedagogy, requires educators to think about the problem and find solutions through group discussions – it aims to move thinking and discussion beyond technical aspects of the initiative to more engaged discussions about learning and teaching (Wright, Jacobs, Ressler and Jung, 2016).

Provided below is an example from the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey of how one S4D organization – Mathare Youth Sports Association in Kenya – uses M&E processes to feedback on, and improve, its programme model, delivery and implementation (see Box 3.1).

3.4.2.2 Teaching by quality teachers, coaches, trainers and mentors

Providing a quality education, whether through traditional teaching methods or through sport programmes, requires quality educators – i.e., teachers, coaches,

Box 3.1. Mathare Youth Sports Association: Learning to drive change

Since 1987, Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) has been using sports for social improvement and community development in Nairobi. It continues this mission by currently engaging over 30,000 children and young people in sport activities through a range of interventions, which includes work readiness and employability programmes. These aim to help youth participants to develop knowledge and skills to access employment opportunities after education.

For each programme, MYSA links inputs with activities, programme outcomes and community outcomes framed within its theory of change, in addition to setting out M&E procedures and learning questions. For example, its Work Readiness Program aims to help its youth participants develop knowledge and skills to access employment opportunities, through career guidance and skills training, career fairs, internships and job placements. MYSA poses questions to assess the impact of this programme and uses data to show progress in regard to participants’ knowledge in identifying career paths, opinions on the difficulty of identifying job opportunities, and perceived understanding of the job application process.

The MYSA approach encourages ongoing learning and involves a high degree of self-reflection to improve the organization’s programmes. MYSA identified a need for improvement, for example, in participants’ development of skills and knowledge for accessing employment. Reflection and focus group discussions further illuminated the type of support that participants needed. MYSA then responded by increasing its focus on the availability of work readiness resources, such as CV writing and job interview preparation sessions, in addition to providing mentors for the job search process. Through this ongoing process of M&E and learning, MYSA continually builds stronger links between implemented activities and desired outcomes in its S4D programming.
trainers and mentors. They are responsible for transmitting knowledge and competencies, facilitating engagement and providing direction and guidance, which is key to the objectives of the S4D programmes. This section reviews two areas that should be kept in mind when designing quality S4D programmes: recruitment of staff and staff training and development.

Recruitment of teachers, coaches, trainers or mentors
Recruiting a key role model and leader, such as a teacher, coach or trainer, with the right qualities and competencies is key for the success of S4D programmes (Bailey et al., 2009; Schulenkorf et al., 2016). For example, one initiative from Israel, which aimed to address Israeli Arab children’s educational needs through football, faced some challenges, as the interviewed volunteers indicated that many of them found it difficult to teach through an informal education model and many of them were uninterested in football (Wahrman and Zach, 2018).

Educators should have characteristics that will facilitate positive relationships, support of young people (e.g., through mentoring and guidance) and the teaching of key competencies and skills that the initiative aims to transfer to participants. According to a qualitative study of coaches from sport-based interventions, educators in S4D programmes must be sensitive to participants and to their contextual needs; they must have the ability to gain participants’ trust as well as show commitment to the project (Morgan and Bush, 2016). This can be a challenge, particularly for educators who may not be from the same community or may not understand the types of communities in which the S4D initiative is implemented.

S4D programmes recruit educators using different approaches, which may present different challenges. Some programmes have sought out former programme participants as educators because of their experience of the programme and their ability to relate to current participants, which may be valuable when aiming to contextualize programmes and engage local communities (Svensson et al., 2016; Spaaji et al., 2016). In another example, a programme in the United Kingdom used celebrities and sports stars to act as role models; while feedback from students and teachers suggests that this approach can be positive, it may also present a challenge, particularly if a celebrity or sport star is found to have engaged in negative behaviour (Armour and Duncombe, 2012). Other programmes may also seek out peer educators to implement the programme.

Staff training and development
As in any classroom, the capacity of the teacher, coach or mentor to engage children and young people in the S4D programming is key and, in order to do so, they need to have effective training and development. There is scarce available evidence on the pedagogy required to train educators and on how such training can help them to achieve the objectives of the S4D initiative (Wright et al., 2016). Some of the evidence reviewed, however, suggests that training educators in critical pedagogy could provide them with the tools they need to carry out their work (Wright et al., 2016). The example of teacher training implemented by Right To Play is presented below (see Box 3.2).

One example from the literature also highlights the need to ensure that any training plans meet the needs of the programme as well as those of the educators. In Papua New Guinea, teachers were trained to deliver on a rugby-based methodology, however, they expressed a need for the training to be followed up further as many faced challenges in implementing the programme (Sherry and Schulenkorf, 2016). Furthermore, once the initiative had been implemented, teachers felt that its delivery then became the responsibility of the development officers responsible for the initiative, which made delivery of the initiative difficult (Sherry and Schulenkorf, 2016).

The training and development provided by S4D programmes can be particularly important for those that seek to recruit volunteers and educators from the communities in which the initiative is implemented. In some cases, these can be vulnerable communities, where those volunteers and educators willing to participate in the S4D initiative face multiple challenges. For example, Burnett (2013) undertook a qualitative study of participants in the Youth Development through Football programme, which was implemented in 10 African countries. Young people who were trained to become peer educators were found to have low levels of education, come from low socio-economic backgrounds
Box 3.2. Right To Play: Training teachers

Right To Play (RTP) operates across the globe, focusing on education, social inclusion, gender equality, well-being, child protection and peace. The organization’s initiatives focus on four types of play – games, sport, creative play and free play – in a variety of contexts, including schools, sports centres, refugee camps, migrant communities and youth detention centres. One of its initiatives, Play for Advancement of Quality Education (PAQE), aims to improve educational outcomes for children aged 2–15 years by training teachers, district education officials, school administrators and coaches in play-based learning through the RTP Continuum of Teacher Training (COTT) model. PAQE is implemented by RTP country offices in Benin, Ghana, Liberia, Mali, Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda and the United Republic of Tanzania, which collaborate with government and civil society partners to promote play-based approaches within the education system. Additionally, PAQE aims to raise awareness of education barriers, especially for girls, and to implement interventions to address these barriers.

The COTT model is based on foundational training, teaching the curriculum through play-based learning, and creating a positive learning environment by paying attention to gender, inclusion and child protection. The training helps teachers to design classrooms as safe spaces where students trust teachers and are motivated to participate, which in turn contributes to learning outcomes. To conclude the training, teachers’ ability to implement play-based learning approaches is assessed through observation by RTP staff, district education officials and school administrators. The COTT model is one of the four core elements of the PAQE initiative, along with: addressing educational barriers; collaborating and advocating with education authorities; and forming youth-led clubs and initiatives driven by coaches.

In addition, RTP uses the clear PAQE Performance Measurement Framework to set out the purpose, use and rules of M&E, which is centred on providing evidence for performance indicators. M&E procedures and indicators align with the pillars described for the delivery of PAQE and thus display relevance to its objectives. A local consulting firm conducts data collection to ensure impartiality. M&E procedures demonstrate rigour, involving the collection of baseline data and an assessment design that involves reviewing historical evidence, collecting feedback from stakeholders (using both long-term data from the life of the initiative and smaller-scale primary data collection) and triangulating results through mixed methods data collection. RTP can then reflect on the evidence and on how to improve these procedures. Paying attention to inclusiveness and ethics, RTP works with local teams to contextualize the data collection methods. Findings are used to inform how the PAQE initiative can be adapted to better achieve its objectives and to suit the needs of the contexts in which RTP works, with a focus on effects. For example, the results of a baseline assessment informed the decision by RTP to address existing gaps by redeveloping the programme.
and have scarce opportunities for employment. Findings suggest the importance of training that focuses on the skills needed to both carry out the programme and support the individual's future employability (Burnett, 2013).

Moreover, the salary and benefits received by S4D staff can also play an important role, particularly in vulnerable communities. Kick4Life Football Club in Lesotho, one of the programmes in the Youth Development through Football programme, provided volunteers with access to a scholarship to complete their schooling (Burnett, 2013). Such incentives can be particularly important for programmes located in areas of high poverty and for those that have a high turnover of staff. Supporting educators, particularly if they are young and out of school, can be an important step in providing them with social mobility.

It is also vitally important to ensure the safeguarding of children and young people when training teachers, coaches, trainers or mentors (see chapter 5).

3.4.2.3 Engaging stakeholders in the design and delivery of S4D programmes

Strong teachers, coaches, trainers and mentors should be complemented by a strong contextual understanding of the needs and capacities of the communities in which education-focused S4D programmes are implemented. The rationale for this is twofold: first, the review of the literature indicates that educational outcomes achieved through sport activities are dependent on context (Sandford et al., 2008; Bailey et al., 2009); and second, the success of an S4D initiative and any development programme is dependent on the buy-in and engagement of local stakeholders (Burnett, 2015a; Kidd, 2011; Svensson et al., 2016).

Engagement requires the creation of a decision-making process that is participatory at all stages (e.g., design, implementation, M&E) and the involvement of children and young people along with local stakeholders (Armour et al., 2013; Bailey et al., 2009; Svensson et al., 2016; Schulekof et al., 2016). It may also require having credible leadership, and a key figure or role model can be effective in the design and delivery of S4D programmes (Bailey et al., 2009; Schulekof et al., 2016).

The literature suggests the importance of ensuring that participants have agency and enabling the meaningful engagement of stakeholders such as teachers and local community, as opposed to implementing a top-down approach to programme design and implementation. Similar to the critical pedagogy approach, the S4D programme and all of its components should reflect the lives and conditions of the children and young people who will benefit from the programme. In other words, the programme needs to have a clear understanding of who the participants are, their background and their needs. This also requires that pedagogy, learning processes and the curriculum align with the needs of participants to promote effective learning (Wright et al., 2016). For example, the teaching personal and social responsibility (TPSR) model has been used as a flexible approach that empowers participants, creates meaningful relationships with and for the participants, and provides the adaptability that teachers need to match the model to their context (see Box 6.4).

Moreover, Mwaanga and Prince (2016) argue that participants themselves should be included in the programme design process, to help the programme to better address their needs.

Furthermore, the engagement of families in education-focused S4D programmes can be critical, as they can shape the behaviours, norms and attitudes of children and young people – whether in positive or negative ways. While families can be part of a particular problem that children and young people face, families can also reinforce the learning that children and young people have acquired (Jeanes, 2013). Families may also be supported by S4D programmes. For example, in Zambia, the Go Sisters initiative engages parents in dialogue and problem solving through the use of ‘family committees’. Engagement of families is intended to gain the trust of the family and to facilitate girls’ empowerment, as participants may otherwise be seen as defying tradition and their culture (Mwaanga and Prince, 2016). The fact that the young women in the Go Sisters initiative played football was met with scepticism by the community, which needed to be addressed. S4D programmes have integrated families using different approaches. For example, three S4D programmes in Kenya – two just outside Nairobi and one in a rural coastal town – aim to
empower young people by using play to address community issues. The programming officers encourage government officials and local leaders to discuss with parents both the programme itself and the importance of girls’ education, and they then meet monthly to continue the dialogue. In addition, each of the programmes organizes: collective discussions with community members, co-educational movie nights to include young men, and weekend tournaments at which information booths are set up to share resources (Spaaij et al., 2016).

Schools also play a vital role, whether as the setting of the S4D initiative or as key stakeholders in it. For example, South African school-based running initiative Mighty Metres was delivered in partnership with 39 primary schools in the Western Cape province and 4 primary schools in the Eastern Cape province as well as a local foundation. At each level of delivery, the programme aimed to engage stakeholders (e.g., participants, implementers and others) to ensure their interaction for delivery – the initiative incorporated a management system to enable coordination between the regional and cluster programming officers and the implementing teachers (Burnett, 2015a). Furthermore, partnering with authorities and organizations such as education ministries or other agencies in sectors related to children and young people can support S4D programmes and enhance their capacity to better meet the needs of children, young people and communities (Sherry and Schulenkorf, 2016; Jones, Edwards, Bocarro, Bunds and Smith, 2017).

Fostering positive relationships can help to ensure that the design, development and delivery of the programme is pragmatic and focused on education (Armour et al., 2013; Bailey et al., 2009; Svensson et al., 2016; Schulenkorf et al., 2016). Forging such relationships can also be a challenge in itself, however.

3.4.3 What are the challenges in implementation?

Literature reviewed for this chapter indicates several key challenges faced by education-focused S4D programmes, including: ensuring context-sensitivity in programme design; the setting of realistic goals; and the limited available evidence to support design and practice.

3.4.3.1 Ensuring context is integrated, particularly where culture, norms and behaviours may be at odds

S4D programmes can the potential to “reinforce or challenge existing power structures”, hindering their capacity to achieve educational outcomes (Giulianotti, 2011; Spaaij and Jeanes, 2013, cited in Wright et al., 2016). And while there is a need to engage with local experts and stakeholders to understand the context when designing and implementing programming, this can also prove challenging.

For example, some communities may find the content of some programmes – such as girls’ education or HIV/AIDS education – difficult to discuss. Addressing this requires working with communities over time and using different strategies to make it possible to achieve the objectives of the S4D initiative (Jeanes, 2013). Additionally, organizations external to the communities in which they work may introduce their own values, behaviours and norms, which may align with neither those of the volunteers or educators hired to deliver programmes nor with those of the participants and community (see Wahrman and Zach, 2018; Sherry and Schulenkorf, 2016). As mentioned in the previous section, addressing this calls for local expertise and may also require additional planning and resources, which will need to be accounted for in the design and development of the S4D initiative.

Furthermore, the socio-economic context of the communities in which the initiative is located may mean that participants face challenges other than just those to be addressed by the initiative. This suggests the need for coaches and programmers to be reflective and able to adapt to such types of challenges. Evidence from an S4D organization in Cameroon, which works with teenage girls by providing them with a safe platform to become change-makers within their communities, indicated that while the organization wanted the girls to be on the field participating in sport, the coaches found that participants would come to the game hungry. Others would be unable to attend at all because of lack of money – and some would borrow from volunteers who may also be facing financial difficulties (Spaaij et al., 2016). Similarly, children’s extreme vulnerability was also described to researchers in relation to the Mighty Metres programme in South Africa. Many children would come to school...
hungry and would be unable to participate in the programme – increasing levels of absenteeism. More importantly, cases of child abuse and other forms of neglect were indicated, suggesting a need to ensure safeguarding in S4D programmes (Burnett, 2014).

Working in and with schools may also present challenges to integrating context into S4D programmes. To have ownership of programme content and deliver it effectively, teachers and school leaders need to be engaged in the process of its development. Moreover, programmes being implemented in schools and in communities may be unaware of the relationships between individual children and their peers. For example, the Mighty Metres initiative in South Africa was delivered by teachers but testimony from a 15-year-old participant indicates that children were grouped with their bullies, which at times reinforced existing challenges (Burnett, 2014).

All levels of programme design and delivery need to be contextualized. The materials and strategies used can also present challenges to implementation, particularly when they are not developed in collaboration with the end users (e.g., the educators and participants). This was the case for the S4D initiative in Papua New Guinea that used Australian-centric materials (Sherry and Schulenkorf, 2016). It is therefore important for S4D programmes to engage local expertise when developing learning materials.

3.4.3.2 Ambitious goals are to be applauded, but they can present a risk

The objectives set by S4D programmes may at times seem ambitious – particularly those of programmes that come from within the S4D sector, where sport can be seen as the solution to many social issues, including education. Programmes should set objectives that can meet the expectations of participants, programmers and other key stakeholders such as funders, but which also match their organizational capacity. While ambitious goals should be applauded, they can also present a risk and potentially undermine the success of the S4D initiative.

For example, addressing wider social issues – such as empowering girls through education – can be difficult to achieve through S4D programmes. As mentioned in the previous section, the context in which participants are located can limit the attainment of goals promised by S4D programmes. Participants may have limited agency, authority and status to become change agents due to family and community dynamics, particularly when it comes to girls’ issues (Jeanes, 2013; Mwaanga and Prince, 2016). One education-focused S4D programme for underperforming boys in Samoa suggested that rather than supporting the boys, it may in fact have led to their further marginalization. Participants focused on the sport component of the programme in the hope of becoming professional rugby players: while a few may have done so, many returned home without additional skills for entering regular employment (Kwauk, 2016).

Realistic goals should be based on the human, material and financial resources available to the initiative. In regard to working with schools, evidence from the League Bilong Laif programme in Papua New Guinea indicates that the programming officers were concerned about the infrastructure of the education system, as the rugby S4D programme was delivered by teachers. League Bilong Laif identified key challenges in the education system, including under-resourced and oversubscribed schools. Moreover, the teaching staff were poorly paid and unreliable, which was a major concern for programme delivery (Sherry and Schulenkorf, 2016). Irrespective of the commitment of implementing actors, the contracts, salaries and benefits of educators working on the delivery of S4D programmes are key for effective programme delivery, particularly when working with educators from vulnerable communities (Burnett, 2013).

Realistic goals should meet the time frame of programme participants and there should be a post-programme plan for participants. Some programmes may be designed to follow the child all the way from early primary school to the end of upper secondary school (Grade 12) as was the case with programmes in the United States (Svensson et al., 2016). Some programmes, however, may have shorter participation time frames, making it more difficult to attain specific goals. For example, teachers participating in a United Kingdom-based programme for disaffected young people discussed the importance of ensuring post-programme links to a programme activity, so as to maintain positive
outcomes attained by participants while in the programme and to achieve impact in the long-term (Armour et al., 2013). Creating post-programme pathways can provide participants with alternatives to the programming activities offered by the initiative and, in some cases, the resources to transition from school into employment (Spaaji, Magee and Jeanes, 2013). It can also provide children and young people with the opportunity to transfer their learned skills and abilities to other settings beyond those created within the initiative (Burnett, 2015a).

S4D programmes need to ensure that the goals set also meet the expectations of participants, as incongruous goals can pose a challenge to engagement and may make participants feel as though they have been deceived. For example, the Go Sisters initiative in Zambia included a training component in running a small business to help participants transition to employment. While some participants found this a positive feature, others expressed disappointment in being trained on skills they felt they would be unable to use, given their belief that there were no available jobs (Mwaanga and Prince, 2016). It is crucial that participants, programming officers and other key actors discuss the programme, its objectives and curriculum to ensure that they reflect the conditions in which the participants live.

Finally, evidence suggests that outside actors such as funders, donors and other funding sources play a critical role in the survival of S4D programmes. They provide funding and at times influence the objectives set for S4D programmes, which may result in S4D organizations having to balance the needs of the participants and community with those of the funding sources. In addition, funders and outside actors may require S4D programmes to provide proof of how successful the programme is in achieving certain measurements and indicators, which may not be aligned with the needs of the organization – making the challenge of meeting its own objectives even more difficult (Burnett, 2015b; Spaaji et al., 2016).

3.4.3.3 Lack of research around the effect of S4D programmes on educational outcomes

Notwithstanding the volume of literature reviewed for this chapter, there is a general lack of evidence on education-focused programmes and their link to educational outcomes. Whitley et al. (2018) indicated that articles focusing on education or employment were the least common when compared with articles referring to health and other sectors. It is important, however, to note the limitations of this review, which did not include grey literature. Quality evaluation reports of S4D programmes may have provided some additional findings on education-focused S4D.

Focusing research on some specific areas could strengthen the understanding of how S4D programmes can better achieve outcomes, including educational outcomes. For example, more diverse, quality evidence from low- and middle-income countries can provide a more contextualized understanding of how S4D programming can be designed and delivered in different contexts (Sherry and Schulenkorf, 2016). Moreover, prioritizing the views of children and young people from different backgrounds can also be valuable in improving existing programmes and designing future S4D interventions (Jeanes, 2013). To better understand the outcomes and impacts of S4D programmes, authors point to a need for empirical evidence and the systematic use of longitudinal evaluation research (Sandford et al., 2008). At the same time, there is a need for research and evaluation to be used for local learning rather than for external accountability (Svensson et al., 2016).

Furthermore, research and evaluation in S4D should seek to understand the underlying structural issues that affect the impact of S4D programmes (Mwaanga and Prince, 2016).

3.5 Conclusions and recommendations

Despite the challenges, education-focused S4D programmes can promote educational outcomes as well as other key outcomes that can improve the lives of participants, their families and schools. Several characteristics should be considered by key stakeholders (i.e., programming officers, funders and donors, educators and participants) during the design, implementation and delivery stages of S4D programming. These characteristics are summarized below in a theory of change, which is a preliminary framework to be reviewed, modified and contextualized for future research (see Figure 3.1).
Figure 3.1. Theory of change for education-focused Sport for Development programmes
3.5.1 Recommendations for key stakeholders: Child-focused S4D and education

To strengthen the evidence base on education-focused S4D programmes, the following key recommendations emerge from the findings in this chapter:

- S4D programmes require the organizational capacity to address the needs of participants and the community in the programme. This involves setting the right goals, reflecting both the financial, human and material resources available as well as the expectations of key stakeholders, including participants and educators. Funders and donors should also be mindful of ensuring the right balance between accountability and the contextual needs and conditions with which programmes are working.

- Throughout the design, implementation and delivery of the programming, all key stakeholders should be involved – the voices of children, young people and teachers should be heard to ensure appropriate ownership and contextualization of programming. S4D programmes use various strategies to engage stakeholders, including management committees, community or family forums, and participation in activity days. Furthermore, S4D programmes need to better understand how to maintain positive outcomes using post-programme activities.

- Meaningful activities that give participants and educators the opportunity to engage in problem identification and problem solving can lead to dialogue and critical thinking around the key challenges facing communities. This requires quality educators – whether they are teachers, coaches, trainers or mentors – and their recruitment and training and development are important. Policymakers may want to also explore ways to ensure that physical education can also achieve educational outcomes.

- It is necessary to strengthen the available research tools to better understand how S4D organizations try to achieve educational outcomes (by type of outcome) and also to promote a culture of evidence-informed practice in the field. Longitudinal research should be aligned with practice to assess sustained impacts and effects.
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Annex 3.A. Summary of literature on education and sport [to be completed]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study information</th>
<th>Programme design/delivery method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Study method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What sports were used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What sport model was used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How were sports used/role of sport?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For whom?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results
- Inclusion
- Empowerment
- Education
- Child protection
- Health and well-being
- Other

Sense of belonging
- Increased inclusion
- Change in perceptions
- Emp., self-det., agency

Social capital
- Cultural capital

Skills development
- Engagement
- Mot., init., goal-set.
- Education (general)
- Employment skills
- Security, safe space

Reduced violence; conflict resolution
- Bystander behaviour
- Decreased drug/alcohol use

Health and well-being
- Increased sport/activity
- Psychosocial benefits
- Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Mot. int., goal-set.</td>
<td>Employment skills</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td>Increased sport activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Employment skills</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Health and well-being (general)</td>
<td>Increased psychosocial benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot. int., goal-set.</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment skills</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sport activity</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased psychosocial benefits</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Educational skills</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Psychological benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Introduction: Social inclusion and sport

Sport, being a naturally social activity, is assumed to have many social benefits, one of which is fostering an atmosphere of inclusivity among social groups. But simply getting a group of children and young people from diverse backgrounds to play a sport together may not be enough for social inclusion and integration to emerge. Further exploration of the connection between sport and social inclusion is needed to better understand the mechanisms by which participation in sport is associated with social inclusion of marginalized children and young people.

Better understanding how sport can help achieve social inclusion in communities is particularly important for the work of UNICEF and partners on two fronts. First, UNICEF believes that every child has the right to grow up in a safe and inclusive environment. The Convention on the Rights of the Child (art. 2) states that children and young people have the right to protection from discrimination “irrespective of the child’s or his or her parent’s or legal guardian’s race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status…. activities, expressed opinions, or beliefs of the child’s parents, legal guardians, or family members.” (United Nations General Assembly, 1989).

Second, the SDGs include various target areas that aim to address social inclusion: reduced inequality (SDGs 10 and 5), quality education (SDG 4), no poverty (SDG 1) and sustainable cities and communities (SDG 11). Specifically, activities undertaken to promote the social inclusion of children address issues such as: child poverty; social protection for minorities and children with disabilities; empowerment of children and young people; and gender equality (UNICEF, 2017).

To strengthen and understand the diverse ways in which sport can lead to greater social inclusion, this chapter: (1) defines social inclusion for the purposes of this work and for S4D programming; (2) looks at how sport and social inclusion are linked; and (3) analyses the literature and a sample of current programmes to assess the quality of the available evidence. This third section contains three subsections, each of which asks a critical question: (1) Why is sport important for each dimension of social inclusion? (2) What strategies work in sport for each dimension of social inclusion?; and, finally, (3) What challenges arise when using sport for each dimension of social inclusion? Consideration of challenges and contextual factors is important: To adequately assess the effectiveness of sport as a tool to promote social inclusion, the belief that sport can be used to foster social inclusion in any context as a sort of panacea must first be problematized and debunked. Knowing the limitations of sport for social inclusion will only help to strengthen the design and implementation of S4D programmes.

The final section of the chapter summarizes the findings through an evidence-informed theory of change for social inclusion-focused S4D, and provides recommendations for practitioners, policymakers and research groups. The benefits of sport for social inclusion include: an increased sense of belonging and acceptance; enhancement of knowledge, skills and understanding; social mobility; empowerment; and greater physical participation in social life. Several challenges limit these benefits, however, including: structural inequality within society; cost of and access to sport; a culture of exclusion in mainstream sports; and approaches to diversity. To overcome these challenges, the evidence indicates various successful strategies and processes used in sport for social inclusion, including: team sports; supportive environments; public recognition; adapted sports; subsidized access; child participation approaches; and access to physically safe, convenient and appropriately equipped sports facilities.

As is well-supported by the available evidence, sport can be used as tool to promote the social inclusion of marginalized children and young people as well as to contribute toward achieving the SDGs. Benefits of sport for social inclusion include: an increased sense of belonging and acceptance; enhancement of knowledge, skills and understanding; social mobility; empowerment; and greater physical participation in social life. Several challenges limit these benefits, however, including: structural inequality within society; cost of and access to sport; a culture of exclusion in mainstream sports; and approaches to diversity. To overcome these challenges, the evidence indicates various successful strategies and processes used in sport for social inclusion, including: team sports; supportive environments; public recognition; adapted sports; subsidized access; child participation approaches; and access to physically safe, convenient and appropriately equipped sports facilities.
main messages drawn from the evidence reviewed in this chapter are summarized immediately below.

**Key findings**

- The multidimensional model of social inclusion comprises three dimensions – the relational, the functional and the physical – and can be used to better understand sport for social inclusion.

- Sport for social inclusion is most closely linked to SDG 10: Reduced inequalities, but also to SDG 4: Quality education; SDG 1: No poverty; and SDG 11: Sustainable cities and communities.

- Why is sport important for social inclusion? Benefits of sport for social inclusion include: an increased sense of belonging and acceptance; enhancement of knowledge, skills and understanding; social mobility; empowerment; and greater physical participation in social life.

- What works in sport for social inclusion? Strategies and processes used in sport for social inclusion include: team sports; supportive environments; public recognition; adapted sports; subsidized participation; participatory approaches; and access to physically safe, convenient and appropriately equipped sports facilities.

- Challenges to using sport for social inclusion include: pervasive structural inequality within society; cost of and access to sport; a culture of exclusion in mainstream sports; and approaches to diversity.

- Recommendations for practice: To simultaneously integrate multiple marginalized groups and pre-empt further exclusion, S4D programmes should focus on dimensions of social inclusion rather than on specific target groups.

- Recommendations for policy: Policymakers should ensure that functional and physical approaches to social inclusion are prioritized as well as relational approaches.

- Recommendations for research: Researchers should conduct more and better quality studies on what works and what does not work when using sport as a tool to promote relational, functional and physical social inclusion.

### 4.2 What is social inclusion in the context of S4D?

Social inclusion refers to addressing the marginalization of groups based on ethnicity, migrant/refugee status, physical or mental disability, gender, socio-economic status, sexual orientation or other status. These types of categories are often used in the literature to organize information on social inclusion, and many sport for social inclusion programmes tend to focus on the inclusion of specific target groups, for example, martial arts for girls, football for disadvantaged young people, or rugby for children and young people with disabilities (Corazza and Dyer, 2017; Hayhurst, 2014; Spaaij, 2013). Thinking about social inclusion instead as a multidimensional concept can result in an approach that has a broader scope, with the potential to simultaneously benefit multiple marginalized groups; an approach that focuses too narrowly on targeted groups can actually have the unintended opposite effect of perpetuating exclusion (Kelly, 2011; Block and Gibbs, 2017; Collison, Darnell, Guilianotti and Howe, 2017; Collins and Haudenhuyse, 2015).

Social inclusion in its multidimensional form (Bailey, 2005; Collison et al., 2017) is applied in this review. Adapted from Bailey (2005), this model focuses on three key dimensions:

- **relational dimension of social inclusion** – which pertains to ensuring “a sense of belonging and acceptance” (p. xx) through interactions with peers or other social groups, which can in turn shape attitudes and behaviours as well as support the development of social networks that can increase social capital.

- **functional dimension of social inclusion** – which encompasses the improvement of skills, equity and power.

- **physical social inclusion** – a new addition, which refers to the availability and suitability of safe spaces for...
marginalized groups to convene, interact and participate in social life, and also to address the physical needs or preferences of marginalized children and young people.

Applying a multidimensional model of social inclusion to the way in which sport is used to achieve social inclusion leads to a more nuanced interpretation of how place and conditions, and people and relationships factor into the achievement of socially inclusive outcomes. Such considerations have important implications for theories of change in, as well as implementation of, policy and practice.

4.3 How are sport and social inclusion linked?

Using the multidimensional model of social inclusion ensures that the relationship between sport and social inclusion is not limited to specific groups, but instead provides a basis by which to understand the strategies that work and what is key for multiple groups. For example:

- Sport programmes that address the relational dimension of social inclusion will likely facilitate expanded social networks and increased social capital for persons with disabilities, ethnic minorities, migrants and refugees, for example, through team sport (Block and Gibbs, 2017; Cockburn, 2017; Corazza and Dyer, 2017; Hayhurst, Giles and Radforth, 2015; Kelly, 2011; Rossi, De Alencar, Rossi and Pereira, 2014).

- Research suggests that through increased participation in sport, members of marginalized groups experience relational social inclusion (Grandisson, Tétreault and Freeman, 2012; Hancock, Cooper and Bahn, 2009; Kelly, 2011). Sport settings where this occurred include, for example, a youth project for culturally and linguistically diverse young people (especially those of African origin or refugee status) in Western Australia (Hancock et al., 2009); a rehabilitation centre for young people with intellectual disabilities (Grandisson et al., 2012); and the Positive Futures programme for young people from disadvantaged communities in the United Kingdom (Kelly, 2011). The specific psychosocial benefits that are associated with experiences of relational social inclusion in and through sports include feeling a greater sense of belonging to communities, increased social capital and the development of a positive sense of self or identity (Cárdenas, 2012; Cooper and Bahn, 2009; De Martini Ugolotti, 2015; Hancock et al., 2009; Spaaij, 2015; Toomey and Russell, 2013). In addition, members of the dominant group also experience a change in perceptions about persons from marginalized groups that challenges stereotypical or prejudicial ideas (Corazza and Dyer, 2017; Devine et al., 2017; Galily, Leitner and Shimon, 2013; Grandisson et al., 2012; Lyras, 2012; McConkey, Dowling, Hassan and Menke, 2013).

- Sport programmes that address the functional dimension of social inclusion can do so by: (1) focusing on skills through services that provide education, employment and capacity building to disadvantaged individuals and communities (Rossi et al., 2014) (see chapter 3); (2) reducing socio-economic inequality faced by disadvantaged children and young people and young girls, for example, by providing opportunities for social mobility (Spaaij, 2013); or (3) focusing on empowerment and participation in decision-making, for example, among young girls and persons with disabilities (Collison et al., 2017; Devine et al., 2017; Hayhurst et al., 2015). (See also chapter 6.)

- Sport programmes that address the physical dimension of social inclusion are likely to pay attention to details such as perceptions of suitability, convenience and safety of sporting locations for marginalized groups like young girls and GSM children and young people, as well as to providing access to appropriate physical environments and/or adapting sporting rules to physical adaptations (Palmer, 2009; Roult, Brunet, Belley-Ranger, Carbonneau and Fortier, 2015).

Moreover, sport for social inclusion (i.e., the use of sport to promote social inclusion) is defined through a broad conceptualization that encompasses both inclusion in sport and through sport (Collins and Haudenhuyse, 2015). Inclusion in sport refers to the aim of increasing sports participation among under-represented groups, e.g., persons with disabilities, young girls, the disadvantaged, and GSM children and young people. Meanwhile, inclusion through sport refers to the aim of addressing
wider social, economic and political inequalities as well as issues of prejudice and discrimination such as those faced by ethnic minorities, migrants and refugees. The two concepts are related. To achieve inclusion through sports, there must first be inclusion in sports for marginalized groups.

### 4.4 What does the evidence say?

Most of the 38 studies included in the review of evidence for this chapter relate to programmes and populations located in Western countries, e.g., Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States (for full details, see Annex 4A). A much smaller number of studies were located in Africa and South America, and at least one in the Middle East. Most studies (68 per cent) included in this chapter used qualitative methods, with a smaller proportion using quantitative methods (24 per cent) or a mixed methods approach (8 per cent). Research on specific sport programmes comprised approximately 61 per cent of the studies included. The marginalized groups targeted by these programmes and interventions were: ethnic minorities, migrants and refugees (6 studies); persons with disabilities (3); disadvantaged young people (7); and young girls (7). No sport interventions in the literature focused specifically on GSM children and young people. In addition, although the sport-sport model was common to many of the articles reviewed, intervention research was more likely than non-intervention research to use the sport-plus model (10 studies) or plus-sport model (4) (see Table 4.1). In the following sections, the results of the literature review are dealt with in the order of relational, functional and, finally, physical social inclusion.

#### Table 4.1. Summary of outcomes, strategies/processes and challenges associated with for sport and social inclusion interventions in the literature, across the dimensions of social inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of social inclusion</th>
<th>Marginalized groups mentioned in literature</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Strategies and processes</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Sense of belonging; mutual respect; trusting relationships; social capital; positive identity; changes in others’ perceptions</td>
<td>Sport-sport model; team sports; supportive environment; norm-challenging sports; public recognition</td>
<td>Sport culture; approaches to diversity; structural inequality; cost of and access to sport; location features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Young girls; disadvantaged young people</td>
<td>Education; employability skills and training</td>
<td>Sport-plus model; capacity building; participatory approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Persons with disabilities; young girls; disadvantaged young people</td>
<td>Increased equity in access; social mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Persons with disabilities; young girls</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Persons with disabilities; young girls</td>
<td>Increased active participation in social life</td>
<td>Sport-sport model; adapted sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1 Sport and relational social inclusion

Relational social inclusion is defined as “a sense of belonging and acceptance” (Bailey, 2005) and is one of the most well-studied phenomena across all marginalized groups. This section asks why sport is important for relational social inclusion, how it works in this regard and what could stop sport from influencing this outcome. (For a summary of the key findings, see Figure 4.1.)

4.4.1.1 Why is sport important for relational social inclusion?

To develop a sense of belonging

Feeling a sense of belonging is a key prerequisite to marginalized groups’ experiences of relational social inclusion (Cárdenas, 2012; Cooper and Bahn, 2009; De Martini Ugolotti, 2015; Hancock et al., 2009; Spaaij, 2015; Toomey and Russell, 2013). This is often in stark contrast to the everyday experiences of prejudice, discrimination and exclusion that marginalized children and young people encounter. Research on a programme for Somali refugees in Australia found that, in some cases, mono-ethnic community sports clubs offered a greater sense of belonging than multi-ethnic clubs, with respondents suggesting that being among others who had had similar experiences helped the adjustment process (Spaaij, 2015). ‘Belonging’ proved to be a gendered process, however, meaning that Somali girls and women in the programme were not afforded the same level of social inclusion through sports as boys and men due to traditional gender roles and social norms or expectations regarding the (in)appropriateness of sports participation by females (Spaaij, 2015). In general, there were fewer opportunities for women and girls to participate in sports through local sports clubs, though multicultural clubs in the community offered a few options for women-only sport.

In comparison, research on migrant males (mainly from Africa) in Turin, Italy, found that recreational practice of parkour and capoeira in public places helped young people to craft narratives of belonging (De Martini Ugolotti, 2015). Similarly, at the Golos por la Paz programme in Ciudad Bolívar, Colombia, a sense of belonging and purpose contributed to disadvantaged young people’s relational social inclusion and their ability...
to coexist and interact peacefully with others (Cárdenas, 2012). In addition, GSM young people’s participation in sport was associated with increased academic belonging at school (Toomey and Russell, 2013).

To encourage mutual respect

Principles of good sportsmanship that encourage mutual respect among teammates and competitors help to create a supportive sporting environment conducive to relational social inclusion (Cárdenas, 2012; Collins and Haudenhuyse, 2015; Morgan and Parker, 2017; Spaaij, 2013). Marginalized children and young people may not be shown the same level of respect as others, which can lead to experiences of social exclusion or lack of acceptance. Research suggests that part of the unique contribution that sport can make toward instilling values of mutual respect among disadvantaged young people may come from, for example, coaches’ influence and opportunities to develop teamwork skills, as in the UK Positive Futures programme (Collins and Haudenhuyse, 2015). Specifically, when the values of trust, respect and recognition are a prominent part of coaches’ relationships with young people, this can help to compensate for some of the disadvantages that young people face and motivate them to push harder to develop their skills – not just in sport, but also in other areas of their lives (Morgan and Parker, 2017). At the Goles por la Paz football programme for disadvantaged young people – both in Ciudad Bolívar and in Bais city, Philippines – moral values such as good sportsmanship and respect for others were instilled, for example, through creating an agreed upon set of rules for cordial communication. As Cárdenas (2012), reports: “The children were committed to these rules and succeeded in doing so.” Furthermore, at the Vencer programme in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, mutual respect among teams and teamwork were among some of the core values that contributed to disadvantaged young people’s increased employability, demonstrating one way in which relational social inclusion can potentially lead to improvement in functional social inclusion (Spaaij, 2013).

To engender trusting relationships

Sport provides an environment in which trusting relationships can be built among team members, creating an atmosphere of acceptance and cohesion (Gailly et al., 2013; Lyras, 2012; Olliff, 2008; Spaaij, 2015). A cohesive society depends on trust among various groups, but due to prejudice, discrimination and inter-group conflict, marginalized children and young people may find it difficult to trust, and to gain trust from, other members of society. Research suggests, however, that, specifically in the case of historic conflicts between ethnic minority and majority groups, sport can help to build trusting relationships. For example, at Mifalot’s Know Your Neighbor football programme in Israel, Palestinian and Jordanian children reported lower levels of mistrust and hatred of Jewish persons after one year of participating in the programme (Gailly et al., 2013). Similarly, research on the Doves Olympic Movement Summer Camp found that Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot children reported greater cross-cultural interactions, friendships and collaborations following a residential stay during the six-day sports camp (Lyras, 2012). Sport was also seen as a realm of social participation that can transcend deep-seated clan boundaries among Somali/Somali-Australian participants when teams comprise team members from multiple clans (Spaaij, 2015). Research by the Centre for Multicultural Youth in Australia also found that refugee and migrant young people considered sport a site for building trust, but that this depended on the culturally sensitive delivery of sport interventions (Olliff, 2008).

In other cases of marginalization not related to ethnicity, being able to build trusting relationships contributes positively to the perception of social inclusion (Cárdenas, 2012; McConkey et al., 2013; Super, Wentink, Verkooijen and Koelen, 2017). For example, in the Special Olympics Youth Unified Sports programme, friendship bonds between persons with and without disabilities was a major social inclusion outcome: “Unified Sports offered the opportunity for inclusive and equal bonds to be forged among the two sets of participants [athletes with disabilities and partners without disabilities] that extended into friendships beyond the playing field. When these bonds were absent, there was less evidence of mutual participation in community settings.” (McConkey et al., 2013, p. 930).

Trust relationships with coaches and peers also made significant contributions to the creation of supportive atmospheres and positive experiences for disadvantaged young people at local sports clubs sponsored by the Youth Sports Fund in the Netherlands (Super et al.,
Similarly, young boys in the Goles por la Paz football programme in the Philippines experienced positive peer relationships and friendships because of their participation (Cárdenas, 2012).

To build social capital

Being part of a sports team, club or association can contribute to relational social inclusion through increased social capital (Block and Gibbs, 2017; Cockburn, 2017; Corazza and Dyer, 2017; Hayhurst et al., 2015; Kelly, 2011; Rossi et al., 2014). Since Putnam’s (2001) seminal work Bowling Alone – which, coincidentally, uses a sports analogy – social capital has become a go-to concept in the study of civic/socio-political development and social relationships. As a result, many studies reviewed for this chapter on social inclusion focused on the links between sports participation and increased social capital.³

Research suggests that the ability to form bonds, linkages and bridges with similar and dissimilar others in the community and in wider society tends to increase feelings of belonging and inclusion (Block and Gibbs, 2017; Cockburn, 2017; Hayhurst et al., 2015) (see Box 4.1). For example, young British Pakistani boys in multi-ethnic neighbourhood cricket and football clubs in the North of England acted as bridge-builders by facilitating interactions and connections between themselves and other children from diverse backgrounds, playing an active role in their own development of social capital (Cockburn, 2017). Additionally, young people with disabilities who played on mixed ability rugby teams, such as Chivasso Rugby in Italy and Bumble Bees Rugby Football Club in the United Kingdom, gained increased social capital through expanded social networks (Corazza and Dyer, 2017). Although mixed teams figure prominently in the research on sport and social inclusion, some research suggests that bonding social capital (e.g., gained through participation in mono-ethnic teams, which are perceived as exclusionary in nature) could, in some cases, act as a prerequisite for establishing linking and bridging social capital (e.g., acquired through integration with multi-ethnic or mainstream teams) among refugee young people (Block and Gibbs, 2017).

³ The idea of social capital is based on the premise that networks of people and norms of reciprocity between people in networks has value (Putnam, 2001). In this way, social capital is related to concepts of trusting relationships, mutual respect and sense of belonging. Too often, however, social capital is used as an all-encompassing term that can lose its distinctive meaning. In this chapter, social capital is defined using Putnam’s conceptualization of reciprocal social networks.

To address crime and delinquency

To address the issues of crime and delinquency, the Positive Futures programme in the United Kingdom increased disadvantaged young people’s social capital by encouraging community participation (Kelly, 2011). Similarly, the Segundo Tempo programme for disadvantaged young people in Bahia, Brazil, found that participants benefited most from socialization opportunities with peers and adults from the community (in addition to health and education) (Rossi et al., 2014). Moreover, female participants of the Because We’re Girls group at an indigenous community sport programme in Vancouver, Canada, demonstrated increased linking social capital and expanded support networks (Hayhurst et al., 2015).

To develop positive identities as well as to change perceptions

Sport can contribute to both improving how members of marginalized groups view themselves, as they develop a more positive identity, and also encourage a change in others’ perceptions of marginalized groups. In the face of prejudice and discrimination, it can be difficult for marginalized young people to feel good about themselves and see their marginalized identities in a positive light, which can in turn lead to feelings of exclusion (Cárdenas, 2012; Cockburn, 2017; Corazza and Dyer, 2017; De Martini Ugolotti, 2015; Devine et al., 2017; Grandisson et al., 2012; Meyer and Roche, 2017; Morgan and Parker, 2017; Rout et al., 2015; Spaaij, 2015; Super et al., 2017).

Participation and inclusion in sports can help marginalized young people to construct more positive narratives about themselves and their communities. For example:

- Young people with disabilities participating in Mixed Ability sports, Unified Sports or integrated sports showed increased self-confidence, self-esteem and self-worth, as well as increased pride and enjoyment (Corazza and Dyer, 2017; Devine et al., 2017; Gally et al., 2013; Grandisson et al., 2012; Lyras, 2012; Rout et al., 2015).
Box 4.1. Barça Foundation: Embedding social inclusion in the local context

Created in 1994, the Barça Foundation works with over 300,000 children annually in their three key programmes - FutbolNet, Bullying and Emotional pediatric well-being (Bienestar Emocional Pediátrico) – which focus on education, social inclusion and violence prevention.

Among the Barça Foundation’s efforts to improve the lives of vulnerable children is its FutbolNet Methodology, a sports-based social intervention which annually benefits more than 120,000 children around the world. The programmes in Greece, Italy, Lebanon and Spain have reached more than 22,000 refugee children and trained more than 191 educators since 2016. While FutbolNet’s design addresses all four key outcome areas discussed in this report, social inclusion is perhaps the most visible. FutbolNet aims to increase participation in inclusive and adapted recreational sports, develop inclusiveness, promote the active participation of children with different abilities, foster inclusion between refugees and host communities, and improve social educators’ skills in using sport as a teaching tool. To do this, it employs specific rules: participants must solve disputes, as there is no referee; teams must comprise participants of different genders, disability status, origins and skill levels; and all must be encouraged to take part in the game.

The Barça Foundation gives considerable attention to community contexts. It focuses on tailoring its goals for child and family participation, its activities and its M&E tools and processes to the context in which the initiative is being implemented. Barça Foundation collaborates with the implementing body at each site to choose the most suitable approach based on the characteristics of the specific participants and educators. Each implementation site has context-specific outcomes to which FutbolNet may contribute. Barça Foundation also acknowledges that specific training needs should be identified for each implementation site and that these should be answered with contextualized specialist training for FutbolNet educators.

While FutbolNet methodology pays particular attention to social inclusion, both this initiative and Barça Foundation itself are also focused on other outcomes for children, including child protection. Barça Lassa, FC Barcelona’s basketball team, has partnered with UNICEF in the initiative Child Sexual Abuse Stays Offside. This initiative is financed and promoted by the Spanish High Council for Sport with Fundación Deporte Joven in collaboration with the Spanish National Committee for UNICEF, which together developed a series of manuals for safeguarding young athletes against abuse. Again, contextualization played an important role in adapting the guides for teachers, coaches and other professional personnel and for various age groups. Barça Lassa promoted the initiative during one match and a press conference, and a training session on child protection is to be organized for FC Barcelona’s own professional trainers, among other activities.
Young people from disadvantaged communities participating in sport programmes reported an increased sense of purpose, greater confidence and high levels of engagement even when sports were challenging (Cárdenas, 2012; Morgan and Parker, 2017; Super et al., 2017).

Research on refugee, ethnic minority and indigenous young people participating in community sports showed that young people were able to construct hybridized bicultural ethnic identities, “creating spaces of recognition within excluding spaces”, and were also able to build their sense of self-worth and resilience through engaging in challenging activities, in addition to developing a sense of pride in both themselves and their community (Cockburn, 2017; De Martini Ugolotti, 2015; Peralta and Cinelli, 2016; Spaaij, 2015).

Yet, while a sport programme for young girls in Senegal that was geared toward promoting gender equality resulted in girls having more positive attitudes about themselves, it had the opposite effect on boys in the programme, whose negative gender attitudes increased (Meyer and Roche, 2017). These contrasting outcomes underline the need to also consider, and influence, the perceptions of others when using sport for social inclusion.

Negative stereotypes about marginalized children and young people can lead to feelings of exclusion. Sport can help to address these negative stereotypes, though often only to a limited degree. This is seen in the case of persons with disabilities, whose participation in Mixed Ability sports and Unified Sports challenged assumptions about ability and attitudes toward disability held by their non-disabled peers, parents and communities, in turn leading to greater integration of persons with disabilities in sports, schools and communities (Corazza and Dyer, 2017; Devine et al., 2017; Grandisson et al., 2012; McConkey et al., 2013). Research also showed that, through participation in sports, tolerance and openness to diversity increased between Israeli and Palestinian children and young people, as well as between Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot children and young people (Galily et al., 2013; Lyras, 2012).

Such benefits may be short-lived, however. For example, even though young British Pakistani boys had taken the lead in integrating with their white peers on a multi-ethnic cricket team (Cockburn, 2017), this integration did not transfer to other contexts off the sports field (e.g., the boys did not maintain interracial friendships in school, not even with the same children with whom they played cricket).

There is also the question of who needs a change in attitude in the first place. One study showed that when a programme dealt with instances of discrimination by sanctioning only the marginalized players – by punishing them for retaliation, but not punishing those responsible for the original offence itself – they faced inevitable challenges in achieving a truly inclusive atmosphere (Jeanes, O’Connor and Alfrey, 2015).

Accordingly, and importantly, it should be acknowledged that while efforts around sport for relational social inclusion present many benefits for marginalized young people, they can also have the unintended negative effect of increasing their risk and exposure to social exclusion (Jeanes et al., 2015).

4.4.1.2 Which processes work when using sport to promote relational social inclusion?

While the literature included a lot of information about the benefits of sport for relational social inclusion, there was less information about the strategies and processes employed to achieve results. Nevertheless, among the research that focused on outcomes associated with relational social inclusion, a pattern was noted in terms of the typical programme model and types of sports used.

**Sport-sport models and team sports**

To promote relational social inclusion, sport programmes tended to follow a sport-sport model that involved team sports, supportive environments and public recognition (Corazza and Dyer, 2017; De Martini Ugolotti, 2015; Morgan and Parker, 2017). The prevalence of sport-sport models and team sports in the research suggests an emphasis on the use of sport itself as a tool for relational social inclusion, without necessarily relying on either supplementary activities or instruction about how to get along with one another. Common team sports mentioned in the literature on relational social inclusion were football, rugby, basketball, cricket, etc. Individual
sports such as martial arts contributed toward relational social inclusion as well, however, especially if they were practised as a group (Hayhurst, 2014).

**Building supportive environments**

Supportive environments also played a key role in promoting relational social inclusion. Such environments encompassed supportive relationships among peers, coaches/teachers and young people, but also between young people and their parents, and young people and the wider community. The supportive environment was key to increasing social capital, sense of belonging, mutual respect, trusting relationships and positive identity, and to changing perceptions of others (Hayhurst et al., 2015; Olliff, 2008; Oxford, 2017; Spaaij, 2013). There is little instruction, however, on how to create these supportive sport environments.

One study suggested that the use of multicultural staff was key to building supportive environments when working with children and young people marginalized because of their ethnicity or nationality (migrant/refugee status) (Block and Gibbs, 2017). Another study emphasized the use of trained professionals knowledgeable on developmental science regarding persons with disabilities (Grandisson et al., 2012). A further study referred to the use of mentors and volunteers from the same community as the marginalized young people (Collins and Haudenhuyse, 2015). The pattern that emerges from these examples suggests that the personnel designated responsible for implementing the programme are crucial to the successful use of sport as a tool to promote relational social inclusion – which makes intuitive sense, since relationships depend on the connections and bonds between the persons involved. No studies reviewed on sport for relational social inclusion effectively tested the validity of this assumption, however. Nevertheless, a body of research on the importance of motivational climates in sport contexts for children and young people has been tied to positive experiences and psychological outcomes such as autonomy support, self-determination and goal orientations (e.g., Reinboth and Duda, 2006), though it has not yet been linked to the issue of relational social inclusion. Hence there is room for further investigation into the connection between supportive and motivational sport climates and relational social inclusion.

**Public recognition of participation and skills**

Public recognition of sports participation, and sports skills or triumphs, can help to boost the public profile and perceptions of marginalized groups and, in turn, enable members of marginalized groups to develop more positive self-perception and feelings of belonging (Corazza and Dyer, 2017; De Martini Ugolotti, 2015; Morgan and Parker, 2017). This makes sense because public recognition represents a form of symbolic acceptance and belonging. Also, the very nature of being considered part of a marginalized group confers a degree of invisibility, since marginalization relegates individuals to the fringes of mainstream society. It is likely, however, that public recognition that takes the form of tokenism will be less effective than genuine recognition based on demonstrated skills and merit.

**4.4.1.3 Challenges and barriers to sport for relational social inclusion**

**The culture of sports**

Despite a tendency to depoliticize sport as a value-free form of social engagement, sport is a cultural product and, as a result, carries the value ascribed to it by the culture in which it is produced. For example, the literature reviewed for this chapter show that the mainstream sports culture, as well as the dominant messages about masculinity, ethnocentrism, ableism and elitism that get played out on a larger national or global scale, also affect the adoption of sport as a resource for social inclusion (Block and Gibbs, 2017; Corazza and Dyer, 2017; Devine et al., 2017; Hancock et al., 2009; Jeanes et al., 2015; Olliff, 2008; Rosso and McGrath, 2016; Spencer-Cavaliere, Thai and Kingsley, 2017).

If, on a national scale, a sport such as football or rugby is not seen as inclusive of marginalized groups – whether marginalized on the basis of ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation or ability – then it will be difficult to bridge the gap between these marginalized groups and mainstream society, even if inclusion attempts enjoy some local success (Corazza and Dyer, 2017). In addition, some examples in the literature from Australia highlighted tensions between how mainstream society values elite sports and how marginalized groups are perceived in such contexts.
sports clubs and professional sports teams, and the more informal unstructured ‘pick-up’ games that are common to the local context of marginalized communities (Block and Gibbs, 2017; Hancock et al., 2009; Jeanes et al., 2015; Olliff, 2008; Rosso and McGrath, 2016). For example, if the local grassroots context values unstructured games but mainstream society attempts to foster social inclusion by focusing on integration into elite sports clubs, participation rates and opportunities for inter-group interaction will be low. Furthermore, research on practitioners working in inclusive programmes for persons with disabilities has questioned whether inclusion in mainstream sports should be the main goal, as this would in practice limit the participation of some young athletes due to the perception that adapted sports were therefore somehow ‘less than’ regular sports (Devine et al., 2017; Spencer-Cavaliere et al., 2017).

A culture of masculinization
There is also the larger issue of the masculinization of sport. Previously, many scholars have contended that sport is perceived as a masculine form of socialization, which not only detracts from its utility as an intervention for social inclusion, but also makes it inherently exclusive (Anderson, 2011; Elling and Janssens, 2009; Hekma, 1998; Lenskyj, 1994; Shang, Liao and Gill, 2012). The literature shows that this dampening effect was true for various marginalized groups but especially for young girls (including those at the intersection of ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities and the socio-economically disadvantaged) and for GSM children and young people.

Numerous examples from the literature review detailed the ways in which the masculinization of sport contributed to the exclusion of girls via a fear of losing their feminine appeal – including the fear of being stigmatized as a lesbian, and the perception of sports as an unsafe and/or unnecessary distraction from more traditional gender roles in the household (Collison et al., 2017; Hancock, Lyras and Ha, 2013; Hayhurst, 2014; Hayhurst et al., 2015; Meyer and Roche, 2017; Oxford, 2017). Even when female players were upheld as sports role models, this was met with scepticism, as detailed in a study on the Football for Social Impact programme in Rwanda: “the idea of replicating the skills of a female footballer was uncomfortable for some and during one discussion she [former Nigerian female footballer Perpetua Nkwocha] was compared to ‘looking like and playing like a man’.” (Collison et al., 2017, p. 229). This discomfort was used, however, as a basis for debating and challenging traditional gender roles.

The exclusion of GSM children and young people from sports is a prominent issue and was well documented in the literature reviewed. In fact, only one study proposed benefits of sport for social inclusion (e.g., academic performance and school belonging) for marginalized GSM children and young people (Toomey and Russell, 2013). A much more common theme was the exclusion, stigmatization and lack of acceptance faced by this group (Calzo et al., 2014; Meresh and Poteat, 2015; Osborne and Wagner, 2007; Sartore and Cunningham, 2009; Zipp, 2011). Research suggests that lower participation in sports and physical activity by both female and male GSM children and young people is due to the perception that these spaces are seen as intolerant of gender non-conformity and as hindering positive self-perception among GSM children and young people, thus leading to experiences of exclusion (Calzo et al., 2014). Sports were also seen as more suitable for GSM females – which may in part be explained by stereotypically ascribed masculine characteristics – but were seen as less suitable for GSM males, for opposite reasons (Zipp, 2011).

Other researchers found that male students who participated in mainstream sports (e.g., American football, basketball, baseball) were more inclined than other male students to exhibit homophobia/prejudice and discrimination against GSM peers. Conversely, female students who mainly participated in extra-curricular activities that fall outside of core sports were less likely than other female students to have homophobic attitudes (Osborne and Wagner, 2007). Even parents demonstrated unwillingness to let their child/young people participate in some sports, which was associated with prejudicial and discriminatory views about GSM coaches (Sartore and Cunningham, 2009). Experiences of victimization were associated with disparities in sports participation and physical activity among GSM boys and heterosexual boys, while disparities in sports participation and physical activity
between GSM girls and heterosexual girls were related to higher rates of obesity among GSM children and young people as a whole (Mereish and Poteat, 2015). These results highlight the potential mental and physical health risks associated with the exclusion from sports of GSM children and young people.

Much of the research reviewed on social exclusion from sports of GSM children and young people came from nationally or regionally representative survey data in the United States. On one hand, this speaks to the veracity of the results and the implications for marginalized GSM children and young people; on the other hand, it shows that this issue is not on the radar of other countries, perhaps especially developing countries. Moreover, none of this research drew from sport programmes, which could suggest that the issue of social inclusion of GSM children and young people in sports is also possibly being ignored by S4D programmes in general.

**Cultural differences and approaches to diversity**

Cultural differences in gender norms, family values and the socialization of children and young people have implications for the effectiveness of sport as a means of fostering social inclusion. The literature reviewed shows that cultural differences in these issues can constrain participation in sports in terms of whether girls are allowed to participate (as previously discussed), whether family obligations overrule leisure time interests, and whether sport is considered something that positively contributes to child development – as opposed to academic studies or other less physical activities (Block and Gibbs, 2017; Collison et al., 2017; Oxford, 2017). In addition, the literature review shows that responses to such challenges around cultural differences can take one of two forms: (1) top-down efforts by mainstream organizations to inculcate solidarity among individuals from marginalized groups through assimilation (Ekholm and Dahlstedt, 2017); or (2) bottom-up attempts by individuals from marginalized groups to navigate bicultural identities through hybridization, blending traditional and new cultures (Cockburn, 2017; Spaaij, 2015). Efforts at assimilation could result in greater social exclusion rather than inclusion, however, and individual attempts at hybridization may only be successful in increasing inclusivity if valued in mainstream sports or at a national cultural level.

Alternatives to multiculturalism such as polyculturalism and interculturalism ask some different questions about cultural diversity, which may provide some useful insight. For example, instead of explicitly discouraging mono-ethnic teams – as was the case in the example of one Australian sport programme (Jeannes et al., 2015) – a sport programme taking a polycultural approach (Morris, Chui and Liu, 2015) would assume that individuals can be part of both mono-ethnic and multi-ethnic teams simultaneously, while a sport programme taking an intercultural approach would seek to foster “a very diverse repertoire of physical cultural activities” (Nakamura and Donnelly, 2017, p. 115). Thus, when seeking to increase relational social inclusion through sport, it is important to think about the implications of adopting one specific approach to diversity over another.

**Summary**

The challenges to sport for relational social inclusion are almost as substantial as the benefits cited in the literature. It is possible that relational social inclusion is a common target of sport for social inclusion programmes because of its perceived apolitical orientation and cost-effectiveness – all that is required is to get a group of children and young people from diverse backgrounds to play sport together and create an inclusive atmosphere. The literature reviewed on sport for relational social inclusion paints a much more complex picture, however. Principally, the literature review demonstrates that the benefits that arise out of participation in sport for relational social inclusion are mainly at the individual and relational level and may not always extend beyond the sports field or influence the community or wider society. Furthermore, while a lot is known about the benefits (why sport is important for relational social inclusion) and, to some extent, the challenges (what does not work in sport for relational social inclusion), not enough is known about the strategies and processes used for its successful implementation (what works in sport for relational social inclusion). As a result, it may prove difficult to scale up programmes and replicate the positive benefits associated with sport for relational social inclusion until more is known about what works across different sporting contexts.
4.4.2 Sport and functional social inclusion

Functional social inclusion was also a popular dimension of social inclusion for research, but to varying degrees. While most research that examined functional social inclusion tended to focus on skill enhancement (e.g., Collins and Haudenhuys, 2015; Ekholm and Dahlstedt, 2017; Hancock et al., 2009; Olliff, 2008; Grandisson et al., 2012; McConkey et al., 2013; Morgan and Parker, 2017) only a smaller fraction of these studies went a step further to discuss the use of increased skills as a stepping stone toward addressing issues of equity and power (Collison et al., 2017; Devine et al., 2017; Hayhurst et al., 2015; Spaaij, 2013). As will be discussed in greater detail in the subsection on challenges, the tendency of sport for social inclusion programmes to focus on improving the individual skills of children and young people from marginalized groups implies a compromise in terms of the extent to which the bigger issues responsible for social exclusion (e.g., structural inequality) can be effectively addressed (Kelly, 2011). This section asks why sport is important for functional social inclusion, how it works in this regard and what could stop sport from influencing this outcome. (For a summary of the key findings, see Figure 4.2.)

4.4.2.1 Why is sport important for functional social inclusion?

A gateway to education and employment services

Sport can sometimes be used as a ‘gateway’ or entry point for participants to join programmes that offer education and employment training (Ekholm and Dahlstedt, 2017; Grandisson et al., 2012; Hayhurst, 2014; Kelly, 2011; Meyer and Roche, 2017; Olliff, 2008; Peralta and Cinelli, 2016; Rossi et al., 2014; Rosso and McGrath, 2016; Spaaij, 2013). The skill enhancement approach to sport for functional social inclusion assumes that marginalized groups are excluded from society because they lack the necessary skills to function as responsible citizens. Hence the provision of education and training should enhance social inclusion. This is an example of a deficit model perspective, and it is problematic because it assumes that the problem lies with deficits in the child or...
young person rather than with the structural inequality that gives rise to disparities in education and employability in the first place (Kelly, 2011). Individual young people are nevertheless likely to still benefit from the additional skills training provided by sport for functional social inclusion programmes – but the structural inequality will remain.

For example, in the state of South Australia, a pilot project based on the Football United (FUn) programme was successful in promoting the health, education and empowerment of culturally and linguistically diverse young people and communities through sport (Rosso and McGrath, 2016). A programme geared toward assimilation of minority young people into Swedish culture focused on the improvement of social and language skills to build solidarity (Collison et al., 2017; Ekholm and Dahlstedt, 2017). Another programme in Australia, for multicultural young people, resulted in improved language acquisition and life skills for recent migrant or refugee arrivals, and also provided opportunities for capacity building by providing professional training for workers drawn from the community (Olliff, 2008). A community programme for Aboriginal young people in the Northern Territory of Australia implemented culturally appropriate education and employment skills sessions, which facilitated cultural learning and had a positive effect on school attendance (Peralta and Cinelli, 2016). Through participation in a sport programme run by a rehabilitation centre in Canada, persons with disabilities were able to develop their abilities – not just socially, but also in terms of improvement in motor and cognitive skills – and a general sense of independence (Grandisson et al., 2012). And through participation in the Segundo Tempo programme in Bahia, Brazil, young people reportedly gained education and citizenship skills (Rossi et al., 2014).

The Positive Futures programme for disadvantaged young people in the United Kingdom gave young people a pathway to work by providing educational and employment opportunities for individual young people (Kelly, 2011). Similarly, another group of sport programmes for disadvantaged young people in UK cities (including Sporting Youth and Get Sport) provided education, training and employment opportunities to participants, along with instruction in boxing, football and other sports. Meanwhile, the Vencer sport programme in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, helped young people participants to find jobs (Spaaij, 2013). Two S4D programmes in Jamaica also helped to build young people’s citizenship skills (reduce antisocial behaviour), while an NGO-led S4D programme for ethnic minority young people in Kosovo helped to train young people sport volunteers in the hope of increasing their employability (Collison et al., 2017). Through participation in a programme focused on social entrepreneurship run by sports-based NGO in Winiti district, Uganda, girls gained entrepreneurial skills and increased their employability and economic independence by learning to become martial arts coaches (Hayhurst, 2014). In the Live, Learn and Play programme in Senegal, girls participated in workshops that increased their life skills and citizenship skills, in addition to playing basketball (Meyer and Roche, 2017).

Providing equity in access to sport, and social mobility

Sport for social inclusion is also expected, however, to address bigger issues such as equality in and through sport. In a previous review of S4D programmes around the world, Hancock et al. (2013) found that social inclusion, “e.g., equality, breaking down stereotypes, accessibility, citizenship”, was a common goal. Yet, in the literature reviewed for this chapter, there were only a few examples of sport for functional social inclusion programmes resulting in greater equity in and through sports. In fact, equity was more likely to be reported as a challenge or area in need of improvement rather than as an actual outcome or benefit.

Equity in sport refers to rectifying the exclusion from mainstream sports culture of some marginalized groups – whether because of gender norms, stereotypes associated with ableism, or disadvantage due to low socio-economic status – by increasing access to sporting opportunities. The literature reported a few programmes providing broader access for migrant and refugee young people to health benefits associated with sport (Rosso and McGrath, 2016); facilitating the acculturation of migrant and refugee young people by

---

4 All references to Kosovo in this report should be understood to be in the context of United Nations Security Council resolution 1244 (1999).
providing increased access to information and transitional support (Olliff, 2008); or ‘democratizing access’ to sport in schools and public areas for disadvantaged young people in Brazil through a municipal government programme (Rossi et al., 2014).

Equity through sport refers to using sport as a stepping stone for gaining practical and social skills that enable social mobility to transcend a marginalized status. Only one programme, the Vencer programme in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, reported that some young people were able to improve their upward social mobility through increased education and employability, though these effects were not widespread (Spaaij, 2013). This led evaluators to conclude that sport for functional social inclusion cannot successfully address issues of equity through programmes that solely target individual development without also addressing structural inequality (Ibid).

To empower marginalized children

Some sport for social inclusion programmes focus on the empowerment of marginalized children and young people (Devine et al., 2017; Hancock et al., 2013; Hayhurst et al., 2015; Hayhurst, 2014; Kelly, 2011; Meyer and Roche, 2017; Peralta and Cinelli, 2016; Rosso and McGrath, 2016) to counteract the fact that persons from marginalized groups are rarely in the position of power necessary to change their social position from excluded to included (for more on this, see chapter 6). For example, community-based sport programmes that facilitate engagement of persons with disabilities from communities in Pacific Island countries helped to increase participants’ economic empowerment and independence, leading to reduced barriers to inclusion as well as improved quality of life (Devine et al., 2017). Equally, community-based sport programmes were able to engage Aboriginal young people and their communities in the design and delivery of sports and cultural activities (Peralta and Cinelli, 2016). Similarly, programmes for disadvantaged young people helped to give young people a voice by increasing their participation in decision-making (Kelly, 2011). In addition, sport programmes helped migrant and refugee young people and communities to gain a sense of control and empowerment through, for example, the opportunity “to improve their health by gaining control over it” (Rosso and McGrath, 2016, p. 109). Specifically, sport programmes geared toward social inclusion of young girls, and toward gender equality/equity, also typically led to increased leadership skills, self-dependency, civic agency, participation and empowerment (Hancock et al., 2013; Hayhurst et al., 2015; Hayhurst, 2014; Meyer and Roche, 2017).

4.4.2.2 What works when promoting sport for functional social inclusion?

Sport-plus models and capacity building

Among the research that focused on benefits associated with functional social inclusion, a pattern emerged in terms of the typical sport model used for programming. To promote functional social inclusion, sport programmes tended to follow a sport-plus model that involved capacity building and participatory approaches (Hayhurst, 2017; Hayhurst et al., 2015; Rosso and McGrath, 2016). There was no distinction between the types of sports used to promote functional social inclusion; programmes often included multiple sports for young people to choose from. The prevalence of sport-plus models in the research on functional social inclusion suggests, however, an emphasis on supplementing regular sport programmes with additional classes and targeted instruction. These supplementary activities tended to focus on capacity building, which was seen as a practical approach to increasing education and employability among mainly young girls and disadvantaged young people (Hayhurst, 2014; Meyer and Roche, 2017).

Child and young people participation in programme decisions

In terms of participatory approaches, it is important for sport interventions that foster functional social inclusion to work with the marginalized groups being targeted in the decision-making process, at the design stage and to fill leadership positions (Olliff, 2008; Rosso and McGrath, 2016; Hayhurst, 2014). For example, a review of the literature provides some evidence that programmes that adopt participatory practices – such as a brokerage approach that focuses on building links between local sports teams and mainstream sports clubs – tend to do a better job at achieving social inclusion than those programmes that use a purely interventionist model based on deficit model assumptions. Other participatory practices include the hosting of consultation forums.
Similarly, participation methods can be applied in studies of S4D programmes themselves. A group of studies by Hayhurst and colleagues (2013, 2014, 2015, 2017) used participatory action research methods to study the social inclusion and empowerment of young girls in and through sports. These participatory approaches to research have the additional benefit of fostering community development, which may provide an impetus to help solidify social inclusion.

Promoting norm-challenging sports

The promotion of norm-challenging sports can also help to provide empowering counter-narratives to those narratives used to justify the exclusion of marginalized children and young people from sports and wider society (Corazza and Dyer, 2017). For example, in the case of young girls and persons with disabilities, participation in any form of physically demanding sport perceived as ‘masculine’ or ‘tough’ challenges traditional norms of gender and physical ability. As a result, sport interventions are more likely to be functionally empowering if, for example, they use martial arts training that serves the dual purpose of providing opportunities for social entrepreneurship as well as self-protection from gender-based violence (Hayhurst, 2014) or if they engage persons with disabilities in Mixed Ability rugby teams or competitive Unified Sports (Corazza and Dyer, 2017).

4.4.2.3 Challenges and barriers to sport for functional social inclusion

Structural inequality

Structural inequality was referred to in several of the articles reviewed for this chapter as one of the biggest challenges, mainly for sport for functional social inclusion, but also for social inclusion in general (Collison et al., 2017; Hancock et al., 2009; Olliff, 2008; Rossi et al., 2014; Rosso and McGrath, 2016; Spaaij, 2013). The effectiveness of sport in promoting social inclusion for economically disadvantaged populations is limited when too much emphasis is placed on ‘correcting’ or compensating for individual deficits and not enough attention is paid to broader structural issues. For example, while NGO-led S4D programmes for ethnic minority young people in Kosovo expected the training of young people sport volunteers to increase employability, the reality of limited job opportunities in an economic downturn meant that not many young people actually found employment (Collison et al., 2017). In addition, two programmes in Brazil – Segundo Tempo and Vencer – found that unless structural factors are addressed, gains achieved in sport programmes tend to remain at the individual or relational level rather than permeate barriers to inclusion in wider society. The researchers who examined these programmes suggest that partnerships between different sectors was a main contributing factor to the programmes’ success in achieving social inclusion, education and civic learning outcomes (Spaaij, 2013; Rossi et al., 2014). (For a programming example, see Box 4.2.)

Issues of cost and accessibility

Studies showed that many programmes that attempt to use sport as a resource for social inclusion overlook the extent to which the issues of cost and equity in access to sport may act as a barrier, even though this should be an elementary consideration (Hancock et al., 2009; McMillan, McIsaac and Janssen, 2016; Olliff, 2008; Rosso and McGrath, 2016). For example, research using representative survey data showed that young people from reconstituted families in Canada were less likely to participate in sport due to income limitations, and that to increase sports participation, it is vital to take into consideration family structure and available financial resources for spending on recreational activities such as sport in the first place (McMillan et al., 2016).

In a number of studies, the issues of cost and access as barriers to sport were often mentioned by participants in interviews. Whether it is the cost of membership fees for sports clubs, the cost and availability of equipment and transport, or a lack of appropriate sporting facilities in resource-poor communities, issues of cost and accessibility can act as major barriers to sport’s effectiveness in promoting functional social inclusion (Hancock et al., 2009; Olliff, 2008; Rosso and McGrath, 2016). Sport may therefore not be the most effective intervention to address the social exclusion of children and young people from low-resource neighbourhoods – unless the cost of participation is free, low or subsidized, and access to appropriate facilities, equipment and transport is improved.
4.4.3 Sport and physical social inclusion

The concept of physical social inclusion draws attention to the reality that creating a social space for children and young people from marginalized groups often necessitates the creation, adaptation or modification of physical places (e.g., for persons with disabilities) to make participation in sport more available, accessible and convenient (Grandisson et al., 2012; Hancock et al., 2009). This section asks why sport is important for physical social inclusion, how it works in this regard and what could stop sport from influencing this outcome. (For a summary of the key findings, see Figure 4.3.)

4.4.3.1 Why is sport important for physical social inclusion?

A boost to active participation

Having physical places that are conducive to social inclusion can result in increased active participation in social life through sports when these places are both safe and convenient, thereby affording marginalized children and young people the opportunity to benefit from sport for social inclusion (Grandisson et al., 2012; Hancock et al., 2009; Lopes, 2015; Palmer, 2009). Though a less common research topic in the literature reviewed, physical social inclusion is important because it is a prerequisite for both relational and functional social inclusion. Thus, the decision to emphasize physical social inclusion in the multidimensional model of social inclusion was purposive. Overlooking this physical dimension would likely pose challenges to successfully addressing the other two dimensions of social inclusion. For example, increased active participation in sports among persons with disabilities was associated with increased social inclusion, as well as with improved cognitive abilities and motor skills (Grandisson et al., 2012). Additionally, research looking at physical social inclusion of ethnic minorities, migrants and refugees found that participation in sport increased with social inclusion, and this was associated with feeling a greater sense of belonging as well as health benefits (Hancock et al., 2009).

Figure 4.3. Sport for physical social inclusion
Just Play, an S4D programme for children and adolescents aged 6–18 years, was developed in 2009 by the Oceania Football Confederation (OFC) in partnership with the Australian Government and the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) Foundation for children. Through child-centred football sessions for girls and boys with and without disabilities, held throughout the Pacific nations, Just Play integrates lessons that address four target areas: social inclusion, violence against women and children, gender inequality, and health. Just Play is locally led, with implementation and monitoring conducted by in-country teams, who are highly involved in giving feedback. In this way, the programme is developed according to local needs, and at the same time, the people of the Pacific feel ownership for the Just Play model, which they are helping to develop for the benefit of their region and the world.

The success of the programme is visible throughout the Pacific. For example, in 2016, following the programme, a much larger proportion of children in the Cook Islands (New Zealand), Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu reported enjoying playing football with girls and acknowledging and celebrating differences, in addition to outcomes achieved in other target areas (UNICEF Just Play Strategy Document).

Building on its early success, Just Play has been scaling up in terms of its target age range, its geographical reach, its stakeholders and supporters, and the contexts in which it operates. Originally, Just Play targeted children aged 6–12 years in 11 Pacific countries: American Samoa, the Cook Islands (New Zealand), Fiji, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tahiti in French Polynesia, Tonga and Vanuatu. It then expanded its programming to adolescents aged 13–16 years in Fiji, Tonga and Samoa, while garnering the support of UNICEF and the New Zealand Government. Just Play has been expanding still further geographically through a partnership with the All India Football Federation, to launch Just Play pilots in the state of Kerala (with the Kerala Football Association and the Government of Kerala) and in the state of Maharashtra (with the Western India Football Association). The programme is expanding to other Indian states and, most recently, to Kiribati and Tuvalu, with further interest shown in Indonesia and other Asian countries.

Furthermore, in 2015, Just Play grew to include a Just Play emergency programme, developed as part of the UNICEF response to Tropical Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu. Now, in areas most likely to experience natural disasters, the Just Play emergency programme leverages existing content to implement activities that deliver messages about safe water, personal safety and preparedness through a flexible format of eight sessions.

OFC partners with various ministries and existing organizations, including other civil society organizations, to engage at different levels within each country and build mutually beneficial relationships. Building on the success of scaling up Just Play in these ways, there remains great potential to further expand the OFC-UNICEF partnership to enable other UNICEF country offices to implement Just Play in their local contexts. Using lessons learned from previous growth, a model informed by research, and the strong partnerships it has created, Just Play has the potential to extend still further to humanitarian contexts, for example, through other partnerships with agencies such as UNHCR.

Box 4.2. Spotlight on Just Play: Leveraging partnerships to broaden the impact of outcomes for children

Just Play, an S4D programme for children and adolescents aged 6–18 years, was developed in 2009 by the Oceania Football Confederation (OFC) in partnership with the Australian Government and the Union of European Football Associations (UEFA) Foundation for children. Through child-centred football sessions for girls and boys with and without disabilities, held throughout the Pacific nations, Just Play integrates lessons that address four target areas: social inclusion, violence against women and children, gender inequality, and health. Just Play is locally led, with implementation and monitoring conducted by in-country teams, who are highly involved in giving feedback. In this way, the programme is developed according to local needs, and at the same time, the people of the Pacific feel ownership for the Just Play model, which they are helping to develop for the benefit of their region and the world.

The success of the programme is visible throughout the Pacific. For example, in 2016, following the programme, a much larger proportion of children in the Cook Islands (New Zealand), Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu reported enjoying playing football with girls and acknowledging and celebrating differences, in addition to outcomes achieved in other target areas (UNICEF Just Play Strategy Document).

Building on its early success, Just Play has been scaling up in terms of its target age range, its geographical reach, its stakeholders and supporters, and the contexts in which it operates. Originally, Just Play targeted children aged 6–12 years in 11 Pacific countries: American Samoa, the Cook Islands (New Zealand), Fiji, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tahiti in French Polynesia, Tonga and Vanuatu. It then expanded its programming to adolescents aged 13–16 years in Fiji, Tonga and Samoa, while garnering the support of UNICEF and the New Zealand Government. Just Play has been expanding still further geographically through a partnership with the All India Football Federation, to launch Just Play pilots in the state of Kerala (with the Kerala Football Association and the Government of Kerala) and in the state of Maharashtra (with the Western India Football Association). The programme is expanding to other Indian states and, most recently, to Kiribati and Tuvalu, with further interest shown in Indonesia and other Asian countries.

Furthermore, in 2015, Just Play grew to include a Just Play emergency programme, developed as part of the UNICEF response to Tropical Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu. Now, in areas most likely to experience natural disasters, the Just Play emergency programme leverages existing content to implement activities that deliver messages about safe water, personal safety and preparedness through a flexible format of eight sessions.

OFC partners with various ministries and existing organizations, including other civil society organizations, to engage at different levels within each country and build mutually beneficial relationships. Building on the success of scaling up Just Play in these ways, there remains great potential to further expand the OFC-UNICEF partnership to enable other UNICEF country offices to implement Just Play in their local contexts. Using lessons learned from previous growth, a model informed by research, and the strong partnerships it has created, Just Play has the potential to extend still further to humanitarian contexts, for example, through other partnerships with agencies such as UNHCR.
4.4.3.2 What works when using sport to promote physical social inclusion?

Sport-sport models and adapted sports

Sport-sport models, which focus on playing sport without any supplementary forms of instruction, were the focus of most research on sport for physical social inclusion. In addition, adapted sports were important for improving equity in access for persons with and without disabilities (Hancock et al., 2009; Lopes, 2015; Palmer, 2009). For example, SURFaddict, a sport programme in Portugal, used adapted surfing and the aquatic environment as a therapeutic sport intervention for persons with disabilities to promote sensory integration (Lopes, 2015). In a few other instances, ‘adapted sports’ were used with ethnic minorities, migrants and refugees due to either their limited knowledge of mainstream sports in their new host countries or their preference for more informal recreational games (see, for instance, Hancock et al., 2009).

The term ‘adapted sports’ can also be applied to modifications made to other aspects of the physical sporting experience, for example, uniforms worn to play sport. Prime concerns among young Muslim girls in a community sport programme for Somali refugees in Australia were whether the attire required to play football would be deemed acceptable by religious standards and how to adapt the shorts, for example, to be more modest (Palmer, 2009). Such considerations represent a form of physical social inclusion that has only recently captured the attention of multinational athletic brands such as Nike, which launched an advertising campaign featuring a sports hijab for professional athletes in 2017, with the aim of making sport more inclusive for Muslim girls and women.

4.4.3.3 Challenges and barriers to sport for physical social inclusion

When addressing physical social inclusion, the choice of location can pose challenges to accessibility and use for both persons with and without disabilities (Oxford, 2017; Roult et al., 2015). For persons without disabilities, such challenges may include the safety and convenience of the location. For example, research on the VIDA programme for social inclusion of young girls through football in Chèvere, Colombia, found that even though the programme was open to both genders, there was low participation among females (Oxford, 2017). According to Oxford (2017), a lack of physical safety and accessibility in programme location and infrastructure, as well as the distance of travel involved, resulted in females opting out (or their mothers opting them out) because it felt unsafe to participate. Furthermore, the design of the space itself also discouraged female participation through reinforced gender norms: “This research revealed that although ‘the door is always open’ for female VIDA participants, the door is not the problem, but rather, the literal and metaphorical path to the door. The use of space, and in particular, how boys and men are socialised to dominate sporting spaces has become an implicit and explicit ritualised form of control in Chèvere” (Oxford, 2017, p. 68).

Though that study focused on inclusion of young girls, the issue of safety is likely to apply to all children, and the issue of gendered spaces is likely to apply also to GSM young people.

In addition, persons with disabilities face unique challenges with location features such as the need for wheelchair ramps, accessible toilets/changing rooms, and specialized equipment and transport, which may make it difficult to organize sports practice sessions and events (Roult et al., 2015).

Even if location-based considerations are taken out of the picture, the provision itself of adapted sports was not without its challenges (Lopes, 2015; Roult et al., 2015). For example, research based in school settings in Québec, Canada, showed that sports practitioners experienced difficulty in adapting and tailoring integrated sport activities for children and young people of different levels of ability and disability (Roult et al., 2015). Similarly, participation in the SURFaddict intervention varied by type of disability. In 2012, the intervention (surfing events) saw greater participation by persons with mobility and intellectual/cognitive disabilities, but very low participation by persons with visual impairments. In 2013, participation by persons with visual impairments increased slightly and participation by persons with intellectual/cognitive disabilities decreased by more than 60 per cent, while participation by persons with mobility disabilities stayed relatively the same (Lopes, 2015). These findings suggest that surfing interventions, even when
adapted, may not be the best way to promote social inclusion of persons with visual impairments, but instead work best for persons with mobility impairments. There is also the issue of the level of training of professionals working with persons with disabilities, specifically their knowledge of sport and developmental science and their ability to apply this expertise to design activities and implement programmes that are truly inclusive for children and young people with disabilities (Grandisson et al., 2012).

4.5. Conclusion and recommendations

Results of the integrated literature review are summarized into a series of recommendations (drawing from examples in the high-quality research studies) and theories of change for sport and social inclusion, organized according to the various dimensions of social inclusion covered in the review.

4.5.1 Recommendations on sport for relational social inclusion

This section presents recommendations for practice in sport for relational social inclusion, developed from the literature review. A theory of change around these practices (inputs column) is summarized below (see Figure 4.4).

**Hire a diverse workforce**

Due to systems of prejudice and discrimination, marginalized groups are under-represented in many areas of social life. Therefore, when marginalized children and young people interact with sport for social inclusion programmes, it would be helpful if the programme staff reflected the diversity of the participants enrolled in the programme. For example, one study recommended that a sport programme in which refugee and migrant young people play on multi-ethnic teams should hire multicultural workers (Block and Gibbs, 2017). Members of majority groups do not always understand what it is like to be excluded, discriminated against and ‘invisible’, and therefore their expectations of marginalized children and young people may be detached from the reality that these children and young people live every day. Having a diverse workforce not only makes marginalized young people feel included and represented in the programme management, but it could also potentially provide some built-in role models to serve as the foundation for the trusting relationships, mutual respect and recognition that are important for developing a sense of belonging and acceptance.

Where possible, one solution is to recruit staff from both within and outside of the community or marginalized population. Hiring from within the community or among
marginalized persons can also be seen as an opportunity for capacity building, which contributes to functional social inclusion. Hiring from outside the community or among non-marginalized persons could act as a strategy for increasing bridging and linking social capital, which also contributes to relational social inclusion. This latter category of sport programme staff may require cultural sensitivity training, however.

Combine mixed and heterogeneous teams
Due to assumptions about the benefits of inter-group contact for mitigating prejudice, the research shows that sport programmes sometimes choose to prioritize mixed teams over homogeneous teams. It is true that mixed sports teams provide certain incontestable benefits, for example, research shows that the participation of persons with disabilities in Mixed Ability sports or Unified Sports alongside non-disabled peers contributes to a motivating and supportive inclusive sports climate (Corazza and Dyer, 2017; McConkey et al., 2013). The research also shows, however, that being on homogeneous teams, with peers of similar backgrounds and experiences, can act as a protective factor by creating a deep sense of belonging (Block and Gibbs, 2017). Therefore, while mixed teams present definite benefits, homogeneous sports teams also contribute to relational social inclusion.

Rather than definitively prefer one format over the other, the needs of the marginalized children and young people should be taken into consideration. For example, if the priority is for minority children and young people to build bonds with similar others and feel like they have a place to belong through participation in the sport programme, then homogeneous teams may be the best fit. If, however, the priority is for marginalized children and young people to form connections with and feel accepted and respected by others in society, then mixed teams may be most appropriate.

Establish systems for reporting and fair adjudication of discrimination incidents
The mainstream culture associated with sports such as football, rugby and basketball, for example, can lead to taunts and altercations among players on the sports field that may escalate off the field. Research shows that even when sport is used as a tool to promote relational social inclusion, marginalized children and young people still experience prejudice, discrimination and exclusion (e.g., De Martini Ugolotti, 2015). Therefore, it is important to set up systems for fair reporting and adjudication of such unfortunate events, whether the imperative to do so comes from marginalized children or young people, non-marginalized peers, parents, coaches or other staff. Having a forum in which to safely air grievances of this nature and knowing that systems are in place to protect against discrimination will go a long way toward creating a more inclusive sporting atmosphere for marginalized children and young people, especially ethnic minorities, refugees and migrants.

One practical solution is to link the reporting of discrimination incidents to the existing child protection and safeguarding systems in place for sport programmes and within the broader social systems. Alleviating concerns about how incidents of discrimination will be dealt with could prove especially useful in encouraging greater participation in sports, e.g., by GSM young people, who, research shows, are likely to stay away from sports due to negative experiences in masculinized sport spaces (Calzo et al., 2014; Mereish and Poteat, 2015; Osborne and Wagner, 2007; Sartore and Cunningham, 2009; Zipp, 2011).

Develop built-in reward systems
Psychology has long established that positive reinforcement is one of the most effective ways to promote desirable behaviour (Deci and Ryan, 1985). The literature reviewed shows that recognition of sports skills and achievement can be a key source of motivation for marginalized children and young people. Specifically, when this recognition takes place in public forums it is associated with increased sense of belonging and acceptance, positive identity development and changes in the perceptions of others (Corazza and Dyer, 2017; De Martini Ugolotti, 2015; Morgan and Parker, 2017). Platforms for public recognition can take the form of public sporting events in the community or integration into regional and national competitions and tournaments. Developing built-in reward systems as an intervention feature is expected to work well for marginalized children and young people, as recent research on adolescent brain development shows that adolescents are highly sensitive to social rewards (Casey, Jones and
4.5.2 Recommendations on sport for functional social inclusion

This section presents recommendations for practice in sport for functional social inclusion, developed from the literature review. A theory of change around these practices (inputs column) is summarized below (see Figure 4.5).

Implement multi-sectoral collaboration

When it comes to functional social cohesion, research shows that collaboration across multiple sectors (e.g., sport, education, health and social protection agencies) to provide wrap-around services for marginalized children and young people can be pivotal in addressing barriers to social inclusion such as structural inequality (Rossi et al., 2014; Spaaij, 2013). Participation in sport cannot by itself stop the systemic prejudice and discrimination responsible for structural inequality within society. For this reason, a sport-plus model is important for functional social inclusion. It should be recognized, however, that the sport programme does not have to be the sole provider of supplementary instruction and activities. In fact, in situations of limited resources this may be unrealistic. Instead, a possible solution is the integration of the sport programme into existing networks of social support. For example, representatives of various sectors can be convened as an advisory board to oversee the coordination of social protection services that supplement sport activities.

Establish community involvement and consultation forums

The community in which the sport programme is located represents another important stakeholder in sport for functional social inclusion. Research suggests that sport...
programmes that integrate community members, as either programme volunteers, mentors or leaders, have a sustainable impact on functional social inclusion (Hayhurst et al., 2015; Peralta and Cinelli, 2016). The rationale for community involvement is that changing the situation of individual children and young people, without also changing their environment, may produce limited short-term gains but is unlikely to have long-lasting effects. A possible solution mentioned in the literature is the use of consultation forums or a brokerage approach to involve community members as well as parents and participants themselves in the planning, design, implementation and M&E of the sport programme (Hancock et al., 2009; Olliff, 2008).

Provide financial subsidies
A basic but crucial message from the literature is that disadvantaged children and young people from low-resource communities and families are unlikely to have the financial resources or income necessary to sustain sports participation (Block and Gibbs, 2017). The costs associated with providing sport activities can include location sourcing and maintenance, transport, equipment, gear, membership fees and staff salaries. When only some of these costs are taken on by the sport programme (e.g., location and staff) it means that responsibility for the other provisions (e.g., transport, equipment, gear and fees) lies with disadvantaged children and young people and their families. When marginalized children and young people cannot afford the costs associated with sport, this reduces their participation in sport programmes and perpetuates their exclusion from both sports and wider society. One solution is to fully fund sports participation for individual children and young people, or at least provide financial subsidies to cover essential expenses. This may, however, require the cooperation and coordination of funding sources such as local governments, NGOs and other sponsors or funding agencies.

4.5.3 Recommendations on sport for physical social inclusion
This section presents recommendations for practice in sport for physical social inclusion, developed from the literature review. A theory of change around these practices (inputs column) is summarized below (see Figure 4.6).

Use accessible sports facilities in safe and convenient locations
Location features can discourage sports participation among marginalized children and young people (Oxford, 2017). For example, persons with disabilities may be unable to use sports facilities that do not have accessible features such as wheelchair ramps and accessible toilets-changing rooms. Disadvantaged children and young people may not participate in sport programmes located a long distance from their neighbourhood, since this involves transport costs that neither they nor their families can afford. All children and young people may stay away from sport programmes if their location is perceived as unsafe – but some potential participants such as young girls may be particularly affected. A possible solution is to select suitable sports locations that are accessible, safe and convenient to use and therefore do not present barriers to physical social inclusion.

Train professionals and coaches
Research shows that the on-site support of coaches and staff who are professionally trained in integrated and adapted sports is particularly important for the physical social inclusion of children and young people with disabilities (Grandisson et al., 2012). In cases where it is difficult to recruit and maintain professionally trained staff, one possible solution is to provide additional training and certification for sports coaches and other staff in applied sports and developmental science (e.g., kinesiology, physical therapy, behavioural therapy, special education). There should always be someone available on site who possesses the necessary knowledge to assist persons with disabilities in sports participation.

Implement culturally sensitive policies and adaptations
Strict adherence to elite sporting rules can discourage marginalized children and young people from participating in sports (Hancock et al., 2009). Cultural differences sometimes lead to varying needs, preferences or interests in the physical characteristics of sports. For example, newly arrived migrants may be
Figure 4.6. Theory of change on sport for physical social inclusion based on the literature

more familiar with some sports than others, which may require a change in sports choices or adaptation of the rules of mainstream sports. Children and young people from disadvantaged communities may prefer informal participation in ‘pick-up’ games over formally structured elite sport pathways. Muslim girls may require female-only environments or adaptations to uniforms. Transgender children and young people may feel more comfortable using unisex toilets, or changing rooms that match their gender identity. It is important that sport programmes pay attention to rules and regulations that govern the physical spaces and physicality of sports to ensure that they are truly inclusive for all marginalized children and young people. A possible solution is to apply the principles of universal design in physical location and instruction, so that the needs of the broadest cross section of society are met.

4.5.4 Recommendations for key stakeholders: Child-focused S4D and social inclusion

In sum, rather than focusing on specific target groups for social inclusion (which can have the unintended and paradoxical effect of perpetuating exclusion from sports), programming officers should focus instead on the various dimensions of social inclusion and how these can be used to simultaneously integrate multiple marginalized groups. Policies should also reflect a greater emphasis on social inclusion as a nuanced, multidimensional concept, as one way to address the overriding focus on relational social inclusion and shift the balance to ensure that functional and physical approaches to social inclusion are also prioritized. Finally, even though the benefits of sport for social inclusion are fairly well understood, more and better quality research is needed to get a firm grasp on what works and what does not work when using sport as a tool to promote relational, functional and physical social inclusion.
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### Annex 4.A. Summary of literature with social inclusion outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Study information</th>
<th>Programme design/delivery method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block and Gibbs (2017)</td>
<td>QL Practitioners, n=10 (70% male)</td>
<td>Various initiatives integrating refugee-background young people into teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaaij (2015)</td>
<td>QL ⚫, ⚫, ⚫, ⚫, n=51 (mostly youth aged 16-25 years)</td>
<td>Involvement of refugee youth in tournaments and teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosso and McGrath (2016)</td>
<td>QL ⚫, ⚫, n=263 participants and 107 volunteers (65% in community programmes, 80% aged 9-16 years, 60% male, 50% refugees)</td>
<td>Sports sessions and health and culture workshops to ‘empower disadvantaged culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities to engage in health promotion through sport’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakamura and Donnelly (2017)</td>
<td>QL Unclear</td>
<td>Sports or physical cultural activities for recreation and/or inter-generational transmission of culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyras (2012)</td>
<td>MM ⚫, ⚫, n=96 (girls and boys aged 13–16 years); n=20 (female and male instructors)</td>
<td>Summer camp to teach sports skills and human rights, environmental concepts, Internet use and conflict management, with the aim of building bridges through Olympism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galily, Leitner and Shimon (2013)</td>
<td>QT ⚫, ⚫, n=329 (39.8% Arab)</td>
<td>Soccer, conflict resolution and life skills training; interaction with children of neighbouring communities; community involvement in social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockburn (2017)</td>
<td>QL ⚫, ⚫, n=unknown (aged 10–11 years)</td>
<td>Identity formation of young boys in mixed ethnicity, community sports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Some results categories are abbreviated: empowerment, self-determination and agency; motivation, initiative and goal-setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Method</th>
<th>Study Participants/Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op</td>
<td>Opinion Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Study method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Martini and Ugolotti (2015)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elholm and Dahlstedt (2017)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock, Cooper and Bahn (2009)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanes, O’Connor and Alfrey (2015)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliff (2008)</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peralta and Cinelli (2016)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corazza and Dyer (2017)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Some results categories are abbreviated: empowerment, self-determination and agency; motivation, initiative and goal-setting.
### What are the results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Emp, self-det, agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adaptation*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Study information</th>
<th>Programme design/delivery method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devine et al. (2017)</td>
<td>QL ▲ ● ○ ◆</td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandisson, Tétreault and Freeman (2012)</td>
<td>QL ▲ ● ○ ◆</td>
<td>Special Olympics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harada, Siperstein, Parker and Lenox (2011)</td>
<td>Op n/a</td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes (2015)</td>
<td>QT ▲ ● ○ ◆</td>
<td>Adapted surfing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConkey, Dowling, Hassan and Menke (2013)</td>
<td>QL ▲ ● ○ ◆</td>
<td>Football, basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roult, Brunet, Belley-Ranger, Carbonneau and Fortier (2015)</td>
<td>QL ◆</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Some results categories are abbreviated: empowerment, self-determination and agency; motivation, initiative and goal-setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot., int., goal-set.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellbeing (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sport/activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therapeutic rehabilitation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Study method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>What sports were used?</th>
<th>How were sports used?</th>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>For whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spencer-Cavaliere, Thai and Kingsley (2017)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Handball, football, baseball, sledging, hockey, rhythmic gymnastics, martial arts, swimming, Special Olympics</td>
<td>Segregated sport settings’ effects on social inclusion; separate sport instruction, participation and competition</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Children with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins and Haudenhuyse (2015)</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>n=26,000 youth (low-income communities, aged 10–19 years, 80% under 17; 20% ethnic minorities); n=1 (case study)</td>
<td>Football, fitness, dance, multiple sports</td>
<td>Positive Futures youth programme for social inclusion, increasing participation in sport and activity, addressing substance abuse issues; relationship building; community sports coaches act as mentors</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Youth from disadvantaged communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly (2011)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>●, ▲, ○ n=88 (3 project managers, 23 staff, 26 youth participants, 36 partners)</td>
<td>Football, multiple sports</td>
<td>Positive Futures youth programme for social inclusion, increasing participation in sport and activity, addressing substance abuse issues; relationship building; community sports coaches act as mentors</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan, McIsaac and Janssen (2016)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>^ n=21,201 (Grades 6–10) data from nationally representative WHO survey of n=26,088</td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
<td>Association of factors (e.g., economic disadvantage, sports participation); youth from low-income, reconstituted families less likely to participate in sport than those from intact families</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan and Parker (2017)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>▲, ● n=60 youth participants; n=20 coaches/leaders</td>
<td>Football, boxing, multiple sports</td>
<td>Sport programmes aimed at reducing violent crime incidence; sport training as intervention for gang activity, employment training and education</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Youth in low-income communities, aged 13–19 years and 14–25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossi, De Alencar, Rossi and Pereira (2014)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>▲, ◊ n=27</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Ministry of Sport programme Segundo Tiempo to democratize sport access in and out of school, encourage activity, increase employability</td>
<td>Bahia, Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Some results categories are abbreviated: empowerment, self-determination and agency; motivation, initiative and goal-setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study information</th>
<th>Programme design/delivery method</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion Empowerment Education Child protection Health and well-being Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging Increased inclusion Change in perceptions Emp., self-det., agency Social capital Cultural capital Skills development Engagement Mot., int., goal-set.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust, respect, recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What are the results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segregated sport settings' effects on social inclusion; separate sport instruction, participation and competition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Children with disabilities +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, fitness, dance, multiple sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Futures youth programme for social inclusion, increasing participation in sport and activity, addressing substance abuse issues; relationship building; community sports coaches act as mentors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom Youth from disadvantaged communities + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, multiple sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Futures youth programme for social inclusion, increasing participation in sport and activity, addressing substance abuse issues; relationship building; community sports coaches act as mentors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom + + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, boxing, multiple sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport programmes aimed at reducing violent crime incidence; sport training as intervention for gang activity, employment training and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom Youth in low-income communities, aged 13–19 years and 14–25 years + + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, boxing, multiple sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport programmes aimed at reducing violent crime incidence; sport training as intervention for gang activity, employment training and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom Youth in low-income communities, aged 13–19 years and 14–25 years + + + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, boxing, multiple sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport programmes aimed at reducing violent crime incidence; sport training as intervention for gang activity, employment training and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom Youth in low-income communities, aged 13–19 years and 14–25 years + + + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, boxing, multiple sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport programmes aimed at reducing violent crime incidence; sport training as intervention for gang activity, employment training and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom Youth in low-income communities, aged 13–19 years and 14–25 years + + + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, boxing, multiple sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport programmes aimed at reducing violent crime incidence; sport training as intervention for gang activity, employment training and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom Youth in low-income communities, aged 13–19 years and 14–25 years + + + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spencer-Cavaliere, Thai and Kingsley (2017)

- **QL**
- **n** = 15 (73% female, **M** age = 31)
- Handball, football, baseball, sledging, hockey, rhythmic gymnastics, martial arts, swimming, Special Olympics
- **QL**

### Collins and Haudenhuyse (2015)

- **MM**
- **n** = 26,000 youth (low-income communities, aged 10–19 years, 90% under 17; 20% ethnic minorities); **n** = 1 (case study)
- Football, fitness, dance, multiple sports
- **MM**

### Kelly (2011)

- **QL**, **n** = 88 (3 project managers, 23 staff, 26 youth participants, 36 partners)
- Football, multiple sports
- **QL**

### McMillan, McIsaac and Janssen (2016)

- **QT**
- **n** = 21,201 (Grades 6–10) data from **n** = 26,068
- Association of factors (e.g., economic disadvantage, sports participation); youth from low-income, reconstituted families less likely to participate in sport than those from intact families
- **QT**

### Morgan and Parker (2017)

- **QL**, **n** = 60 youth participants; **n** = 20 coaches/leaders
- Football, boxing, multiple sports
- **QL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Study method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>What sports were used?</th>
<th>How were sports used?</th>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>For whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spaaij (2013)</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>△ ● ● n=249 youth; n=28 staff; final interview sample: n=89 (53 former participants, 36 staff)</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Vencer holistic youth programme for team sports, games and active learning to teach employable skills and prosocial values; create supportive learning environment; tool for reflection and applying lessons</td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</td>
<td>1,286 youth from low-income communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super, Wentink, Verkooijen and Koelen (2017)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>▲ ● ● n=22 (59% female)</td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
<td>Youth Sports Fund for providing equal access to sports club participation; financial support for sports participation; sport associated with benefits in health, education and social status</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Socially vulnerable youth from disadvantaged communities, aged 10-18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cárdenas (2012)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Goles por la Paz programme for promoting inclusion and peace through socialization; team sports and cooperative games to promote empowerment, leadership and health, and to challenge gender norms</td>
<td>Ciudad Bolívar, Colombia; Bais city, Philippines</td>
<td>Youth from conflict-affected Colombian neighbourhoods (30 children) and drug-affected Filipino neighbourhoods (boys, aged 10-15 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collison, Darnell, Giulianotti and Howe (2017)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>● ● ● n= approx. 100</td>
<td>Football, cricket, multiple sports</td>
<td>Youth programmes in communities and sports clubs to show issues with how ‘youth’ and ‘gender’ are conceived; objectives varied by country (e.g., gender issues in equity and participation in Rwanda, employability in Kosovo)</td>
<td>Jamaica, Kosovo, Rwanda, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Youth, ethnic minority youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock, Lyras and Ha (2013)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>□ □ □ n=376 (123 in Europe, 101 in Africa, 88 in North America, 55 in Asia, 29 in Australia)</td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
<td>Survey of S4D initiatives specifically for females</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Female participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Some results categories are abbreviated: empowerment, self-determination and agency; motivation, initiative and goal-setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot., int., goal-set.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot., int., goal-set.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic capital; occupational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging traditional gender roles; sense of purpose; moral values (e.g., sportsmanship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic development; challenging gender norms; civic participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused on process rather than outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Study method</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>What sports were used?</td>
<td>How were sports used?</td>
<td>Where?</td>
<td>For whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayhurst, Giles and Radforth (2015)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>n=11 (55% under 18 years)</td>
<td>Football, basketball</td>
<td>Vancouver Aboriginal Friendship Centre Society’s recreation programme (especially the Because We’re Girls group); ability to choose from roster of activities (including physical activity) as form of empowerment</td>
<td>Vancouver, Canada</td>
<td>Youth and young Aboriginal women, aged 13–30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayhurst (2014)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>n=35</td>
<td>Martial arts</td>
<td>Training for employability (coaches) and protection from gender-based violence (GBV); capacity building and empowerment through entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Winita, Uganda</td>
<td>Girls aged 10–18 years (over 2,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayhurst (2017)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Tournaments with supplementary gender rights curriculum; protection from GBV, sexual/reproductive rights</td>
<td>Canada, Nicaragua</td>
<td>Indigenous community</td>
<td>(women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer and Roche (2017)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>n=87 youth (aged 13–18 years; 71% female); n=32 coaches</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Live, Learn and Play programme: train-the-trainer model to build capacity, increase skills (citizenship and leadership) and build self-efficacy</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Coaches (engagement of youth unclear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford (2017)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>n=60 (aged 18–80 years)</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>VIDA programme: develop sports skills, promote sports participation into adulthood, training for transition from player to coach; psychosocial support (education, conflict resolution, substance abuse)</td>
<td>Chévere and Bacano, Colombia</td>
<td>Approx. 450 participants of mestizo, Afro-Colombian and indigenous ethnicities; female and male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rauscher and Cooky (2016)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Conceptual paper proposes social justice model of S4D that teaches girls ‘hardiness’ to develop purpose and form connections</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toomey and Russell (2013)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>n=12,641 (girls and boys, Grades 7–12; 10% GSM)</td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
<td>Part of extra-curricular activities at school; study examines participation</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>GSM youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Some results categories are abbreviated: empowerment, self-determination and agency; motivation, initiative and goal-setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hayhurst, Giles and Radforth (2015) QL
  - n = 11 (55% under 18 years)
  - Football, basketball
  - Vancouver Aboriginal Friendship Centre Society’s recreation programme (especially the Because We’re Girls group); ability to choose from roster of activities (including physical activity) as form of empowerment

- Hayhurst (2014) QL
  - n = 35
  - Martial arts Training for employability (coaches) and protection from gender-based violence (GBV); capacity building and empowerment through entrepreneurship

- Hayhurst (2017) QL
  - Football Tournaments with supplementary gender rights curriculum; protection from GBV, sexual/reproductive rights

- Meyer and Roche (2017) QT
  - n = 87 youth (aged 13–18 years; 71% female); n = 32 coaches
  - Basketball Live, Learn and Play programme: train-the-trainer model to build capacity, increase skills (citizenship and leadership) and build self-efficacy

- Oxford (2017) QL
  - n = 60 (aged 18–80 years)
  - Football VIDA programme: develop sports skills, promote sports participation into adulthood, training for transition from player to coach; psychosocial support (education, conflict resolution, substance abuse)

- Chévere and Bacano, Colombia
  - Approx. 450 participants of mestizo, Afro-Colombian and indigenous ethnicities; female and male

- Rauscher and Cooky (2016) n/a
  - Conceptual paper proposes social justice model of S4D that teaches girls ‘hardiness’ to develop purpose and form connections

- Toomey and Russell (2013) QT
  - n = 12,641 (girls and boys, Grades 7–12; 10% GSM)
  - Multiple sports Part of extra-curricular activities at school; study examines participation

- United States
  - GSM youth

- GSSM youth
  - GETTING INTO THE GAME

Challenging stereotypes and traditional gender roles; meeting basic needs

Autonomy, self-reliance/dependency; employability; economic independence

Focused on research method more than outcomes

More positive attitudes toward/endorsement of non-traditional gender roles (among women only)

Trust, purpose, politeness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study information</th>
<th>Programme design/delivery method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Study method</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buzuvis (2011)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examines provisions in place for inclusion and participation; recommends that educational benefits of sports are promoted as grounds for equal rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSM youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examines effects of childhood gender non-conformity and athletic self-esteem on sports participation and physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSM and non-GSM youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mereish and Poteat (2015)</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examines disparities in sports participation, physical activity and obesity; team sports and physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSM and non-GSM youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne and Wagner (2007)</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in core sports (e.g., American football, baseball, basketball, soccer) and its relationship with homophobic attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sartore and Cunningham (2009)</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examines attitudes of former athletes and parents to GSM coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSM coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipp (2011)</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 7–12 students; GSM youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Some results categories are abbreviated: empowerment, self-determination and agency; motivation, initiative and goal-setting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Skills development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Skills development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp., self-det., agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Mo., int., goal-set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Mo., int., goal-set.</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Mo., int., goal-set.</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Mo., int., goal-set.</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Mo., int., goal-set.</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo., int., goal-set.</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td>Health and well-being (general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td>Health and well-being (general)</td>
<td>Increased sport/activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td>Health and well-being (general)</td>
<td>Increased sport/activity</td>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td>Health and well-being (general)</td>
<td>Increased sport/activity</td>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td>Health and well-being (general)</td>
<td>Increased sport/activity</td>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and well-being (general)</td>
<td>Increased sport/activity</td>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sport/activity</td>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/a: Lower participation rates and physical activity among GSM youth

n/a: Disparities in participation in sport and physical activity

Core high school sports associated with greater endorsement of homophobic attitudes, especially among males

n/a: Study 2 showed parents with negative attitudes to gay men and lesbians were less likely to allow children to participate in sports with GSM coaches

Masculinized sports (e.g., football, wrestling): as age increases, GSM males less likely but GSM females more likely to participate
Chapter 5
Child protection and Sport for Development

5.1 Introduction: Child protection and sport

Sport can contribute positively to child protection outcomes, especially among vulnerable and marginalized children. Numerous programmes have found that sport can contribute to positive youth development and to building life skills – including discipline and self-esteem. Moreover, it is widely perceived that sport can help to steer young people away from risky behaviours including juvenile delinquency, aggressiveness and violence (Khan and Jamil, 2017) through strengthening social bonds with positive actors (Hirschi, 1969) and by providing meaningful activity within a structured framework.

The benefits of sport activities in integration initiatives to promote peace among marginalized and vulnerable sectors of the population, and in post-disaster psychosocial interventions have also been recognized, and significant programmatic efforts are being directed toward these ends (Kunz, 2009). Overall, the discourse surrounding sport initiatives is largely positive: sport can offer children and young people a safe and friendly environment in which to encounter and address their problems and fears (Kunz, 2009) and sport can be an important contributor to the fulfilment of SDGs that address child protection, in particular SDG 16: Peace, justice and strong institutions, and two of its targets (Target 16.1 and Target 16.2).1

This chapter will review evidence of how sport and sport programming contribute to child protection outcomes. Although the literature review was originally intended to focus on the positive contribution of sport to child protection, the review has revealed that protection risks within sport comprise another vital component of the evidence, and these also need to be reported. By synthesizing available empirical evidence on promising practices and positive impacts of sport, as well as on risks to child protection, this chapter will provide recommendations for S4D programmes that focus on child protection.

This chapter is organized as follows: First, it will provide a definition of child protection, and review how child protection links to the realm of sport. The second section will look at what the evidence says, introducing the methodology used in this review, and then summarize the successes of, challenges to and recommendations for practice informed by the existing literature. The chapter will end by summarizing both the main conclusions, through a proposed theory of change for child protection-focused S4D, and recommendations for practitioners, policymakers and research groups. The

---

1 Target 16.1: Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere (and, in particular, Indicators 16.1.1 to 16.1.4). Target 16.2: End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children (and, in particular, Indicators 16.2.1 to 16.2.3).
main messages drawn from the evidence reviewed in this chapter are summarized immediately below.

Key findings presented in this chapter include the following:

- Although inconsistent, evidence does show that S4D can contribute to positive child protection outcomes through reducing violence and risky behaviour (e.g., non-violent crime, delinquency, substance use, recidivism) and, promisingly, through reducing gender-based violence (GBV).

- No evidence was found to show that sport programmes contribute to reducing exploitation or abuse of children and young people, which are key components of the definition of child protection. Importantly, sports participation itself can involve justifiable, and serious, child protection concerns.

**S4D programmes that work for child protection are those that do the following:**

- Contribute to protection of children and young people through the development of agency, by promoting social capital and supportive relationships that can lead to education and employment.

- Offer a safe space that provides a sense of security, in which children and young people can socialize without stigmatization or scrutiny by authority.

- Promote conflict resolution competencies and encourage cooperative behaviour, for example, fair play with discipline for violations, and penalties (as opposed to rewards) for overly aggressive behaviour.

- See coaches as role models for athletes to help reduce gender inequality and GBV by increasing discussions related to violence involving other athletes and increasing bystander intervention.

**Challenges to S4D programmes seeking to promote child protection include the following:**

- Lack of evidence on how sport can be used for child protection, and the risk that localized interventions overpromise in terms of the effects they can have on systemic drivers of violence such as social norms and biases.

- Evidence that points toward inadequate regulation to ensure the protection of children and young people in sport.

- Insufficient numbers of programming staff trained in child protection.

- Some sports continue to expose children and young people to multiple forms of risk and violence, which is normalized within the sport contexts and cultures (and supported by reward/power structures and by hypermasculinity).

**Policymakers and S4D practitioners seeking to promote child protection can trial the following promising practices:**

- Create uniform/standard practices that make coach training mandatory to reduce the likelihood of abusive practices.

- Tie sports into existing social programmes that those tackle structural problems and child protection risks at the systemic level (e.g., poverty and education) that have the potential to hinder positive child protection outcomes.

- Advocate for more rigorous research and evidence generation that specifically explores the impact of sport programming on violence reduction in all of its forms.

- Follow through and monitor the implementation of international and national safeguarding standards.

**5.2 What is child protection in the context of S4D?**

Child protection refers to the prevention of and responses to violence, exploitation and abuse against children and young people, and is a critical prerequisite to “ensuring children's rights to survival, development and well-being” (UNICEF, 2008). Child protection often targets children and young people with unique vulnerabilities to abuses, which may include those who live in conditions without access to parental care, those in conditions of conflict with the law and those in settings of armed conflict (UNICEF, 2006). It follows that this chapter
focuses on S4D and sport programmes with desired outcomes that aim to prevent and respond to violence in its different forms and exploitation and abuse directed at children.²

Sources of violence can vary significantly as the child progresses through distinct stages of life. For example, during the early years, children are more likely to be victims of violence in the household, which means that parents or caretakers may constitute the main perpetrators of violence. As children grow up, violence is no longer confined to the household and can spread to other environments in which the child actively participates, such as the school environment, the community and sports settings.

5.3 How are sport and child protection linked?

As children transition to adolescence, which is characterized by rapid physical and neurological growth, the onset of puberty and sexual maturity (UNICEF Data, 2018), the likelihood that they are exposed to violence outside the realm of the household increases, but so too does the likelihood that they themselves become perpetrators of violence (Chioda, 2017; Muggah and Aguirre Tobón, 2018). During this stage of development, parental influence over the child decreases, and the reference group of the child gradually switches from family to peers in the community; in school and in sport, who acquire significant importance and influence over the child’s behaviour and decisions. In particular, sports coaches can become key authority figures, wielding considerable influence over the child.

While having mechanisms to protect children and young people from violence in sport is of imperative importance, they can be problematic. Many actions in sport are not actually violent, but can be interpreted as such (Mountjoy, Rhind, Tivas and Leglise, 2015) if adhering to the standard definition of violence.³ Some sports involve the intentional use of physical force that may cause unintentional injuries to another participant. Compounding this issue is the fact that violence has become normalized as an accepted part of sport practice in some contexts (Stirling and Kerr, 2009).

Subsequently, defining and clarifying ‘violence in sport’ is a crucial concern of the research on sport and child protection. According to Mountjoy et al. (2015), the forms of violence in sport can be grouped in regard to their focus at the individual, relational or organizational level (see Figure 5.1):

- At the individual level, violence concerns an athlete’s health and well-being (such as protection from depression, self-harm, etc.).
- At the relational level, violence can stem from relationships with key actors, such as coaches, peers and health care providers, and can encompass sexual harassment and physical and emotional abuse.
- At the organizational level, violence can stem from systems that encourage overtraining, encourage initiation ceremonies and/or involve systematic doping, among others.

Child protection in the context of sport therefore involves keeping children and young people safe from physical, sexual and psychological forms of violence that can occur at these distinct levels and which can be perpetrated by various actors with whom the young person interacts in the sports arena. Because sport is the activity that draws the highest number of young participants and fans around the world (Feinstein, Bynner and Duckworth, 2006; Right To Play, 2008), child protection strategies are of far greater concern in sport than in any other activity.⁴

---

² Such desired outcomes of child protection-focused S4D programmes include: addressing attitudes, norms and behaviours such as commercial sexual exploitation and trafficking of children, child labour, bullying, neglect, gender-based violence, and harmful traditional practices (e.g., child marriage). Child protection outcomes may include changes in the awareness, attitudes and behaviours of participants, such as reductions in bullying, drug and alcohol abuse or aggressive behaviour; and increased access to and use of prevention and response services for participants, such as birth registration, family counselling or home visits.

³ The standard WHO definition of violence encompasses “the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation.” (WHO, 2002, pxi).

⁴ In Flanders, Belgium, three out of four youths aged 10–17 years were involved in at least one sport (Scheerder, Vos and Pabian, 2011) and in the Netherlands, 63 per cent of children aged 12–17 years participated in sports in 2011—2012 (Spruit, van Vuigt, van der Put, van der Stouwe and Stams, 2016). Rates of participation across developed countries are similar, indicating an overall high degree of involvement in sport among children and youth.
5.4 What does the evidence say?

After an initial scan of the abstracts of the available literature, 45 articles and other documents were reviewed in full to better understand the impact of sport on child protection outcomes. Of these, only 18 articles included evidence of positive effects on child protection outcomes (see Annex 5.A). At least eight articles addressed how sport can constitute a risk to protection (e.g., through exposure to violence) and five outlined specific safeguards or models to keep children safe in sport.

Of the 18 articles with evidence of sport’s positive contribution to child protection, most focused on the United Kingdom (5 articles) and United States (4), although there was also evidence from Belgium (1), Germany (1) and the Netherlands (1). Studies from developing countries that featured in the literature focused on Central America (2 articles), Colombia (1), India (1), the Islamic Republic of Iran (1) and Sri Lanka (1). One paper did not mention the country in which the sport programme it studied was implemented.

The reviewed sport programmes often involved work with coaches, and the target audiences of the programmes were largely male. Even when programmes were also open to girls or young women, female participation was considerably lower than male participation. Articles that identified positive impacts of sport on child protection used a combination of methods: four used mixed methods, six used only quantitative methods, and eight used only qualitative methods. Five involved only conceptual or theoretical discussions of child protection and did not aim to measure programme effects on child protection. (Only articles with evidence of positive impacts on protection are provided in the annex.) The most rigorous articles used experimental or quasi-experimental methods for programme evaluation, with 10 articles identifying significant effects on child protection outcomes, although at least 8 articles using qualitative methods presented context-specific results and rich descriptions of evidence indicating impacts of sport on child protection. Regarding the quality of the evidence, 12 articles were ranked as ‘high’ quality, 3 as ‘medium’ quality and 3 as ‘low’ quality. The most significant shortcoming identified was that most articles lacked an explicit mention of ethical considerations. It may be the case, however, that all or some of the research had ethical clearance, but this was not made explicit in the articles. Another limitation is that some of these studies included very small sample sizes, potentially reducing the generalizability of results.
Overall, the literature on the impact of sport initiatives on child protection is not abundant, and what evidence is available is skewed toward high-income country experiences. This is despite the prevalence of such initiatives in action globally. Moreover, because a large part of the reviewed literature stressed the need to protect children in sport, the following section will also discuss key findings on risks in sport that hinder child protection outcomes.

5.4.1 Why is sport important for child protection?
Sport is important for child protection because it can contribute to positive child outcomes through the reduction of violence and risky behaviours (e.g., non-violent crime, delinquency, substance use), although available evidence is inconsistent in this regard. It is widely believed that sport can contribute to a reduction in violence. The reasoning for this is that sport is considered an alternative to aggressive behaviours, because sport allows the display of competitive behaviours, but in an environment subject to rules and regulations (Mutz, 2012). More nuanced studies have argued that the type of sport practised may make a difference to the prevalence of violent behaviour (Spruit, van der Put, van Vugt and Stams, 2018).

Lastly, recent evidence has pointed to ways in which sport can contribute to a reduction in structural violence. For example, sport has been promoted as an effective tool for reducing youth delinquency, and sport interventions have been used widely by governments and institutions in support of this aim. Nonetheless, the evidence on the effects is mixed, and, as Parker, Meek and Lewis (2014) and Spruit et al. (2018) point out, the success of such initiatives is conditional on other factors, including coach behaviours and implementation that is accompanied by post-intervention support. Other research has explored how sport can contribute to reducing engagement in other forms of risky behaviour (in addition to crime) such as substance use and abuse, but the evidence for an effect is far from clear or consistent. Some studies have instead found that the sports environment can increase access to alcohol among participants (UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti, 2010) and others have found that sports team participation (compared with non-participation) is associated with a range of antisocial behaviours.

5.4.1.1 Sport as a form of violence intervention
Sport can contribute positively to child protection outcomes through reducing violence and risky behaviours, although the available evidence is inconsistent in this regard.

It is widely believed that sport can contribute to a reduction in violence, and provide an alternative to aggressive behaviour, as sport allows for the display of competitive behaviours, but within an environment subject to rules and regulations (Mutz, 2012). Empirical evidence on the role of sport and its contribution to reducing violence is unclear, however, with some studies pointing to a negative association between sports participation and violent behaviour (Booth, Farrell and Varano, 2008) – meaning that sport activities are associated with a decrease in violent behaviour – while others point to a positive association (Faulkner et al., 2007), denoting the opposite effect. In a study on how social control activities – including practising sport – affect young people’s reports of serious delinquency and risky behaviour, Booth et al. (2008) found that sport significantly reduced the risk of involvement in serious delinquency (defined as carrying a weapon, being in a physical fight and being part of a gang) for females, but not for males. The authors suggested that young women may be more prone to reap the benefits of sport for violence reduction because they are less likely than their male counterparts to develop ‘jock identities’, which often underscore supportive attitudes for violence (Booth et al., 2008).

More nuanced studies have argued that the type of sport practised may influence the prevalence of violent behaviour. Spruit et al. (2018) argued that there are “cultural” differences between sports that may account

5 Results of the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey showed that 72.2 per cent of S4D programmes that responded were identified as aiming to achieve child protection outcomes, including providing a safe and secure space for children (58 per cent of programmes) and reducing risky behaviour such as violence and drug and alcohol abuse (68 per cent). The survey also indicated that 52 per cent of child protection-focused S4D initiatives reported using sport in emergency or humanitarian settings.
for variations in sport’s impact on violence. For example, compared with basketball, football tends to involve more aggressive incidents on the pitch, while basketball has stricter rules that hinder antisocial behaviour (e.g., timeouts, fouls for holding the ball) (Spruit et al., 2018); this may explain why sport may have a greater impact in reducing violent behaviour among those who play basketball than among those who play football. Nevertheless, the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey showed that football is the most common sport among S4D initiatives, used by 38 per cent of all S4D initiatives and by 39 per cent of child protection-focused S4D initiatives.

After football, child protection-focused S4D initiatives most commonly reported using multiple sports (18 per cent) or other sports (15 per cent), followed by a much smaller proportion of initiatives reporting using tennis (5 per cent), basketball and martial arts (both 4 per cent).

In a study of youth attitudes and use of violence among adolescents aged 12–20 years in Brandenbrug, Germany, Mutz (2012) found that youth attitudes to violence differed depending on the sport practised: Young people participating in combat sports such as boxing, karate, wrestling and particularly bodybuilding were more likely than non-athletes to approve of and use physical violence. Interestingly, the only evidence that the study found for sport reducing violence-supportive attitudes was among those who practised ‘leisure sports’ such as jogging or skating. According to Mutz, “it is ultimately obvious that public hopes and political expectations of sports’ capacity to curb youth violence seem to be over-optimistic” (2012, p. 195).

While the role of sport in reducing violence in all of its forms is not yet clear, there is promising evidence that sport can contribute to a reduction in GBV. One of the most widespread sport interventions is the programme Coaching Boys Into Men (CBIM), which encourages athletic coaches to speak directly to their young male athletes about respect toward women and girls (see Box 5.1). The programme has been applied in the context of the United States, with some success: Using a randomized controlled trial to evaluate the CBIM programme in Northern California, one mixed methods study found that coaches trained in CBIM had heightened awareness of abusive behaviours and were better prepared to identify and prevent abusive behaviours among their athletes. In addition, CBIM coaches showed greater confidence in intervening when abusive behaviours occurred among their athletes, higher levels of bystander intervention and a higher frequency of violence-related discussions with athletes and other coaches (Jaime et al., 2015).

Adaptations of the CBIM programme have been implemented elsewhere, with some positive results. In India, for example, a study by Miller et al. (2015) revealed that, prior to CBIM being implemented, cricket coaches were not yet actively serving as role models for athletes, nor did they address violence toward women and girls, although some coaches expressed a willingness to take on this role. When CBIM was implemented in India and the programme subsequently evaluated using quasi-experimental methods with baseline and follow-up surveys, the study found that athletes whose coaches had been trained in CBIM showed greater improvements in gender-equitable attitudes compared with athletes whose coaches provided standard coaching only. In addition, marginally significant improvements were seen in the reduction of negative bystander behaviour (i.e., going along with peers’ abusive behaviour), suggesting that adaptation of the programme in India was feasible and had produced some positive results (Miller et al., 2014). The evidence from this programme suggests, however, that adaptation to the local context is necessary for it to produce results and this may require more time for training coaches.

Lastly, recent evidence has pointed to ways in which sport can contribute to reducing structural violence. In a recent paper on the impact of national football team victories on conflict, Depetris-Chauvin and Durante (2017) found that individuals in 18 African nations interviewed after a national team’s victory were less likely to report a strong sense of ethnic identity, and concluded that the victory of the national team strengthened patriotic and national sentiment and reduced ethnic identification, which subsequently had a significant impact on reducing violence and conflict. Countries that qualified for the Confederation of African Football (CAF) Africa Cup of Nations experienced significantly less conflict than countries that did not; this reduction effect that emerged following qualification for the tournament appeared to
Box 5.1. Select examples of sport programmes with positive protection outcomes

**Coaching Boys Into Men (CBIM):** An evidence-based violence prevention programme that intends to: alter gender norms that foster adolescent relationship abuse (ARA) and sexual violence (SV) perpetration; promote bystander intervention; and reduce ARA/SV perpetration. Coaches trained in CBIM are guided to deliver messages to their athletes that focus on stopping violence against women and girls via a series of 12 training cards available through an online kit that also includes surveys and analysis tools to gather feedback from athletes and other coaches about the programme. This online kit can be downloaded from the CBIM website. CBIM has mostly been applied in the United States and Canada to date, but the programme has developed a more global focus over the last decade or so. In 2006, and in partnership with UNICEF, the programme developed an international guide for coaches, which was distributed to the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) and national football associations in more than 200 countries. In 2009, CBIM was adapted for cricket coaches in Mumbai, India, under the name Parivartan. The programme has also been adapted in countries such as Angola, Australia, Brazil, Mexico and South Africa, among others (CBIM, 2018).

**Tiempo de Juego:** A foundation that uses sport (football) and cultural activities (art workshops and educational courses) to keep children away from social problems that surround them such as drug use and gang involvement. Programmes were implemented in Cazucá, Colombia, one of the most marginalized and violent districts in the country. The foundation’s sport programme consists of weekly training in football; all sport activities are supported by a psychosocial programme that helps participants in their daily lives. Tiempo de Juego was established in 2006, as a project for the Communication for Development (C4D) programme through the Universidad de La Sabana. Every year, around 2,500 children and adolescents aged 4–18 years participate in the foundation’s sport programme. Tiempo de Juego currently belongs to the Street Football World network, which is associated with FIFA, and applies its approved rules of street football (Global Giving, 2018).

**Sky Sports Living for Sport:** No longer active, this national initiative based in the United Kingdom encouraged secondary schools in the United Kingdom and Ireland to run their own sport projects within a broad framework developed by project sponsors and organizers. Teachers organizing projects within their schools could select any sport activity or combination of activities for students, including climbing, horse riding and skiing. Projects lasted from one term to one academic year and involved between 4 and 75 students. Each project culminated in a sport event, often a tournament or competition organized by the project participants. A central component of the programme was its team of more than 135 world-class athlete mentors, who worked directly with students. More than one third of all secondary schools in the United Kingdom took part in the programme, with an overwhelming proportion of teachers noting positive impacts on children in terms of their confidence, self-esteem and teamwork skills. In its 14 years of activity, the programme reached over 500,000 young people, but came to an end in August 2017 (Sky Sports Living for Sport, 2017).
persist in the months following the tournament (Depetris-Chauvin and Durante, 2017). This study relied on Afrobarometer data and hence did not include children in its sample, however, it provides an important starting point for future exploration of the role of sport in addressing systemic forms of violence.

5.4.1.2 Sport and reduced participation in non-violent crime and delinquency

Sport has been promoted as an effective tool for reducing youth delinquency, and sport interventions have been used widely by governments and institutions in support of this aim. One explanation for sport’s contribution to reducing delinquency is that sports participation constitutes a conventional activity that entails bonding with positive members of society (coaches and peers) and strengthening social ties, which in turn reduces the likelihood of engaging in delinquent behaviour (Hirschi, 1969). Despite this explanation, strong, systematic and empirical evidence pointing to a link between sport and youth crime reduction is still lacking (Parnell, Pringle, Widdop and Zwolinsky, 2015) and the evidence that is available is mixed – and thus insufficient to conclusively determine sport’s impact on crime (Spruit, van Vught, van der Put, van der Stouwe and Stams, 2016).

Among the evidence reviewed for this chapter, an early study conducted in Germany found that young members of sports clubs had lower rates of delinquent behaviour, but that playing sport only accounted for 9 per cent of the variance (Brettschneider and Naul, 2004). Other studies, notably those focused on high-income countries, showed a greater impact of sport on antisocial behaviour. For example, the United States-based programme Midnight Basketball League, implemented throughout the 1990s, was found to reduce crime by up to 30 per cent (Farrell, Johnson, Sapp, Pumphrey and Freeman, 1996) and a sports counselling programme based in West Yorkshire, United Kingdom, had a positive effect on reducing recidivism among participants when compared with a control sample of non-participants (Nichols and Taylor, 1996; Nichols, 2008). The West Yorkshire Sports Counselling programme consisted of 12 weeks of sport activities delivered by four sports leaders on a one-to-one basis, involving one meeting per week between the sports leader and participant.

In a more recent study, Parker et al. (2014) evaluated the effects of a sport programme on participating youth offenders in the South of England, finding that sport in the prison setting can encourage youth offenders to desist from offending again in future. Another recent study, by Spruit et al. (2018) on the impact of a Dutch sport programme that targeted (mostly) male adolescents from disadvantaged neighbourhoods with high crime rates, also found positive results: programme participants showed significant improvements in risk and protective factors for delinquency, including fewer friends with delinquent behaviour, and more prosocial behaviours, with the authors concluding that coach behaviours and the socio-moral climate of the sports club predicted intervention success.

In contrast, in a meta-analysis exploring the relationship between sports participation and juvenile delinquency that used a sample of 51 studies, Spruit et al. (2016) found no significant association between sports participation and juvenile delinquency. Several moderating factors also emerged from the analysis, in particular that the type of study influenced the relationship between sport and delinquency, with longitudinal studies indicating that athletes were significantly more delinquent than non-athletes. Evidence is therefore mixed but shows that sport has potential to reduce crime. As Parker et al. (2014) and Spruit et al. (2018) point out, the success of sport initiatives is conditional on other factors, including coach behaviours and implementation that is accompanied by post-intervention support.

5.4.1.3 Sport as an intervention for substance use

Research has also explored how sport can contribute to reducing engagement in other risky behaviours beside crime such as substance use and abuse, but the evidence for an effect is far from clear or consistent. Chen et al. (2004) studied the association between five dimensions of adolescent behaviour and drug involvement among 16-year-olds enrolled in secondary school in Panama, the five Spanish heritage countries of Central America and the Dominican Republic, and found that sport may have played an important role in shielding youth from risks connected to the earliest stages of drug involvement. Additional literature suggests the potential for sport to mitigate the likelihood of engaging in other
risky behaviours, including alcohol intoxication and tobacco use (see, for example, Woitas-Ślubowska, 2009).

Other studies have, in contrast, found that the sports environment increases access to alcohol among participants (UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti, 2010) and that sports team participation (compared with non-participation) is associated with a range of antisocial behaviours, including alcohol use (Garry and Morrissey, 2000; Nelson and Wechsler, 2001). Other authors conclude that whether sport contributes to or hinders more drinking among youth may depend on the type of sport practised (Mutz, 2012) and other contextual factors (Ford, 2007). Furthermore, some authors have emphasized that it is not necessarily clear that sport has a role in diverting young people from using drugs, especially as more children are becoming involved in elite and competitive sports, where the use of performance-enhancing drugs can be widespread (UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti, 2010).

5.4.1 Promising evidence for child protection outcomes

In sum, the evidence on whether sport programmes contribute to child protection outcomes in general and violence reduction in particular is unclear, but promising sport initiatives that contribute to reducing GBV have been identified. Furthermore, the links between sport and risky behaviours, including alcohol consumption and drug use, also remain unclear. Promising evidence pointing to reduced crime and reoffending among participants of sport programmes has been registered, however. No evidence is found that sport programmes contribute to reducing exploitation or abuse of children and young people, which are key components of the definition of child protection, and thus greater attention to M&E is needed in the implementation of S4D initiatives to help to fill the gap in evidence on the impact of programmes on child protection outcomes.

5.4.2 What works when using sport as a protective factor in children’s lives?

The mechanisms by which participation in sport can contribute to positive child protection outcomes include: (1) bonds formed through social capital; (2) the development of positive identity; (3) the creation of a safe space; and (4) prosocial values.

5.4.2.1 Development of social capital through sport

One important mechanism by which sport contributes to positive child protection outcomes is the formation of bonds through the development of social capital. Coaches in particular are key figures for instilling positive behaviour and for creating a pedagogical sports environment that has a caring and motivational climate (Spruit et al., 2018) – all integral components of programme success. The actions taken by coaches greatly influence to what extent young people can experience the potential positive aspects of sport (Bailey and Dismore, 2004) and supportive relationships between these adults and young participants should be a key part of any sport programme promoting positive youth development (Armour and Sandford, 2013). Haudenhuyse, Theeboom and Coalter (2012) point out that sport programmes with coaches who place the young person’s well-being at the centre and who recognize and address the broader, structural conditions of the young participants have the potential to make a positive impact among vulnerable children and young people.

Evidence supports this, for example, Kelly’s (2013) study on the Positive Futures, a national social inclusion programme that has operated in the United Kingdom for more than 10 years, which targets marginalized adolescents aged 10–19 years using sport and other activities. The study found that the adolescents’ use of their supportive relationships with coaches and staff had helped them to establish paths toward education and employment. In his work exploring the impact of the West Yorkshire Sports Counselling on reoffending rates, Nichols (2008) found that aspects of programme success included the sports leaders serving as positive role models, along with their strong mentoring relationship with programme participants. Sandford et al. (2008) also highlighted the role of sports leaders as central to programme success in relation to the HSBC/Outward Bound project and the Youth Sport Trust/Sky Sports Living for Sport programme in the United Kingdom. Spruit et al. (2018) also found in their study on the predictors of a sport programme’s success in preventing juvenile delinquency that the education level of coaches was important in determining their impact on disadvantaged young people.
Even in post-disaster contexts, the role of coaches in sport programming is vital, as shown by an evaluation of a programme implemented in the aftermath of an earthquake in Bam, Islamic Republic of Iran. In this study, Kunz (2009) noted that the role of coaches and their efforts to create a supportive environment were essential to the use of sport as an effective instrument to support the psychosocial rehabilitation of children affected by the natural disaster. From this evidence, it follows that coaches play a vital role in generating positive protection outcomes for children and young people, as they can act as role models for instilling positive behaviour and can create linkages with future employment and education opportunities that reduce exposure to violence.

5.4.2.2 Positive identity development through sport

Another mechanism through which sport contributes to child protection outcomes is the development of a positive identity through sport. Sport can be protective because it allows children and young people to develop alternative identities and can instil a “positive alternative means for future self-definition” (Parker et al., 2014, p. 387). In this process, children and young people develop a more positive idea of themselves and who they can become. According to Parker et al. (2014), the promotion of self-esteem and the development of social skills that characterize sport programmes targeting young offenders in prison settings can help them to imagine a more positive future, encouraging them to desist from crime in future.

Evidence indicates that the development of an athlete identity can directly influence protection outcomes. Whitley, Massey and Wilkison (2018) carried out a qualitative evaluation of an existing programme for positive youth development among under-resourced youth in New York, United States, and found that being an athlete changed the way in which participating youth were treated. The status acquired from being a talented athlete protected this group from harm, as gangs and significant others tended to protect the most gifted athletes. In another study, looking at how sport affected the lives of former athletes who grew up in under-resourced communities with adverse childhood experiences, Massey and Whitley (2016) found that pressure to use drugs and engage in criminal activity was ameliorated, with peers actively encouraging athletes and those heavily invested in sport to avoid situations that could put their athletic careers at risk. In sum, by way of social capital gained through sport and the new relationships that develop in this environment, children and youth acquire the capacity to explore new identities and develop a vision for an alternative and more positive future (Whitley et al., 2018).

5.4.2.3 Creation of a safe space in sports settings

There is some evidence that the setting in which sport activities are located can act as a safe space, as extracurricular activities often take place within a safe environment (Lerner, Almerigi, Theokas and Lerner, 2005; Zimmerman et al., 2013). (For an example, see Box 5.2).

A participatory mapping exercise with 32 young peer leaders and coaches involved in Tiempo de Juego’s sport programme in Cazucá, Colombia, showed that the initiative provided participants with a sense of security, with some study participants describing the place where sport was practised as an “enclave of security, [and] sharing” (Sobotová, Šafaříková and Martínez, 2016, p. 530), although some participants recognized that travelling to these spaces and accessing them could be problematic. According to Haudenhuyse, Theeboom, Nols and Coussée (2013), participation by marginalized youth in sports clubs in the context of Flanders, Belgium, revealed that sports clubs offered young people environments in which they could find “support, meaning, appreciation, security and caring” (p. 193). Those settings in which sport activities take place can also act as a place of refuge from the discriminatory practices of authorities against marginalized and minority young people. For example, an evaluation of the Positive Futures programme in the United Kingdom found that sport initiatives provided a space in which young people could socialize without attracting unwanted police attention, constituting a form of “diversionary activity” but also “sanctioned leisure”, which was conditional upon avoiding behaviour that may be considered disruptive (Kelly, 2013, p. 272). As previously mentioned, 58 per cent of child protection-focused S4D initiatives in the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey reported providing a safe and secure space as a primary non-sport objective.
5.4.2.4 Promotion of prosocial values in sport

Lastly, sport can contribute to child protection outcomes through the development of prosocial values, including conflict resolution competencies and cooperation (Gasser and Levisen, 2004; Right To Play, 2008). Of the child protection-focused S4D initiatives that responded to the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, 64 per cent reported using lessons to explicitly address antisocial behaviour such as bullying and violence. From the theoretical standpoint of social learning (Bandura, 1973), it can be argued that sport instils in children and young people prosocial behaviours like cooperation, respect and willingness to follow rules and regulations, and there is some evidence that this is the case.

An education programme implemented among secondary school students in Sri Lanka, for example, showed that a programme intervention consisting of Olympism lessons – a series of educational modules involving classroom activities for conflict resolution lessons and outdoor sport activities – had some positive results, with participants showing increased conflict resolution competencies (Nanayakkara, 2016). An

Box 5.2. Spotlight on AMANDLA: Safe-Hubs for child protection

Founded in 2007, AMANDLA is a South African non-profit organization that aims to create safe spaces which use football to engage youth in holistic development. The Safe-Hub model relies on the organization’s central curriculum, the EduFootball programme, to provide age-appropriate structured play and sport activities for children aged 5–16 years. The model also supports employability, further education and training for young people aged 17 and above. In each Safe-Hub, sport is the foundation for building relationships between vulnerable children and youth and adults who they can trust. Team training sessions, football leagues and tournaments provide safe activities, and night programming targets victims and perpetrators by providing secure activities between the peak crime hours of 8 p.m. and midnight. In the same setting, participants also have access to support for academic studies, psychological well-being, family planning, substance abuse, and health. Coaches are trained in first aid and child protection and as child and youth care workers. Social workers are present on site to provide counselling and reliable referral pathways. Local ownership is important to keep participants safe, as Neighbourhood Watch schemes and local community leadership contribute to keeping facilities safe and secure. Young people are central in all decision-making in relation to each Safe-Hub.

The Safe-Hub model uses a monitoring, evaluation and learning system to manage and improve the model and for accountability. This system relies on indicators aligned with the model’s conceptual framework to collect data that can show if the Safe-Hub initiative is meeting its goals. Indeed, these data show a reduction in contact crime in the areas surrounding the Safe-Hubs. Some of the other positive results include 88 per cent of participants showing more resilience to peer pressure, and 96 per cent of them having set goals and demonstrating motivation to achieve them. Through its Social Franchise System, AMANDLA aims to implement 100 Safe-Hubs across South Africa by 2030 as well as roll out Safe-Hubs beyond Africa – work is already under way on a Safe-Hub in Berlin, Germany.
evaluation of recreational activities to educate young people at social risk in Costa Rica about aggression and values found that these activities inspired a decreasing tendency toward aggressive behaviours as well as an increase in expression of values, including respect, cooperation and self-control (Rodríguez, Rodríguez, Orozco and Schmith, 2016). In a qualitative evaluation of a post-disaster psychosocial intervention in the aftermath of an earthquake in Bam, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kunz (2009) found that the introduction of sport had a positive effect on the well-being of participating children who had been affected by the natural disaster. The study found that their initial aggression and hostility was channelled through sport and play activities into cooperative team play. According to Rodríguez et al. (2016), the changes that are typically observed in sport programmes include increased attitudes of cooperation, self-control and respect for others.

5.4.2.5 Mechanisms for child protection in and through S4D
This evidence points to the mechanisms through which sport contributes to positive child protection outcomes. The literature highlights the vital role of coaches not only to the overall success of programme implementation, but also in generating social capital that can lead to positive identity development among child and young participants. Sport activities can also constitute safe spaces in which participants can be shielded from community violence or violence perpetrated by the discriminatory practices of authorities. Lastly, sport can contribute to child protection outcomes by building and strengthening prosocial values, in particular competencies for conflict resolution and cooperation.

5.4.3 What are the challenges in using sport for child protection?
The literature review also identified risks in sport that hinder child protection outcomes, particularly risks concerning exposure to violence in all of its forms. Despite the conflicting – and, at times, contradictory – evidence gathered on the impact of sport, the narrative that stands is that sport has overwhelmingly positive effects, hampering the emergence of other narratives that contradict this widely accepted view (Coalter, 2010).

While the literature review for this chapter focused initially on synthesizing evidence on the positive contribution of sport to child protection outcomes, sport is not exclusively a protective medium, nor is it always protective. According to Rhind et al. (2014) it is necessary to re-evaluate the proclaimed evangelic role of sport and its consideration as a fix-all solution in developing countries. In particular, the link between sport and exposure to interpersonal violence in all of its forms – and, specifically, sexual violence – needs to be better understood and documented, as evidence generation is still in its infancy in this regard.

5.4.3.1 Interpersonal violence in sport
Initial evidence suggests that prevalence rates of interpersonal violence in sport could be high and that peers tend to be the main perpetrators (Vertommen et al., 2017). In 2010, however, UNICEF reported that there had only been a meagre assessment thus far of the prevalence, scale and depth of violence against children in sport (UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti, 2010). This is still the case in this present review, as only a handful of studies have explored the prevalence of violence in sport. In fact, currently there exists neither reliable figures on the prevalence rates of interpersonal violence in organized youth sport (Vertommen et al., 2016) nor a validated international questionnaire to gather this information.

The available evidence does not paint a favourable picture, however. A study in the United Kingdom found that the prevalence of interpersonal violence was estimated to be as high as 75 per cent for emotional harm and 24 per cent for physical harm among athletes under 16 years of age, although this study had an extremely low response rate (less than 1 per cent) (Alexander, Stafford and Lewis, 2011). In a more recent study, nearly 4 out of 10 participants in organized sport in the Netherlands reported some kind of unwanted behaviour, and in Belgium and the Netherlands, 44 per cent of respondents who had participated in sport before the age of 18 years reported at least one experience with one of the three types of interpersonal violence (Vertommen et al., 2016). In the latter study, almost 38 per cent of respondents indicated at least one incident of psychological violence and 11 per cent at least one event...
involving physical violence, while 14 per cent had experienced sexual violence at least once (Vertommen et al., 2016). In perhaps the only large-scale study of bullying in sport, Sisjord et al. (2007) found that 30 per cent of children sampled (aged 12–16 years) reported having experienced bullying.

Evidence also indicates that certain groups are more at risk of experiencing violence in sport. In Vertommen et al. (2016) and Alexander et al. (2011), males experienced physical violence more often than females, while females reported higher rates of sexual violence. As the athlete increases in talent, she or he is also at greater and prolonged risk of experiencing violence (Fasting and Sand, 2015; Vertommen, Schipper-van Veldhoven, Hartill and Van Den Eede, 2015) – especially sexual violence (Brackenridge, Kay and Rhind, 2014). According to Vertommen et al. (2016): “Being an elite (young) athlete, investing an immense amount of time, money, energy in sport, has systematically shown to significantly increase the risk of exposure to IV [interpersonal violence] in sport” (p. 234). In a qualitative study, Fasting and Sand (2015) also found that children who worked hard to become better athletes were more prone to sexual violence and according to the authors, “performing at higher levels also appears to parallel a higher predisposition to sexual violence.” (Bjørnseth and Szabo, 2018, p. 377).

Minority groups within sport also tend to be more victimized, although the extent to which this is the case is still largely unexplored (Fasting and Sand, 2015). Evidence on this last point is scarce, but in a recent study, Vertommen et al. (2016) found that prevalence rates of interpersonal violence among those who had played organized sports before the age of 18 years in the Netherlands and Belgium were higher among athletes who were immigrants, GSM young people or persons with disabilities compared with their non-minority counterparts. Interestingly, bisexual respondents in this study reported an even higher prevalence of interpersonal violence than their gay/lesbian and heterosexual peers (Vertommen et al., 2016).

5.4.3.2 Sexual abuse in sport

Sexual abuse has become a key concern of literature on child protection in sport since the 1990s, primarily due to the realization of its prevalence in sport (Bjørnseth and Szabo, 2018; Lenskyj, 1992). Sexual abuse is often perpetrated by a person of trust outside of the family, such as a sports coach, and it is something to which males are more often exposed in sport than females (Edinburgh, Saewyc and Levitt, 2006; Smallbone, Marshall and Wortley, 2013). Females are certainly not exempt, however, and some studies found that sexual abuse in sport is more prevalent among girls (Fasting, Brackenridge and Kjølberg, 2013; UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti, 2010).

While literature estimating the prevalence of sexual abuse in sport is not abundant and has primarily focused on the coach-athlete relationship (Bjørnseth and Szabo, 2018), a recent study estimated the prevalence of sexual violence against children in sport to be 14 per cent in Belgium and the Netherlands (Vertommen et al., 2016). Other studies estimate rates of sexual abuse in sport ranging from 2 to 49 per cent, with wide discrepancies in estimates a result of differences in measures and study designs (Baker and Byon, 2014; Brackenridge and Fasting, 2002; Chroni and Fasting, 2009; Fasting, 2015). A large-scale, retrospective study also found that almost one third (29 per cent) of 6,000 respondents in the United Kingdom had experienced sexual abuse as child athletes (Alexander et al., 2011), suggesting that prevalence rates of sexual violence in sport are very high (2018), although all of this evidence is concentrated in high-income countries. In developing countries, where sport regulations may be much more lax or even non-existent, prevalence rates could be even higher, however, this is not known at this time, as no systematic evidence exists in this area (UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti, 2010).

5.4.3.3 Addressing challenges to child protection in S4D

Initial evidence indicates that the prevalence of violence in sport is high, with certain groups – e.g., elite athletes, minorities – more at risk of victimization. Further data collection is necessary to better understand this, however, especially in developing country settings, where important evidence gaps remain. Moreover, results from the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey showed that violence and insecurity was the second most frequently reported challenge or vulnerability faced
by children and young people in child protection-focused S4D programmes (63 per cent of programmes), while 10 per cent of these programmes reported that participants drop out because of safety and security concerns. As such programmes aim to achieve better child protection outcomes, addressing violence faced by participants, including identifying and eliminating the risk of violence in sport, is of utmost importance. The existing literature also highlights that the role of sport in the lives of children and young people requires a more nuanced appreciation that better captures how it can contribute to both positive and negative child protection outcomes. According to Coakley (2011), the positive relationship between sport and good protection outcomes is dependent on many factors – including, for example, norms and sport culture, and meaning and value assigned to sport – and in the absence of these, sport can become another risk factor for young people (Kreager, 2007; Palmer and Thompson, 2007). Perhaps the most fundamental point of all is to critically evaluate whether the goal of sport – to remain aggressively competitive and dominate others in the field – is compatible with the narrative of sport as a place or space that promotes understanding and peace (Massey and Whitley, 2016).

5.4.3.3 Normalization of violence in sport
Research has highlighted the existence of several mechanisms that can contribute to hindering child protection outcomes in sport. These include unhealthy practices that can be normalized and tolerated (Alexander et al., 2011; Papaefstathiou, Rhind and Brackenridge, 2013; Stirling and Kerr, 2009), a high tolerance of random incidents of violence, and the presence of reward structures for overly aggressive behaviour, which are especially prevalent in competitive sports (Vertommen et al., 2016). Furthermore, sport can also be linked with negative impacts such as hooliganism, doping and drugs or alcohol (Sobotová et al., 2016) and can contribute to the escalation of conflicts (Schulenkorf, 2010; Sugden, 2008), particularly through the promotion of narratives of masculine resilience (Smith, 2013), although this may vary by type of sport practised (Mutz, 2012).

5.4.3.4 Unequal power dynamics in sport
In addition, the inherent power dynamics and culture of authoritarian leadership that occur in sport between participants and their peers, parents and coaches can leave children vulnerable to abuse (Brackenridge, 2001). In the wake of the #MeToo movement, there has been increasing concern that sexual harassment and abuse in different spheres demands attention – and the world of sport is no exception. Especially worrisome is the fact that young athletes necessarily spend considerable time with their coaches and behaviour that would usually be unacceptable outside of sport is considered normal in this realm, placing children and young people in particularly vulnerable situations that may lead to sexual abuse. In addition, children and young people who are involved in sport are often blind to the coach’s knowledge and skills and their position and power (Stirling and Kerr, 2009). Fear of the consequences, feelings of guilt and shame, and fear of possible detrimental impacts on their sports career also constricit athletes from speaking out about abuse (Bjørnseth and Szabo, 2018). Consequently, there is a very high risk that victims of abuse remain silent. Another contributing factor to abuse is that coaches are not well informed of the rules regarding the acceptable limits of the coach-athlete relationship and guidance on this topic is not commonly administered. Protection of children and young people from abuse in sport is also hampered by a general lack of knowledge about the child protection measures that exist in sports organizations (Brackenridge and Fasting, 2002) as well as difficulties in sharing information about offending coaches and the absence of legislation forcing sports organizations to adopt screening measures (Kirby, Demers and Parent, 2008).

5.4.3.5 Safeguarding children in sport
Safeguards for children and young people participating in sport have been introduced through various stakeholders, including international organizations and national governments, although important shortcomings remain. (For an example of safeguarding in practice, see Box 5.3.)

International organizations: Until the late 1990s and early 2000s, very few sports organizations had systems in place to respond to complaints about inappropriate behaviour by adults and peers in sport (International Safeguarding Children in Sport Working Group, 2016) and very few organizations had designed explicit measures to protect athletes from violence (UNICEF Office of
Recently, a set of international safeguards was developed by UNICEF in partnership with several organizations with the aim of establishing the foundations for ensuring children’s safety and protection in sport globally (2016). These safeguards are based on the Convention on the Rights of the Child and existing child protection standards and good practices, and they highlight, among other things, that all organizations providing sport activities should: (1) have a safeguarding policy that is inclusive; (2) have effective systems to process complaints or concerns, and support systems for victims of violence; (3) have arrangements to provide essential information and support to those responsible for safeguarding children; (4) have measures to minimize risk for children; (5) have codes of conduct; (6) perform appropriate recruitment and training; (7) work with partners to ensure shared expectations on safeguarding; and (8) implement M&E of sports organizations.

**National governments:** Regulations and training sessions have been set up by national governments, most notably in developed countries (especially Australia, Canada, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom), to ensure the protection of children in sport. Government intervention and regulation exist to varying degrees, however, and even in developed countries, the implementation of laws and the provision of training sessions to safeguard children has been neither uniform nor always mandatory. In Belgium, for example, only half of all sports club coaches have a specific sport-related pedagogical qualification that all coaches should ideally have (Van
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**Box 5.3. Spotlight on the ChildFund Alliance Pass It Back programme: Safeguarding for children**

Since 2015, the ChildFund Alliance Pass It Back programme has used tag rugby to implement an integrated life skills and sport curriculum in the East Asia and Pacific region. The programme has so far reached 3,000 children aged 12–16 years, to deliver four modules that focus on gender, sexual and reproductive health, planning for the future, rights and violence prevention. The experiential learning programme is designed to be fully participatory, with input from child participation experts. Young coaches design a short rugby game to simulate a real-life situation and then guide participants in reflecting on what the experience was like, connecting it to their own lives and applying solutions. Coaches are all young members of the local community aged between 16 and 25 years, who are trained not only to implement the life skills and sport curriculum but also to uphold principles of safeguarding and child protection.

ChildFund Alliance implements the Pass It Back programme paying significant attention to safeguarding to ensure that both the participants and young coaches are safe from harm, physical and mental abuse, and neglect. The organization works with players, coaches, partners and any relevant national sporting bodies to ensure that policies and procedures for safeguarding are present at all levels. Since 2017, the Pass It Back programme has also been piloting a project on safeguarding and social inclusion policies and practices, involving self-assessment, education and policy development activities. A recent external evaluation of the programme showed that this pilot is having an impact by increasing the proportion of participants who know where to get support when it is needed, who know of a safe place they can go and who know that they can ask for support.
Lierde and Willems, 2006). In Canada, training programmes for coaches suffer from a self-selection bias, as coaches who participate in voluntary training sessions are the ones less likely to perpetrate abusive practices (Kerr and Stirling, 2008). In the United States, laws have recently been enacted to protect athletes from specific harms such as traumatic brain injuries. Yet, these laws have important limitations, for example, in the case of traumatic brain injuries, they do not reflect a scientific basis for the amount of time young athletes should refrain from participating in sport activities following an injury, and the laws exhibit important differences in regard to the type of health professional best qualified to make the decision as to whether an athlete should return to sport (Harvey, 2013).

While international instruments such as the International Safeguards for Children in Sport are available, no data exist to better understand which countries are adhering to these safeguards. Based on the evidence outlined above, protection mechanisms in developed countries do exist, but they do not necessarily align with international instruments, and they still have significant limitations, especially since they often lack mandatory requirements as well as uniformity in their implementation. It is particularly worrying that no information is available on existing safeguards and limitations regarding their implementation in sport in developing country settings – especially given that S4D programmes are typically concentrated in developing countries and regions.

5.4.3.6 Practical limitations of using sport as an intervention

While there is some evidence of the impact of sport initiatives on child protection outcomes, Coalter (2010a) argues that sport interventions are guided by “inflated promise” and “lack conceptual clarity” (p. 473). In addition, the impact of sport is dependent on the presence of a set of factors embedded within these programmes. In other words, sport alone cannot and will not ensure successful child protection outcomes; instead, sport activities must be accompanied by certain characteristics such as the presence of supportive coaches (Haudenhuyse et al., 2014), an aspect highlighted in several studies included in this review. As Coalter (2007) and Crabbe et al. (2006) explain, sport programmes cannot have a transformative capacity if they merely offer sport activities, they can only contribute in a meaningful way if implemented within a personal and social development approach. As Haudenhuyse et al. (2013) point out, to create truly supportive settings, sports clubs and coaches must take on a personal and social development approach.

Furthermore, it is necessary to recognize and address that young people in vulnerable situations – those most likely to engage in risky behaviours – may completely reject organized sport activities and be unwilling to participate because sports settings usually contain characteristics similar to those of other settings in which they have felt exclusion or failure (Haudenhuyse et al., 2012). As Williams and Bedward (2001) argue, sport can be both alienating and embarrassing for young people who have little aptitude or skill for sport. For Collins (2005), an additional criticism of the use of sports clubs is that they may constitute narrow subcultures or cliques, and rather than produce true community integration through the creation of bridges between dissimilar people, they are better at producing bonds between similar people. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, it is imperative to discern whether the forms of ‘social inclusion’ that sport programmes offer marginalized young people, and which may have the potential to reduce crime and violence, can coexist in societies where structural inequality perpetuates social exclusion and where sport programmes mount a façade of support for the marginalized but do little, if anything, to address larger, structural problems (Kelly, 2013).

5.5 Conclusions and recommendations

Sport activities have long been assumed to contribute to positive child protection outcomes, including through
reducing violence and risky behaviours. Robust empirical support has not, however, been found for the theoretical perspectives that argue for the role of sport in violence reduction through social control and adoption of certain norms and values.

A few sport initiatives have shown promising results in reducing GBV and other risks of violence for children and young people by promoting the formation of bonds through social capital and through the development of positive youth identities and prosocial values. Nevertheless, the literature also indicates that sport can constitute a protection risk, as children and young people who practise sport are at greater risk of being victims of all forms of interpersonal violence, with certain groups – e.g., elite athletes, minorities – facing heightened risks, although further evidence needs to be collected on this front, particularly in developing country settings. While advances have been made to ensure the protection of children in sport, both nationally (mostly in developed countries) and internationally (such as through the development of the International Safeguards for Children in Sport), important limitations remain. These include the absence of data to better understand which countries are adhering to these safeguards as well as the lack of mandatory requirements and uniformity in national safeguards.

For sport initiatives to be successful, positive change in protection outcomes should first be understood as contributing directly to any and all of the mechanisms identified, in turn leading to a decrease in violence and risky behaviours among children and young people who participate in sport activities. Furthermore, it is necessary to understand if, and under what conditions, sport programming can contribute to addressing other protection risks that fall under the UNICEF definition, such as exploitation. Lastly, change in protection outcomes should be understood both as the adoption of safeguards across different contexts, and also as evidence that the adoption of these safeguards significantly contributes to child protection. The two theories of change below illustrate how sport can contribute to positive child protection outcomes, and also how sport may constitute a protection risk (see Figures 5.2 and 5.3).

**Figure 5.2. How sport contributes to child protection outcomes**

![Diagram showing how sport contributes to child protection outcomes](image)

5.5.2 Recommendations for key stakeholders: Child-focused S4D and child protection

Practitioners working in S4D interventions should invest in the training of coaches, who have been identified as a central pillar for the success of sport initiatives. In addition, it is important to advocate for uniform and homogeneous laws at all levels of government that make coach training mandatory – rather than voluntary – to reduce the likelihood of abusive practices. Practitioners should encourage those coaches who have not fully recognized their imperative role in athletes’ lives and behaviour to participate actively as role models by encouraging positive behaviours, particularly with the aim of reducing GBV. Programmatic efforts that have been empirically proven to create positive change – such as CBIM – should be expanded. In volatile environments, especially in settings following conflict or natural disaster, coaches administering sport programmes should be provided with additional support, both material and psychological.

Policymakers need to re-evaluate existing assumptions about sport as some sort of ‘silver bullet’ for addressing the integration of marginalized and vulnerable populations; as a tool for decreasing crime and violence; and as a tool for conflict resolution. It is necessary to create sport programmes that address the systemic problems that lead to the exclusion of vulnerable populations, rather than rely solely on sport to address profound social ills. Creating such programmes would involve, as a first step, listening to the voices of those who are marginalized to learn how to modify and improve existing programmes and initiatives, and where possible, involving marginalized groups in programme design and evaluation.

Following on from this, an additional recommendation is for policymakers to tie sport into existing social programmes that tackle structural problems that are often linked to violence, such as poverty, education and employment, among others. As Hartman and Kwak (2011, as cited in Haudenhuyse et al., 2012, p. 480) highlight, sports practices can be “conceptualized as a form of political engagement and educative practice that could contribute to more fundamental social changes.” One practical recommendation could be to increase cash
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**Figure 5.3. How sport can contribute to child protection risks sport**

![Diagram showing the relationship between sports, mechanisms, violence increase, and risk behaviors like interpersonal violence, gender-based violence, hooliganism, and risky behavior increase.]

transfers to encourage access to sport activities or sports clubs for the children of cash transfer beneficiaries. In addition, it is necessary to sponsor programmes that truly create bridges between groups that would normally not interact with each other, rather than support programmes that further reinforce exclusionary practices that lie at the heart of violent dynamics. Building such bridges could include, for example, enabling access to sports clubs that bring together both marginalized and non-marginalized children and young people.

Researchers in the area of S4D and child protection should focus on generating more research and evidence that explores both the positive impacts of sport on child protection outcomes and its potential risks, looking especially at developing country settings, where evidence is particularly lacking. Such research requires, first, the creation of an internationally validated instrument and indicators to measure and compare the prevalence of violence in sport, although the design of data collection instruments will require awareness of the ethical limitations of research involving children; sensitivity to the topics of violence, exploitation and abuse; and consideration of regional and cultural differences. Data collection should also be geared toward building a wider evidence base on the positive impacts of sport programmes on child protection, which will involve evaluating existing initiatives and gaining a better understanding of the potential of sport to have positive impacts on other forms of protection, such as preventing exploitation. Specific indicators should be created, and baseline and follow-up measurements taken.

Second, it is necessary to use a mixed methods approach to gain a better understanding of the processes and mechanisms through which sport contributes to positive protection outcomes, as well as to reformulate existing theories on the benefits of sport unsubstantiated by empirical evidence. Third, data collection efforts should also better represent the voices of children and young people, although some qualitative work has included the voices of participants of sport programmes. Remarkably, the voices of elite athletes are under-represented in the literature. Where possible, researchers could also invest in building longitudinal data sets to better understand how sport can contribute to long-term change, taking care that the indicators created do not reproduce practices of social exclusion and pathologize those who are marginalized (Haudenhuyse et al., 2012). Researchers can also contribute to a better understanding of which countries follow existing international guidelines for child protection in sport, both to identify gaps in protection and to assess the effectiveness of existing safeguards.
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## Annex 5.A. Summary of literature with child protection outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Study method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>What sports were used?</th>
<th>How were sports used?</th>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>For whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitley, Massey and Wilkinson (2018)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>Disadvantaged youth; traumatized youth</td>
<td>Developing systems theory to understand impact of sports on fostering positive youth development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobotová, Šafaříková and Martínez (2016)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>Cazucá, Soacha, Colombia</td>
<td>Tiempo de Juego programme using public space/territory; unpacking geographies and feelings about space along indicators of: security, freedom of speech, feeling of belonging, equal access</td>
<td>Young peer leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanayakkara (2016)</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Secondary school students</td>
<td>Educating youth through sport, plus practical teaching in schools about aims of International Olympic Committee to build peaceful world; whether Olympism values can be applied to real-life situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime et al. (2015)</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>California, United States</td>
<td>Coaching Boys Into Men programme to alter gender norms that foster adolescent relationship abuse/sexual violence</td>
<td>Male high school students and sports coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller et al. (2014)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>Mumbai, India</td>
<td>Adopting Coaching Boys Into Men programme in India; evaluating potential to change social norms related to masculinity and reduce gender-based violence</td>
<td>Sports coaches and male students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What are the results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Empowerment, self-determination, agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Method**

- **QL**: Qualitative practitioners (volunteer or professional)
- **QT**: Quantitative participants
- **MM**: Mixed Methods Community members (not practitioners)
- **Op**: Opinion Paper other professionals (e.g., multicultural workers)
- **n/a**: Not applicable community leaders

**Study Participants/Sample**

- **QL**: Qualitative practitioners (volunteer or professional)
- **QT**: Quantitative participants
- **MM**: Mixed Methods Community members (not practitioners)
- **Op**: Opinion Paper other professionals (e.g., multicultural workers)
- **n/a**: Not applicable community leaders

**Citation**

- Whitley, Massey and Wilkison (2018) QL Developing systems theory to understand impact of sports on fostering positive youth development
- Disadvantaged youth; traumatized youth

- Embodied physicality and competition; change in youth–environment interactions; developmentally focused sport environment

- Initiative location as enclave of sharing, respect, freedom, security, equality

- Whitley, Massey and Wilkison (2018) QL Developing systems theory to understand impact of sports on fostering positive youth development
- Disadvantaged youth; traumatized youth

- Embodied physicality and competition; change in youth–environment interactions; developmentally focused sport environment

- Initiative location as enclave of sharing, respect, freedom, security, equality

- Sobotová, Šafaříková and Martínez (2016) QL, n = 32 Tiempo de Juego programme using public space/territory; unpacking geographies and feelings about space along indicators of: security, freedom of speech, feeling of belonging, equal access
- Cazucá, Soacha, Colombia
- Young peer leaders + + Initiative location as enclave of sharing, respect, freedom, security, equality

- Nanayakkara (2016) MM, n = 124 (45% female) Educating youth through sport, plus practical teaching in schools about aims of International Olympic Committee to build peaceful world; whether Olympism values can be applied to real-life situations
- Central Province, Sri Lanka
- Secondary school students + +

- Jaime et al. (2015) MM, n = 176 (100% male) Coaching Boys Into Men programme to alter gender norms that foster adolescent relationship abuse/sexual violence
- California, United States
- Male high school students and sports coaches + +

- Miller et al. (2014) QT, n = 309 (100% male, aged 10–16 years) Cricket Adopting Coaching Boys Into Men programme in India; evaluating potential to change social norms related to masculinity and reduce gender-based violence
- Mumbai, India
- Sports coaches and male students + +
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Study method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>What sports were used?</th>
<th>How were sports used/role of sport?</th>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>For whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller et al. (2012)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseline: ( n = 2,006 ) (100% male) Follow-up: ( n = 1,798 ) (100% male) Girls were eligible to participate, but in a separate, female-specific survey that was excluded from the analysis</td>
<td>Examines effectiveness of Coaching Boys Into Men, a dating violence prevention programme</td>
<td>Sacramento County, California, United States</td>
<td>Sports coaches and male high school athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massey and Whitley (2016)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>( n = 10 )</td>
<td>Examines how sport potentially contributes to development over time</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Former athletes who had experienced multiple traumas/adverse experiences during childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunz (2009)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>▽</td>
<td>( n = 15 )</td>
<td>Post-disaster psychosocial intervention</td>
<td>Bam, Islamic Republic of Iran</td>
<td>Children, youth, parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly (2012)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>▲, ○, □</td>
<td>( n = 88 )</td>
<td>Explores the role of sport interventions in contributing to youth crime reduction</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haudenhuyse, Theeboom, Nols and Coussée (2014)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>●, ▲, ○, □</td>
<td>( n = 50 ) young people (aged 9–22 years, 58% male); ( n = 13 ) coaches, board members and club coordinators</td>
<td>How participation in sports clubs is experienced and how vulnerable youth can best be supported</td>
<td>Flanders, Belgium</td>
<td>Socially vulnerable youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haudenhuyse, Theeboom and Coalter (2012)</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>●, ▲, ○</td>
<td>( n = 35 )</td>
<td>Organized sport as a series of social relationships and processes; how it contributes to decreasing vulnerability</td>
<td>Flanders, Belgium</td>
<td>Socially vulnerable youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Dormitzer, Gutiérrez, Vittetoe, González and Anthony (2004)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>( n = 12,589 ) school-attending youth (aged 16 years)</td>
<td>Part of adolescent behavioural repertoire (ABR); study aims to estimate strength of association among five ABR dimensions and the earliest stages of drug involvement</td>
<td>Panama, Spanish-heritage countries of Central America, Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the results?</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Health and well-being</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment, self-determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation, initiative, goal-setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and well-being (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miller et al. (2012)**

**Study method:** QT

**Sample:** Baseline: n = 2,006 (100% male) Follow-up: n = 1,798 (100% male)

Girls were eligible to participate, but in a separate, female-specific survey that was excluded from the analysis.

Examines effectiveness of Coaching Boys Into Men, a dating violence prevention programme.

Sacramento County, California, United States

Sports coaches and male high school athletes

Improvements in gender-equitable attitudes

Positive: distraction from hardship, way out. Negative: arena to develop violent and angry persona. Dependent on structure provided, relationships and opportunities

Coaches play crucial role in using sport and play to support post-disaster psychosocial rehabilitation

Self-regulation

Additionally, sports clubs provide environments of appreciation and caring; requires specific efforts from coaches and cultural context

Focus on coaching practices that have potential to decrease vulnerability (e.g., placing youth well-being at centre, focus on concrete needs and life situations)

**Massey and Whitley (2016)**

**Study method:** QL

**Sample:** n = 10

Examines how sport potentially contributes to development over time.

United States

Former athletes who had experienced multiple traumas/adverse experiences during childhood

Positive: distraction from hardship, way out. Negative: arena to develop violent and angry persona. Dependent on structure provided, relationships and opportunities

**Kunz (2009)**

**Study method:** QL

**Sample:** n = 15

Post-disaster psychosocial intervention.

Bam, Islamic Republic of Iran

Children, youth, parents

Coaches play crucial role in using sport and play to support post-disaster psychosocial rehabilitation

**Kelly (2012)**

**Study method:** QL

**Sample:** n = 88

Explores the role of sport interventions in contributing to youth crime reduction.

United Kingdom

Self-regulation

**Haudenhuyse, Theeboom, Nols and Coussée (2014)**

**Study method:** QL

**Sample:** n = 50 young people (aged 9–22 years, 58% male); n = 13 coaches, board members and club coordinators

How participation in sports clubs is experienced and how vulnerable youth can best be supported.

Flanders, Belgium

Additionally, sports clubs provide environments of appreciation and caring; requires specific efforts from coaches and cultural context

Focus on coaching practices that have potential to decrease vulnerability (e.g., placing youth well-being at centre, focus on concrete needs and life situations)

**Chen, Dormitzer, Gutiérrez, Vittetoe, González and Anthony (2004)**

**Study method:** QT

**Sample:** n = 12,589 school-attending youth (aged 16 years)

Part of adolescent behavioural repertoire (ABR); study aims to estimate strength of association among five ABR dimensions and the earliest stages of drug involvement.

Panama, Spanish-heritage countries of Central America, Dominican Republic

Youth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Study method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Programme design/delivery method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Meek and Lewis (2014)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>▲ n=12 (aged 15–17 years, 100% male)</td>
<td>Multimodal sport initiatives in prison setting, for psychosocial and rehabilitative impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milner and Baker (2017)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲ n=8,043 (National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Wave III)</td>
<td>Explore role of sports participation and experiences of intimate partner violence victimization (IPVV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutz (2012)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲ n=1,319 (aged 12–20 years)</td>
<td>Relationship between different types of sport and males’ attitudes toward and use of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, Duncome, and Armour (2008)</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>▲ n=150 (participants per cohort, Year 9)</td>
<td>Positive youth development in context of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodríguez, Rodríguez, Orozco and Schmith (2016)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>▲ n=28 (100% male)</td>
<td>Effect of recreational activities on aggression and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruit, van der Put, van Vugt and Stams (2018)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>● ▲ Coaches: n=38 Adolescents: n=155 (aged 12–18 years, 91.6% male)</td>
<td>Preventing juvenile delinquency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Study Information

**Programme design/delivery method**

**What are the results?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Empowerment, self-determination, agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parker, Meek and Lewis (2014)

**Citation**

**Study method**

**Sample**

**What sports were used?**

**How were sports used/role of sport?**

**Where?**

**For whom?**

- Sense of belonging
- Increased inclusion
- Change in perceptions
- Empowerment, self-determination, agency
- Social capital
- Cultural capital
- Skills development
- Engagement
- Motivation, initiative, goal-setting
- Security, safe space
- Reduced violence, conflict resolution
- Bystander behaviour
- Decreased drug/alcohol use
- Health and well-being (general)
- Increased sport/activity
- Psychosocial benefits
- Other

Promoting young offenders to desist from offending in future

### Milner and Baker (2017)

**Citation**

**Study method**

**Sample**

**What sports were used?**

**How were sports used/role of sport?**

**Where?**

**For whom?**

- Sense of belonging
- Increased inclusion
- Change in perceptions
- Empowerment, self-determination, agency
- Social capital
- Cultural capital
- Skills development
- Engagement
- Motivation, initiative, goal-setting
- Security, safe space
- Reduced violence, conflict resolution
- Bystander behaviour
- Decreased drug/alcohol use
- Health and well-being (general)
- Increased sport/activity
- Psychosocial benefits
- Other

Negative association between sports participation and IPV prevalence (among women, not men) who are highly educated; mediated by education and employment

### Mutz (2012)

**Citation**

**Study method**

**Sample**

**What sports were used?**

**How were sports used/role of sport?**

**Where?**

**For whom?**

- Sense of belonging
- Increased inclusion
- Change in perceptions
- Empowerment, self-determination, agency
- Social capital
- Cultural capital
- Skills development
- Engagement
- Motivation, initiative, goal-setting
- Security, safe space
- Reduced violence, conflict resolution
- Bystander behaviour
- Decreased drug/alcohol use
- Health and well-being (general)
- Increased sport/activity
- Psychosocial benefits
- Other

Type of sport matters: youth in combat sports showed higher approval and use of violence; youth in leisure sports were less in favour of violence than non-athletes

### Sanford, Duncombe, and Armour (2008)

**Citation**

**Study method**

**Sample**

**What sports were used?**

**How were sports used/role of sport?**

**Where?**

**For whom?**

- Sense of belonging
- Increased inclusion
- Change in perceptions
- Empowerment, self-determination, agency
- Social capital
- Cultural capital
- Skills development
- Engagement
- Motivation, initiative, goal-setting
- Security, safe space
- Reduced violence, conflict resolution
- Bystander behaviour
- Decreased drug/alcohol use
- Health and well-being (general)
- Increased sport/activity
- Psychosocial benefits
- Other

Improvement in antisocial behaviour, but multiple factors involved in maximizing benefits

### Rodríguez, Rodríguez, Orozco and Schmith (2016)

**Citation**

**Study method**

**Sample**

**What sports were used?**

**How were sports used/role of sport?**

**Where?**

**For whom?**

- Sense of belonging
- Increased inclusion
- Change in perceptions
- Empowerment, self-determination, agency
- Social capital
- Cultural capital
- Skills development
- Engagement
- Motivation, initiative, goal-setting
- Security, safe space
- Reduced violence, conflict resolution
- Bystander behaviour
- Decreased drug/alcohol use
- Health and well-being (general)
- Increased sport/activity
- Psychosocial benefits
- Other

Improvement in prosocial attitudes; decrease in negative behaviour

### Spruit, van der Put, van Vugt and Stams (2018)

**Citation**

**Study method**

**Sample**

**What sports were used?**

**How were sports used/role of sport?**

**Where?**

**For whom?**

- Sense of belonging
- Increased inclusion
- Change in perceptions
- Empowerment, self-determination, agency
- Social capital
- Cultural capital
- Skills development
- Engagement
- Motivation, initiative, goal-setting
- Security, safe space
- Reduced violence, conflict resolution
- Bystander behaviour
- Decreased drug/alcohol use
- Health and well-being (general)
- Increased sport/activity
- Psychosocial benefits
- Other

Fewer conduct problems; better acceptance of authority; fewer friends with delinquent behaviour; better resistance to social pressure; more prosocial behaviour. Coach behaviours and socio-moral climate predicted success

---
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Chapter 6
Empowerment and Sport for Development

Sport empowers through motivating children and young people to set goals for themselves and to work with others to achieve those goals, while actively engaging in and contributing to social life. This implies three categories of empowerment: individual, group and community. The evidence indicates a positive association between participation in sports and psychosocial variables related to self-determination, collective agency and civic engagement. Evidence strongly suggests that skill development in autonomy-supportive, mastery-oriented, motivational sport climates is important for self-determination and individual empowerment. To a lesser extent, evidence also suggests that building partnerships between young people and community members through participatory approaches in sport programmes that also involve family members is important for the civic engagement and community empowerment of children and young people. There is reasonable evidence to suggest that team sports, positive peers and caring coaches/mentors are important for individual empowerment. Evidence that these features of sports settings can also be linked to collective agency and group empowerment is, however, mainly anecdotal, and these proposed relationships remain largely theoretical and in need of further investigation. Relationships between children/young people and coaches, mentors, peers, parents and other community members were important for all three levels of empowerment.

6.1 Introduction: Empowerment and sport

Children and young people who participate in sport and do well often report feelings of increased confidence (Haudenhuyse, Theeboom and Coalter, 2012; Hayhurst, 2013). Increased confidence in their skills and abilities to achieve goals on the sports field can help children and young people to recognize their own power both as individuals and as a team. Therefore, sports settings – as public arenas for the demonstration of skills in the pursuit of goals – can support child and young people’s empowerment. For example, youth reported experiencing more empowerment-related opportunities to show initiative, teamwork/social skills and leadership in organized extra-curricular activities such as sport than in other settings such as the classroom, work and when hanging out with friends. (Hansen, Larson and Dworkin, 2003; Larson, Hansen and Moneta, 2006). In addition, studies that compared sport activities with other types of organized activities found that youth participation in organized sports was positively associated with empowerment outcomes and processes, while participation in academic clubs showed either a negative association with these factors (Larson et al., 2006) or no significant relationship (Hansen, Skorupski and Arrington, 2010). Furthermore, team sports provided more opportunities for these associated empowerment experiences than individual sports (Hansen et al., 2010). Overall, sport stands out as being a context in which young people report high levels of empowerment-related outcomes (Hansen et al., 2010; Larson et al., 2006).

To strengthen and understand the diverse ways in which sport can lead to greater empowerment, this chapter: (1) defines empowerment for the purposes of this work and for S4D programming; (2) looks at how sport and empowerment are linked; and (3) analyses the literature and a sample of current initiatives to assess the quality of the available evidence. This third section asks three critical questions: (1) Why is sport important for each type of empowerment; (2) What strategies work in sport for each type of empowerment?; and, finally, (3) What challenges arise when using sport for each type of empowerment?

The final section of the chapter summarizes the findings through an evidence-informed theory of change for empowerment-focused S4D, and provides recommendations for practitioners, policymakers and research groups. The main messages drawn from the
In this report, empowerment is conceptualized across three categories: individual, group and community, each of which links to sport in unique way:

- **Individual empowerment** refers to self-determination, which children and young people experience through autonomy, self-discipline/control, agency, a positive self-concept and the motivation they feel when mastering a sports skill and being able to do it.

- **Group empowerment** refers to collective agency that arises from thinking, working and/or playing in a group toward a shared or common goal – experiences common to team sports.

- **Community empowerment** is the enhancement of the local community’s capacity for civic engagement and contributions to its own sustainable development. Many sports teams are community based, involved in their communities and instil a sense of local pride and standards.

**S4D programmes that work for personal empowerment and beyond are those that do the following:**

- Deliver in autonomy-supportive and mastery-oriented sport climates. For example, programmes aiming to achieve individual empowerment outcomes can use the teaching personal and social responsibility (TPSR) model.

- Foster team sport and collective agency: Team sports supported by caring relationships with peers and adults involved in the programme (i.e., coaches and mentors) also work for the empowerment of individuals.

- Support participatory approaches that use experiential learning and reinforce community connections such as with families and through civic engagement.

**Challenges to S4D programmes seeking to improve empowerment include the following:**

- Existing negative social perceptions of children and young people (e.g., as irresponsible or affiliated to gangs).

- Pervasiveness of the deficit model approach, which overemphasizes shortcomings and overlooks strengths of children and young people – undermining the promotion of empowerment and agency.

- Adultism, or when adults assume that children cannot or should not contribute to participatory activities (including design and implementation of S4D programmes), which again discourages children’s and young people’s participation and can disempower.

- As elsewhere, a lack of intentional design to ensure that programme processes facilitate empowerment.

- Lack of guidance/consensus on the definition and measurement of empowerment – as both an outcome and process, which can be difficult to disentangle.

**Policymakers and S4D practitioners seeking to promote child protection can trial the following promising practices:**

- Train coaches to support autonomy and mastery climates in S4D programmes.

- Use evidence-based experiential learning models (e.g., TPSR model) to develop skills.

- Include various stakeholders (e.g., children and young people, parents, community members and others from various sectors in the community) in programme design, implementation and evaluation.

- Promote the use of an evidence-informed and intentionally designed approach to S4D for empowerment.

**6.2 What is empowerment in the context of S4D?**

Empowerment can be a difficult concept to define. As UNICEF notes in its Generation Unlimited campaign material, “There are no commonly agreed measures of youth empowerment and participation…. This undermines the credibility of investments aimed at raising empowerment as their efficacy cannot be proven.” (UNICEF, 2018). In fact, of the 56 empowerment-focused S4D programmes that
responded to the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, only 2 focused solely on empowerment outcomes, while 43 also focused on child protection outcomes, 36 on social inclusion, and 26 on education outcomes. Nevertheless, the literature on psychological empowerment (Zimmerman and Rappaport, 1988; Zimmerman, 1995; Wong, Zimmerman and Parker, 2010) and articles reviewed for this chapter provided some useful ways to conceptualize children’s and young people’s empowerment. Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988, p. 746) defined psychological empowerment as “the connection between a sense of personal competence, a desire for, and a willingness to take action in the public domain.” They also noted that participation in civic life is an important mechanism for psychological empowerment. Subsequently, Zimmerman (1995) proposed that there are three components of psychological empowerment: intrapersonal (within-individual) outcomes, interactional (or relational) outcomes and behavioural outcomes. Meanwhile, other conceptualizations of empowerment (drawn from literature on child and youth participation in society) emphasize shared control, shared power, shared decision-making and shared responsibility among children, young people and adults as the pathway to achieving empowerment (Hart, 1992; Wong et al., 2010).

Box 6.1. Spotlight on Monrovia Football Academy: Empowering Liberia’s youth

Monrovia Football Academy (MFA) was founded in Liberia in 2015 with the vision of empowering young Liberians to have a positive impact on their communities. The non-profit leadership institution harnesses young people’s interest in football to provide a holistic approach to students’ total development. What began as a small-scale initiative with 27 students has grown into an academy with 92 full-time residential students aged 8–15 years. The school follows the Liberian Ministry of Education’s curriculum for its core subjects, and supplements this with courses in leadership, entrepreneurship, music, health science, and science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) subjects.

The initiative is achieving its goal of having a statistically significant effect on leadership via five key factors: academic ability, attitudes toward gender, resilience, pride in national identity, and prosocial skills. It also aims for a minimum of 90 per cent of graduates to attend university and at least 90 per cent to be gainfully employed following further education. A 2018 report on an independent, quasi-experimental impact evaluation of the programme reflects the commitment of MFA to high-quality M&E. The report pays attention to relevance, impartiality, inclusiveness and ethics, rigour and transparency. It compares MFA students with those who ‘just missed the cut’ using baseline scores gathered during the selection process and results of later assessments conducted at football festivals attended by these students. From this evaluation, the impact of MFA is visible. MFA students performed 8 percentage points higher on a standardized exam than their ‘just missed the cut’ peers (p < .05). MFA students also scored significantly more positively on a gender equality index, on national pride in Liberia and on social inclusion. Current efforts by MFA to scale up its programme are informed by this quality research. The organization aims to reach an additional 20 students each year and is also working with LEAD Africa, a network of sports academies with a similar ethos, to replicate the MFA model with the vision of creating one locally run academy in each African nation.
In reviewing the literature on empowerment through sport for this chapter, it was discovered that the studied sport programmes varied in two aspects. The first was the type of development targeted (i.e., personal development vs social group and team development). The second aspect in which sport programmes in the reviewed literature varied was how far the circle of concern extended (i.e., whether limited to individual outcomes or expanded to also include family and community outcomes). When combined and collapsed across these two dimensions, efforts to empower children and young people through sport can be placed in one of three categories: individual empowerment, group empowerment or community empowerment.

6.2.1 Individual empowerment

Individual empowerment is realized through the ability to lead a self-determined life. Self-determination is a form of optimal intrinsic motivation that arises from the satisfaction of the individual’s basic psychological needs: autonomy, relatedness and competence (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Literature and research on the relationship between sports participation and psychosocial outcomes suggests that in the context of organized sports participation, children and young people experience a sense of self-determination through the development of skills in autonomy-supportive and mastery-oriented motivational climates (Fenton, Duda, Appleton and Barrett, 2017; Gould, Flett and Lauer, 2012; MacDonald, Côté, Eys and Deakin, 2011; Schallilée, Theeboom and Van Cauwenberg, 2017). Feeling the freedom to practise and develop sporting skills and then step into a public arena and do their absolute best (through the skills they have mastered) instills in children and young people confidence in their individual abilities and can be empowering, especially when accompanied by support from their peers and coaches (Gould et al., 2012; MacDonald et al., 2011; Schallilée et al., 2017).

Of the 56 empowerment-focused S4D programmes identified in the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, 14 focused on individual empowerment through the achievement of outcomes such as leadership, autonomy and psychosocial development. Of these 14 programmes, 1 focused on autonomy, 5 on leadership and 9 on psychosocial development, including confidence, self-esteem, socio-emotional skills and pride (for an example, see Box 6.1). In their implementation, programmes appeared to link outputs in participants’ individual psychosocial development with outcomes in empowerment, albeit broadly defined ones.

6.2.2 Group empowerment

Group empowerment is a sense of collective agency that arises from sustained interaction and relationships with others. Collective agency is thinking, doing and acting together as a group to achieve shared or common goals. Research suggests that learning to work well with others as part of a sports team with the support of peers and caring coaches, mentors or other young leaders is positively associated with psychosocial outcomes related to collective agency (Bean, Forneris and Halsall, 2014; Berlin, Dworkin, Eames, Menconi and Perkins, 2007; Halsall and Forneris, 2018; Hammond-Diedrich and Walsh, 2006; Muller Mariano and Pereira da Silva Filho, 2015; Strachan, Côté and Deakin, 2009). Furthermore, team sports appear to not only have an advantage over other types of organized activities (e.g., performance arts, academic clubs, service learning) but also present distinct advantages over individual sports or physical activity (Evans et al., 2017; Hansen et al., 2010; MacDonald et al., 2011; Pantzer, Dorwart and Woodson-Smith, 2018; Vikman, Elsborg and Ryom, 2017). Therefore, through participation in team sports, children and young people may grow confident in their abilities to work with both peers and adults in a group setting to achieve common goals. This form of group empowerment on the sports field can potentially transfer to child and youth participation in community contexts (Hellison, 2003).

6.2.3 Community empowerment

Community empowerment is the enhancement of the local community’s capacity for civic engagement and contributions to its own sustainable development. Civic engagement is informed by active involvement with community life and participation in public institutions. Research shows that participatory approaches that bring together different generations, through young people acting in partnership with adults, create opportunities for sustainable participation by children and young people in civic activities and public institutions (Zeldin, Larson,
Camino and O’Connor, 2005; Zeldin, Christens and Powers, 2013). Building on the collective agency that arises from group empowerment of children and young people through team sports, the involvement of parents, families, community leaders and other community members in sport activities can further increase the confidence of children and young people in their abilities by expanding their circle of support (for a programme example, see Box 6.2).

Additionally, intentional efforts to connect activities and experiences on the sports field or court to real-life contexts such as communities and governing organizations through experiential learning design can teach young people values of responsible citizenship (Halsall and Forneris, 2018; Muller Mariano and Pereira da Silva Filho, 2015; Wamucii, 2012). Using sports participation to open up other opportunities for children and young people to have a positive impact on the communities and societies in which their sport programmes are embedded presents the most direct link to civic engagement for S4D approaches, and though not without its challenges (Coalter, 2007a), offers
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**Box 6.2. Spotlight on Fútbol Más: Empowering communities for sustainable impact**

Fútbol Más was founded in Chile in 2008 and now operates in more than 70 neighbourhoods across seven of the country’s regions, as well as in Peru, Ecuador, Haiti, Mexico, Paraguay and Kenya. The organization implements various initiatives including recovering public spaces as places of protection and training, campaigns promoting unity and positive attitudes to transform football, the creation of spaces for interaction and recreation in emergency contexts, and a resilience model in schools to strengthen peaceful coexistence. Children and adolescents aged 6–15 years participate in socio-sport classes and the football league, while youth aged 16–20 years participate as trained resilience tutors who support the classes.

The organization’s use of football to promote children’s well-being depends on connecting members of the communities in which it works and promoting cohesion through play and sport. Impact evaluations show how Fútbol Más initiatives contribute to feelings of community safety, neighbourhood trust, safety and respect at school, psychological well-being (such as the absence of post-traumatic stress in emergency contexts) and behavioural strengths (such as prosocial conduct). Fútbol Más also believes that families and the community are key in ensuring a long-term and sustainable impact. Families thus participate in Neighborhood Coordination Teams, which support the families to lead the management of initiatives until they can do so autonomously. This involves the neighbourhood representatives taking over the implementation of the initiative, channelling into it the needs and objectives of the community, and managing the public space in which the initiative takes place. Across 72 of the neighbourhoods in which Fútbol Más operates, 24 are self-sufficient and 48 are in transition from confidence to autonomy. Fútbol Más also works to connect community organizations and local stakeholders from various sectors with its community leaders, and believes in supporting community members to be their own advocates. In these ways, Fútbol Más is an example of how sport initiatives can unite children and youth in partnerships with adults, expanding their local circle of support, and also contribute to the local community’s empowerment and sustainable development.
potential benefits not just for individual children and young people but for their communities as well (Halsall and Forneris, 2018; Lerner, 2015; Reding, Grieve, Derryberry and Paquin, 2011).

6.3 How are sport and empowerment linked?

The common thread linking the three categories of empowerment is motivation. Self-determination, agency and engagement are all motivational concepts. Therefore, sport can empower through motivating individuals to set goals for themselves and to work with others to achieve those goals, while actively engaging in and contributing to social life. In this chapter, empowerment in sports settings is conceptualized as children’s and young people’s experiences of self-determination, collective agency and civic engagement, through use of participatory approaches that respect and lift up young people’s voices and contributions to promote skills development and teamwork with support from caring coaches, mentors, peers, family members and adult partners within the community (see Figure 6.1). Empowerment in sports settings can address the needs of both young girls and boys. Female empowerment, however, is a critical issue for UNICEF, which seeks to empower vulnerable young girls through advancing gender equality (UNICEF, 2018). A number of studies suggest that not only does sports participation have a positive impact on the empowerment of girls (Bean, Forneris and Halsall, 2014; Chawansky and Mitra, 2015; Forneris, Camiré and Williamson, 2015; Gould et al., 2012; Pantzer et al., 2018; Peacock-Villada, DeCelles and

Figure 6.1. Conceptualization of empowerment through sport

Banda, 2007; Roemmich, Lambiase, McCarthy, Feda and Kozlowski, 2012; Schailée, Theeboom and Van Cauwenberg, 2015) but also that the association of sport with empowerment may be stronger for girls than for boys (Gould et al., 2012; Pantzer et al., 2018; Roemmich et al., 2012). Yet, this may say more about the level of inequality that in exists in society between girls and boys – girls are at a disadvantage ‘playing catch up’ and therefore naturally cover more ground or greater distances across scales and indicators used to assess intervention outcomes – rather than point to the unique ability of sport to promote empowerment. Additionally, of the 56 empowerment-focused S4D programmes identified among the 106 programmes that participated in the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, 7 of them discuss gender issues in their target goals, and of this small number, 4 focused on reaching gender equality in participation rates and 3 reported broadly teaching participants about gender issues or gender equality.

The social inclusion chapter of this report discussed how sport can be used as a tool to increase inclusion of girls in sport as well as to increase inclusion of girls in society through sport, noting that this could be achieved through functional social inclusion, a dimension that encompasses skills, power and equity (see chapter 4). In this way, the use of sport to empower girls is associated with social inclusion of girls in and through sport. For example, research by Hayhurst (2013) showed that through learning martial arts, girls were empowered to combat GBV, speak up for reproductive rights and pursue employment opportunities through developing skills to coach others in martial arts. Throughout this chapter, examples are included from the research of empowerment in sport programmes specifically for girls, and instances in which effects are more pronounced for girls than boys are noted. Nevertheless, the focus of this chapter is the empowerment of both girls and boys.

6.4 What does the evidence say?

6.4.1 Why is sport important for empowerment?

Participation in sport can allow children and young people to experience power within themselves, within their peer group or team, and within their community. To understand why sport is important for empowerment, and to identify what works when using sport as tool to empower children and young people, it is helpful to think of empowerment in terms of its associated outcomes, processes and settings.

Empowerment outcomes

It was more often the case in the literature reviewed that research focused on anticipated benefits and outcomes related to empowerment, rather than on explicit measures of empowerment. In the context of organized sports participation, many different anticipated benefits and outcomes related to children’s and young people’s empowerment were studied (for a full list, see Annex 6.A). These included: (1) self-determination at the individual level (autonomy, perceived control, self-regulation, initiative, confidence, competence, self-efficacy, self-esteem and self-worth); (2) collective agency at the group/team level (leadership, responsible decision-making, perceived social support, quality relationships with others, and resourcefulness); and (3) civic engagement at the community level (critical awareness of social issues, which informs meaningful community involvement; public and institutional participation; and civil discourse).

Empowerment processes

The common thread linking the three categories of empowerment is that self-determination, agency and engagement are all motivational concepts. Therefore, sport empowers through motivating individuals to set goals for themselves and to work with others to achieve those goals, while actively engaging in and contributing to social life. The fundamental strategies and processes used for children’s and young people’s empowerment through sport that were identified in the literature were: (1) skills development through deliberate and engaging practice in autonomy-supportive, mastery-oriented, motivational climates; (2) teamwork among peers to build a sense of collective agency; (3) provision of a caring climate with quality relationships and support from coaches, mentors and peers; (4) partnerships between young people and adults and intergenerational relationship building in learning/developmental environments such as organized activity contexts and communities; and (5) participatory approaches in
programme design, implementation and evaluation, as well as in policymaking forums outside the context of sport programmes. For example, Wamucii (2012) found that the promotion of leadership, skills development and access to jobs as part of the Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) programmes in Kenya was associated with youth empowerment.

**Empowerment settings**

Organized activities such as sport – both within and outside of school – are associated with empowerment processes and related outcomes, especially when paired with other productive extra-curricular activities. For example, Forneris et al. (2015) found that youth participating in sport and non-sport extra-curricular activities tended to score higher on empowerment and empowerment-related outcomes (social competencies and a positive self-concept) than youth who participated in sport activities alone or no extra-curricular activities at all. In that study, some youth who participated only in sport activities still scored higher on empowerment outcomes than youth who participated in no extra-curricular activities. More specifically, young girls who participated only in sport activities still scored higher on empowerment and positive identity than young girls who participated in other activities or no extra-curricular activities.

6.4.1.1 Sport and individual empowerment

According to the literature reviewed for this chapter, sport can be an important context for the individual empowerment of children and young people because of its association with several psychosocial outcomes that, when combined, can be best described as self-determination. In this subsection, self-determination is first defined, followed by discussion of some specific outcomes related to self-determination that are supported in the literature and which help to answer the question of why sport is important for individual empowerment of children and young people. Some common strategies used to empower individual children and young people are also presented, to show what works for young people’s self-determination and individual empowerment (see Figure 6.2).

**Figure 6.2. Sport as a context for individual empowerment**
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6.4.1.2 Self-determination

As previously mentioned, self-determination is a form of optimal intrinsic motivation that arises from the satisfaction of basic psychological needs: autonomy, relatedness and competence (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Participation in sport has been found to be positively associated with psychosocial outcomes related to self-determination such as an increase in autonomy (Muller Mariano and Pereira da Silva Filho, 2015), agency (Peacock-Villada et al., 2007), self-discipline/control (Haudenhuyse et al., 2012; Whitley, Hayden and Gould, 2016), a positive self-concept (Whitley et al., 2016) including self-efficacy (Coalter and Taylor, 2010) and self-esteem (DeBate, Pettee Gabriel, Zwald, Huberty and Zhang, 2009) as well as increased competence and confidence (Hammond-Diedrich and Walsh, 2006; Haudenhuyse et al., 2012; Hayhurst, 2013; Peacock-Villada et al., 2007). The literature also showed that while many S4D programmes targeted or measured self-determination (Tadesse, Asmamaw, Mariam and Mack, 2018) and related psychosocial outcomes such as self-control (Bean et al., 2014), self-regulation (Tadesse et al., 2018), competence (Berlin et al., 2007; Whitley et al., 2016) and confidence (Berlin et al., 2007), research on these programmes did not necessarily always report on the relationships between sports participation and these outcomes.

Initiative was the outcome related to self-determination most commonly reported in the literature as having a positive association with sport (Berlin et al., 2007; Gould et al., 2012; Hansen et al., 2010; Larson et al., 2006; MacDonald, Côté, Eys and Deakin, 2012, 2011; Schailée et al., 2017; Strachan et al., 2009; Whitley et al., 2016). Larson (2000) views initiative as closely related to individual agency and autonomy, which are important concepts for positive youth development in Western cultures. He defines initiative as the “ability to be motivated from within to direct attention and effort toward a challenging goal” and notes that organized activity contexts (e.g., sport, performance arts, service learning) are better suited to youth’s experience and development of initiative than classrooms and unstructured leisure activities (Larson, 2000, p. 170). Furthermore, studies that compared sports activities to other types of organized activities (Hansen et al., 2010; Larson et al., 2006) found that organized sports had the strongest positive association with initiative when compared with all other activities (academic clubs, performance arts, faith-based activities, community-based activities and service learning).

One of the possible reasons why initiative was the individual empowerment-related outcome most frequently cited in the literature is because it is included in a measure of developmental experiences in organized activities called the Youth Experience Survey or YES (Hansen and Larson, 2005) and in the subsequently developed sport-specific adaptation of the survey, the Youth Experience Survey for Sport or YES-S (MacDonald et al., 2012). In both of these measures, initiative is conceptualized as opportunities for experiences of goal-setting, effort, problem-solving and time management. In other words, they frame initiative as youth’s ability to direct their own activities. Although measures of self-determination also exist in the literature, they were more likely to be used as a predictor variable than as an outcome variable – i.e., satisfaction of self-determination needs (especially autonomy) was associated with sport performance and other sport-related outcomes (Almagro, Sáenz-López and Moreno, 2010; Álvarez, Balagueira, Castillo and Duda, 2009; Amorose and Anderson-Butcher, 2015; Cheval, Chalabaev, Quested, Courvoisier and Sarrazin, 2017; Gillet et al., 2010).

As a counterpoint, at least one study showed that autonomy was negatively associated with physical activity – that is, children and young people who perceived themselves as having more autonomy were less likely to engage in physical activity (Rachele, Jaakkola, Washington, Cuddihy and McPhail, 2015). It is important to highlight, however, that general physical activity is not necessarily the same as organized sports.

6.4.1.3 Skills development

According to theories of psychological empowerment, a key component of empowering others is building their capacity to make autonomous decisions by helping them to master important skills (Wong et al., 2010; Zimmerman, 1995; Zimmerman and Rappaport, 1988). Evidence shows that skills development in sport can be used as a tool for individual empowerment (Halsall and Forneris, 2018). (For a programmatic example, see Box 6.3.)
Some of the specific skills associated with sport and empowerment in the literature were personal and social skills (MacDonald et al., 2012; Schailléè et al., 2017, 2015; Strachan et al., 2009; Whitley et al., 2016), physical skills (Gould et al., 2012; Hayhurst, 2013), life skills (Halsall and Forneris, 2018; Peacock-Villada et al., 2007), technical skills (Whitley et al., 2016), organizational skills (Hammond-Diedrich and Walsh, 2006), communication and expression skills (Muller Mariano and Pereira da Silva Filho, 2015) and peer-teaching skills (Hammond-Diedrich and Walsh, 2006). The type of sports participation – whether young people sampled a variety of sports or specialized in a specific sport – did not have a significant effect on their acquisition of initiative or social skills (Strachan et al., 2009).

A process evaluation study (Bean et al., 2014) based on Girls Just Wanna Have Fun, a sport programme for girls that followed the teaching personal and social responsibility (TPSR) through physical education model (Hellison, 2003), found that integrating life skills lessons on self-control and goal-setting into cooperative games was positively associated with expressions of youth voices. Also, the Sports United to Promote Education The Seedbeds of Peace programme in Medellín, Colombia, used football as an analogy to teach life skills to disadvantaged children (who are otherwise vulnerable to criminal activity) as well as to reshape their moral values in the hope of bringing about positive social change. The programme involved 995 children and youth aged 7–19 years, across 9 neighbourhoods and 25 groups. Children and youth came from low-resource, high-risk neighbourhoods in which at least 20 per cent of the population was under the age of 18 years. Most participants were white, but the sample also included Afro-Colombians and indigenous youth. The programme structure followed a plus-sport model and included activities such as football, graffiti, dance, arts and crafts, theatre and cooking.

Effective skills development components of the programme included: (1) use of football as an analogy to deliver life skills curriculum (e.g., using scoring drills to apply lessons of good decision-making, the exercise of control [delayed gratification], analysis and reflection); (2) reflection on moral dilemmas that may arise in football and applying these to real-life situations (e.g., whether or not to own up to referee about a ‘hand ball’ during a match was connected to owning up to accidental wrongdoings in real life); and (3) life projects (i.e., community outreach involving hosting events to which community members were invited and positive messages were shared via visible slogans and small giveaways).

The link between skills development and empowerment is illustrated by the following quote about youth civic engagement from one programme official: “Whilst skills can be taught via a curriculum, values are internal beliefs that cannot be taught. As such, we simply wanted to provide the children with the opportunity to discuss and reflect upon moral issues and engage in moral acts to benefit others…. The life projects serve to reinforce strengthened or redefined moral values by putting participants [sic] beliefs into actions, so that they could experience the feelings associated with helping others and acting in a moral fashion.” (Hills, Gómez Velásquez and Walker, 2018, p. 27).

Box 6.3. Example of how sport is used for empowerment through skills development

The Seedbeds of Peace programme in Medellín, Colombia, used football as an analogy to teach life skills to disadvantaged children (who are otherwise vulnerable to criminal activity) as well as to reshape their moral values in the hope of bringing about positive social change. The programme involved 995 children and youth aged 7–19 years, across 9 neighbourhoods and 25 groups. Children and youth came from low-resource, high-risk neighbourhoods in which at least 20 per cent of the population was under the age of 18 years. Most participants were white, but the sample also included Afro-Colombians and indigenous youth. The programme structure followed a plus-sport model and included activities such as football, graffiti, dance, arts and crafts, theatre and cooking.

Effective skills development components of the programme included: (1) use of football as an analogy to deliver life skills curriculum (e.g., using scoring drills to apply lessons of good decision-making, the exercise of control [delayed gratification], analysis and reflection); (2) reflection on moral dilemmas that may arise in football and applying these to real-life situations (e.g., whether or not to own up to referee about a ‘hand ball’ during a match was connected to owning up to accidental wrongdoings in real life); and (3) life projects (i.e., community outreach involving hosting events to which community members were invited and positive messages were shared via visible slogans and small giveaways).

The link between skills development and empowerment is illustrated by the following quote about youth civic engagement from one programme official: “Whilst skills can be taught via a curriculum, values are internal beliefs that cannot be taught. As such, we simply wanted to provide the children with the opportunity to discuss and reflect upon moral issues and engage in moral acts to benefit others…. The life projects serve to reinforce strengthened or redefined moral values by putting participants [sic] beliefs into actions, so that they could experience the feelings associated with helping others and acting in a moral fashion.” (Hills, Gómez Velásquez and Walker, 2018, p. 27).
and Recreation (SUPER) programme model has been used to effectively teach life skills through sport (DeBate et al., 2009; Goudas and Giannoudis, 2010, 2008).

Sometimes more important than the skills learned, however, was the context, conditions or climate under which skills were acquired. Specifically, in organized sport contexts, the presence of autonomy-supportive coaches who cultivated a mastery-oriented climate was related to psychosocial outcomes associated with individual empowerment and self-determination (Almagro et al., 2010; Álvarez et al., 2009; Conroy and Coatsworth, 2007; Gould et al., 2012; MacDonald et al., 2011; Roemmich et al., 2012; Schaillée et al., 2017). Of specific interest to this chapter is the fact that combining autonomy support with mastery-oriented motivational climates has been referred to as an ‘empowering coaching style’ (Duda and Appleton, 2016).

### 6.4.1.4 Autonomy support

It makes sense that to encourage autonomy among children and young people, the adults with whom children interact should be supportive of this goal. Controlling leadership styles among adults (e.g., parents, teachers, coaches) are associated with negative or less positive developmental outcomes (need frustration, low intrinsic motivation and amotivation) when compared with autonomy support for children and young people (Amorose and Anderson-Butcher, 2015; Cheval et al., 2017; Deci, Schwartz, Sheinman and Ryan, 1981; Gjesdal, Haug and Ommundsen, 2017; Haerens, Aelterman, Vansteenkiste, Soenens and Van Petegem, 2015; Ryan and Deci, 2016; Soenens, Deci and Vansteenkiste, 2017). It would be difficult for children and young people to learn to make autonomous decisions if they are not supported with opportunities to experience autonomy and to learn from such experiences.

Autonomy support from coaches may include expressing interest in young people’s input and praising young people for autonomous behaviour as well as using supportive instruction that emphasizes affiliation in the coach-athlete relationship rather than control or blame (Conroy and Coatsworth, 2007). These coaching strategies were positively associated with the youth athlete’s perceived autonomy, intrinsic motivation and future adherence to physical activity and sport (Almagro et al., 2010). Autonomy support from coaches was also associated with need satisfaction, self-determined motivation and enjoyment among male youth enrolled as cadets in a soccer school (Álvarez et al., 2009). One study used a small-sample randomized controlled trial design to show that both autonomy and mastery can increase girls’ and boys’ physical activity while playing ‘exergames,’ videogames that combine exercise with videogames” (Roemmich et al., 2012). Specifically, opportunities for autonomy were associated with greater physical activity time among girls.

### 6.4.1.5 Mastery-oriented motivational climates

Children and young people can have both positive and negative experiences in sport. In a mastery-oriented motivational climate, young people are motivated to master the tasks or sports skills required to perform at their personal best on the sports field or court, rather than to be preoccupied with winning or with avoiding losing (Duda and Nicholls, 1992). Evidence shows that a mastery-oriented caring climate was associated with or predicted positive outcomes such as initiative, goal-setting, personal and social skills, and physical skills at the individual level (Gould et al., 2012; MacDonald et al., 2011; Schaillée et al., 2017). Empowering coaching climates such as mastery goal orientation and autonomy support not only increased children’s and young people’s motivation and enjoyment in sport, but also predicted greater (moderate to vigorous) physical activity levels and lower adiposity (Fenton, Duda, Appleton and Barrett, 2017). Other research shows, however, that dedication, age, gender and family characteristics/socio-economic status can all determine who benefits more from empowerment outcomes associated with sport (Akiva, Cortina and Smith, 2014; Gould et al., 2012; Schaillée et al., 2015). In general, more dedicated, older youth, and females may benefit more in terms of empowerment through sport.

### 6.4.2 Sport and group empowerment

In the context of sport, playing together as a team can produce a sense of collective agency that is empowering. In this subsection, collective agency is first defined, followed by discussion of some specific outcomes related to collective agency that are supported
in the literature and which help to answer the question of why sport is important for group empowerment of children and young people. Some common strategies used to empower groups of children and young people are also presented, to show what works for young people’s collective agency and group empowerment (see Figure 6.3).

6.4.2.1 Collective agency

Collective agency is thinking, doing and acting together as a group to achieve shared or common goals. According to Bandura (2000), a key element of collective agency is people’s shared beliefs in their collective power to produce desired results. To build up to collective agency, certain values of effective teams must first be instilled: leadership, responsible decision-making, resourcefulness, quality relationships and perceived support. The review of the literature shows, however, that there remains a lack of evidence for the claim that sport empowers children and young people specifically through building their collective agency, even though some studies show distinct advantages for participation in team sports and psychosocial factors associated with collective agency and empowerment more broadly (Eime, Young, Harvey, Charity and Payne, 2013; Evans et al., 2017; MacDonald et al., 2011; Panter et al., 2018; Wann, Brasher, Thomas and Scheuchner, 2015; Wikman et al., 2017).

Many of the programmes studied in the research incorporated youth leadership and responsibility into their design (Bean et al., 2014; Halsall and Forneris, 2018; Hammond-Diedrich and Walsh, 2006; Hemphill, Janke, Gordon and Farrar, 2018; Meir, 2017; Muller Mariano and Pereira da Silva Filho, 2015; Wamucii, 2012).

Figure 6.3. Sport as a context for group empowerment
but very few of them reported leadership skills as an outcome. Leadership and responsibility were taught through multiple methods, including the use of community mentors, cross-age teaching, and relational practices embedded into physical activities and cooperative games, with the TPSR through sport model (Hellison, 2003) emerging as a popular evidence-based intervention model used to teach leadership and responsibility among other skills (for more details, see Box 6.4). In these programmes, youth learned to become confident leaders as well as to develop empathy for others in leadership positions (Hammond-Diedrich and Walsh, 2006) and youth voices increased because of leadership opportunities (Bean et al., 2014); youth's improved sense of responsibility also transferred to the school context in terms of youth developing increased responsibility and control/autonomy over their own school performance (Muller Mariano and Pereira da Silva Filho, 2015). One programme also used sport to harness youth's spirit of volunteerism by seeking to enhance their ability to mobilize local resources (Wamucii, 2012).

In terms of perceived support, evidence shows that as a result of participation in a basketball programme that promoted resilience and used group-based structures to promote peer support, young participants improved their ability to praise, motivate and support their peers (Berlin et al., 2007). Additionally, a study on young people engaged in a boxing programme showed that their perception of coaches as supportive and responsive to their needs was integral to their capacity to work toward competence (Haudenhuyse et al., 2012). In regard to quality relationships, research on the developmental model of sports participation (Strachan et al., 2009) shows that the type of sports participation matters for empowerment outcomes: ‘samplers’ (those sampling a wide variety of sports) scored higher than ‘specializers’ (those focusing on one sport) on adult networks and social capital, but specializers scored higher than samplers on positive relationships and diverse peer relationships. This suggests that sampling a wide variety of sports may be more important for quality peer relationships or making friends, while the sustained practice required to specialize in a particular sport may be more important for quality relationships between young people and adults.

6.4.2.2 Team sports

Strategies for supporting group empowerment include emphasizing teamwork, but whether this is connected to collective agency outside of team performance remains unclear. Team sports seem to present an advantage over individual sports when it comes to psychosocial benefits, in part because of the social aspects inherent in team sports (Wikman et al., 2017) but, paradoxically, these benefits are more likely to align with individual empowerment than group empowerment. In their systematic review of the literature on sport and adolescent psychosocial outcomes, Eime et al. (2013) found that organized team sports had a slight advantage over informal individual sports in terms of psychosocial outcomes such as self-concept, self-esteem and self-efficacy (which has been linked to individual empowerment in Figure 6.1 above) as well as positive development and moral reasoning (Evans et al., 2017). In another study, youth perceived participation in intramural sports as being associated with “bonding with teammates, improving ability to work with a team, and increased feelings of belonging at school” (Pantzer et al., 2018, p. 661). Even though girls were less likely, however, to participate in these intramural sport activities, they tended to score higher than boys on psychosocial outcomes.

6.4.2.3 Positive peer experiences

Evans et al. (2017) noted that mere participation in team sports is not necessarily associated with team outcomes, and this is reflected in the fact that the literature rarely measures empowerment at the group level. Nevertheless, research suggests that positive experiences among peer groups in the context of sport serve to support empowerment. In the Girls Just Wanna Have Fun sport programme, peer interaction during relational time at the beginning of sessions was used to share challenging experiences that had occurred during the previous week and to play cooperative games that taught communication, teamwork, confidence,

---

5 Five of the 56 empowerment-focused S4D programmes that responded to the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey identified developing participants' leadership skills as a target goal, although without specifying exactly what this entails.
Box 6.4. Spotlight on the teaching personal and social responsibility (TPSR) through physical education model

**Background:** The TPSR model was developed by Hellison (2003) to educate children and youth how to become responsible persons using strategies of gradual empowerment and relational learning integrated into physical education activities, to teach individuals to respect others, put in their best effort, and practise self-direction and leadership through helping others, with the expectation that these skills would transfer ‘outside the gym’ to their schools, homes and communities (Martinek and Hellison, 2016). Although, the TPSR model was initially criticized for lacking supporting evidence, the development and revision of a validated observational measure specifically to assess the TPSR model, known as the Tool for Assessing Responsibility-based Education (TARE), has helped to increase the evidence base for the TPSR (Escartí, Wright, Pascual and Gutiérrez, 2015; Wright and Craig, 2011).

**Why is it important?** Participation by children and youth in sport or physical education settings that use the TPSR model is associated with empowerment-related outcomes linked to both individual and group empowerment. A systematic review showed that across a number of varying contexts, participants, types of sport and research methods, the TPSR model was positively associated with responsibility, social skills and positive peer environments (Caballero Blanco, Delgado-Noguera and Escartí-Carbonell, 2013). Mixed methods research suggested that participation in physical activities that used the TPSR model was positively associated with early adolescents’ self-efficacy, resourcefulness, self-regulated learning and responsibility (Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual and Marín, 2010). A large cross-sectional survey across 148 schools in New Zealand that used the TPSR model’s intentional physical activities and one-on-one conversations, followed by group meetings, reflection time and awareness talks, also found that outcomes associated with student engagement in TPSR model activities included increases in supportive behaviour toward others and in self-directed learning (Gordon, Thevenard and Hodis, 2011). Another quantitative survey examined 253 middle school students’ scores for both social responsibility and personal responsibility and found that these were positively correlated with intrinsic motivation (Li, Wright, Rukavina and Pickering, 2008). In addition, at least one quasi-experimental study has shown that primary and secondary school-aged youth developed increased resilience (reductions in observed and suffered violence) as a result of implementation of the TPSR model (Martínez, Gómez-Mármol, Valenzuela, De la Cruz Sánchez and Suárez, 2014).

**What works?** A number of qualitative studies also suggest that individual and/or group empowerment are related to outcomes such as motivation, goal-setting, a positive self-concept, relatedness, teamwork and leadership (Walsh, 2004; Ward, Henschel-Pellett and Perez, 2012; Whitley, Massey and Farrell, 2017; Whitley and Gould, 2011). More importantly, these studies show the importance of caring climates and relatedness in developing an intentional approach to skills development that encourages the cultivation of meaningful relationships – which help children and youth to feel psychologically safe, setting the stage for empowerment – in addition to the importance of youth empowerment through participation/having a voice or say in programming decisions that affect their experiences (Ward et al., 2012; Whitley et al., 2017).
leadership and so on (Bean et al., 2014). Additionally, Schaillée et al. (2015) found that participation in sport was more empowering (in terms of personal and social skills) for girls from non-intact families when placed in a programme group with a higher proportion of similar peers (who were also from migrant backgrounds and had poor school performance).

In another study, young people in a South African football club described bonding with peers as though they all belonged to the same family, and noted the positive effects of this caring climate on their increased resilience (Draper and Coalter, 2016). Research also showed that in team sports environments, affiliation with peers was associated with youth reports of personal and social skills development (MacDonald et al., 2011). Furthermore, team sports provided more opportunities for these empowerment-related experiences than individual sports did (Hansen et al., 2010). Finally, a process evaluation provided some insight into how to use the sports captaincy experience as an opportunity to promote youth responsibility and peer leadership (Gould and Voelker, 2010).

### 6.4.2.4 Caring coaches and mentors

The importance of caring coaches and mentors in sports settings is linked to concepts of both autonomy-supportive, mastery-oriented, motivational climates and partnerships between young people and adults, which are covered in the subsections on individual empowerment and community empowerment respectively. Caring coaches and mentors also deserve a special mention regarding their potential influence on group empowerment, however. A few studies highlight the importance of caring coaching relationships to children’s and young people’s group empowerment-related outcomes in sport. For example, coaches’ performativity of young people’s well-being, their creation of safe and accepting sports-playing environments, their negotiated authority and their development of young people’s socio-psychological competencies were perceived as key success factors in a boxing programme for youth from underserved communities (Haudenhuyse et al., 2012).

Although it is plausible to assume that caring coaches and mentors can positively contribute to young people’s collective agency, sport literature has tended to focus more heavily on benefits for individuals rather than for groups of individuals. One possible exception may be in the sport performance literature, in which particular coaching styles are linked to team morale and performance (Turman, 2003).

Nevertheless, sport programmes that rely heavily on coaching interventions to produce results are likely to use empowering approaches to motivate teams (Duda and Appleton, 2016). In connecting team sports to individual empowerment, researchers may miss a step by neglecting to assess the impact of team sports on collective agency, which could be an intermediary or explanatory variable. Young people’s experience of collective agency from working in teams is important not only to performance on the sports field or court, but also to any setting that requires group work (e.g., school, workplace, community organization, governmental institution). Therefore, even though there is a lack of evidence in the literature to support the notion that caring coaches and mentors contribute to children’s and young people’s collective agency as a group-level variable, this is an important finding in itself, and one deserving of further research.

### 6.4.3 Sport and community empowerment

Although the idea that sports participation can lead to community empowerment through young people’s civic engagement is a fundamental principle behind the concept of S4D, evidence supporting a link between this input and outcome remains sparse. Subsequently, linking sports participation to civic engagement is one of the fronts on which the S4D field has been criticized for being too evangelical and lacking in evidential substance (Coalter, 2010). In this subsection, civic engagement is discussed first, followed by specific outcomes related to civic engagement that are supported in the literature and which help to answer the question of why sport is important for the involvement of children and young people in community empowerment. Also presented are common strategies used to engage children and youth in community empowerment, to show what works for young people’s civic engagement and community empowerment (see Figure 6.4).
6.4.3.1 Civic engagement

In this report, civic engagement refers to the informed, active involvement of children and young people in community life and their participation in public institutions. Civic engagement represents a way for children and young people to contribute not only to their own individual empowerment or that of their sports team/group, but also to the empowerment of their community. A couple of studies reviewed for this chapter show that empowerment-related outcomes such as young people’s critical awareness of children’s rights to education and to protection from child labour, and of the impact of traditional gender norms on young girls’ lives can arise from youth participation in sport where critical awareness is part of the sport programme’s intentional design (Chawansky and Mitra, 2015; Wamucii, 2012). Additionally, research on at least one programme supports the idea that sports participation can be associated with community involvement through enhanced relationships (social connections), increased community participation, increased sense of community and greater partnership among young people and other community members (Halsall and Forneris, 2018).

Drawing from the results of the UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey, four more examples are salient:

- ChildFund Alliance (Australia) focuses on increasing player learning in the areas of gender, sexual and reproductive health, planning for the future, rights and violence prevention.
- Youth Environment Service Busia (Uganda) aims to empower youth as community change agents in various ways, one of which is increasing their participation in reporting cases of girls child abuse in...
the community. Youth Environment Service Busia also focuses on improving hygiene practices in communities and organizes activities with Busia Municipal Council to keep communities clean.

- Oasis, through its Reach for your Dreams initiative (South Africa), is teaching skills of fair play, respect, gender equality and conflict resolution to children aged 6–10 years.
- Monrovia Football Academy (Liberia) is achieving statistically significant effects in five areas that are predictive of leadership: academic ability, attitudes toward gender, resilience, pride in national identity, and prosocial skills.

Meanwhile, other research on a cross section of youth showed that sports participation was associated with adult networks and social capital, integration with family and linkages to the community (Strachan et al., 2009). Sport involvement has also been linked with increased civic participation (Wamucii, 2012) through youth’s involvement in civil discourse (e.g., participatory practices that generate dialogue and debate on vital issues affecting youth and wider society) and participation in public institutions (e.g., outreach to local government representatives). A couple of other programmes also targeted civic engagement-related outcomes such as civic and collective participation (Moreau et al., 2014) as well as active citizenship and socio-political participation (Berlin et al., 2007) but reported neither on these outcomes nor on their connection to sports participation.

Systematic reviews have revealed that many sport programmes take place in community contexts, with some researchers even suggesting that communities are a desirable setting for reaping the optimal psychosocial benefits of young people’s participation in team sports (Eime et al., 2013). In theory, this should make the link between young people’s sports participation and community empowerment through civic engagement even more apparent. According to the principles of experiential learning, however, it is essential that empowering opportunities for young people’s participation in communities are integrated into the sport programme’s design to strengthen the connection between learning and lived experience.

The literature shows that using sport as a tool for children’s and young people’s involvement in community empowerment can be approached in one of two ways. The first is through a focus on individual and collective agency within the programme, in the hope that through knowledge transfer, young people can apply these skills in the broader community, as was the case with both the Harlem RBI programme (now known as DREAM) and the DesÉquilibres programme (Berlin et al., 2007; Moreau et al., 2014). The second way is through the direct involvement of community members in young people’s sport programmes, and the direct involvement of young people in community issues, as was the case with Right To Play’s Promoting Life Skills in Aboriginal Youth (PLAY) programme and the Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSAs) programmes (Halsall and Forneris, 2018; Wamucii, 2012). The literature seems to suggest that the latter approach may potentially be more effective, given that the PLAY and MYSAs programmes not only intentionally incorporated civic engagement into the sport model, but also reported youth empowerment outcomes.

Two potentially key strategies were identified in the literature for teaching young people about community empowerment and civic engagement through sport: partnerships between programme young people and non-programme adults in the community, including parents; and use of participatory approaches.

6.4.3.2 Partnerships between young people and adults

In partnerships between young people and adults, both share the power and responsibility for decisions and for pursuing joint goals together as partners. Because student-coach relationships fall under autonomy-supportive, mastery-oriented, motivational climates, much of the literature on sport and partnerships between young people and adults has already been covered in the subsections on individual empowerment and group empowerment. Intergenerational relationships, however, are a specific type of partnership between young people and adults (Zeldin et al., 2013), associated with empowerment in community settings. According to Zeldin et al. (2005, p. 2), intergenerational partnerships act “as a foundation from which youth can be active agents in their own development, the
development of others, and the development of the community.” Furthermore, these authors argue that intergenerational relationships serve three main purposes, by facilitating: (1) young people’s participation in decisions that affect their lives; (2) positive youth development; and (3) community and civil society development.

Strategies for fostering intergenerational relationships between children/young people and (older) adults include: supporting and respecting young people’s voices, particularly when it comes to having a say in programming decisions; paying attention to young people’s emotional state by providing a safe environment and caring climate; working with and motivating young people to help them develop skills and achieve goals; and engaging young people as equitable partners in change efforts (Zeldin et al., 2013, 2005). For example, the MYSA programmes took the approach of facilitating youth engagement with influential community members such as local representatives on pertinent social issues (Wamucii, 2012). Meanwhile, the PLAY programme took the approach of explicitly incorporating adults from an Inuit community into programme implementation to act as mentors for youth (Halsall and Forneris, 2018), who benefited in terms of individual empowerment.

6.4.3.3 Participatory approaches

Building strong intergenerational partnerships goes beyond coaches and mentors; responsibility for these relationships – in terms of establishing intentionality of purpose, programme design and roles for young people and adults– also encompasses the sport programme or S4D organization itself. This suggests that participatory approaches, in which adults demonstrate respect for young people’s voices in decision-making, should be integrated into the sport programme for youth empowerment to occur (Akiva et al., 2014). For example, a Child Trends journal article reported that high school-aged youth in particular were more likely to be motivated to attend structured after-school activities if incentives such as opportunities to lead planning activities were provided (Collins, Bronte-Tinkew and Burkhauser, 2008). Additionally, a process evaluation on a leadership and empowerment sport programme for youth showed that a lack of participatory approaches (specifically a lack of participatory action research) resulted in setbacks with M&E results that might otherwise have been avoided had young people been involved in decisions around evaluation and other elements of programme design and implementation (Meir, 2017). Finally, the literature also suggests that meaningful participation (through recognition of status and respect) is critical to the success of sport interventions that specifically hope to target middle and late adolescents (Yeager, Dahl and Dweck, 2018).

The literature on child participation tends to emphasize shared power between young people and adults. For example, in his seminal work on the ‘ladder of child participation’, which was commissioned by UNICEF, Hart (1992, 2008) defined several levels of increasing child participation, with recommendations on how to move past decorative forms of non-participation (e.g., manipulation, tokenism), toward more authentic child participation, such as through the ideal mechanism – “child-initiated shared decisions with adults” (Hart, 2008: 22). Hart (2008) later provided some caveats to his model of participation that are important to note: (1) the ladder was not intended to represent developmental progression; (2) it was not meant to be a comprehensive tool for evaluating programmes; (3) there are certain cultural limitations that may mean the ladder is more relevant to conceptualizations of child participation common in high-income countries; and (4) the top rung is not intended to symbolize ‘children in charge’, but rather self-determination in making partnerships with adults. Despite these caveats, the ladder of child participation has continued to be a useful guide for international development organizations and practitioners. More recent work that builds on previous theories (Wong et al., 2010) suggests a typology of youth participation and empowerment (TYPE), which emphasizes that both adult-controlled and youth-controlled environments fall short of true empowerment; instead, true empowerment is represented by pluralistic forms of shared control between young people and adults that ensure both the presence of young people’s voices and active participation.

Young people are also not the only beneficiaries of community empowerment through sport. A body of
literature in sport on team identification showed that strong identification with teams is associated with psychological benefits at the group or community level. For example, while research with adolescents showed a positive association between team identification and satisfaction with social life (Wann et al., 2015), research with adults showed that identification with their local high school's American football team was associated with their greater collective self-esteem and community identification (Reding et al., 2011). In the PLAY programme for Inuit youth, the community mentors also benefited from skills development and the community as a whole benefited from enhanced relationships (social connections), increased community participation, increased sense of community and greater partnership among community members (Halsall and Forneris, 2018). In addition, parents involved in the Craque do Amanhã programme also benefited, as they reported improved family relationships (Muller Mariano and Pereira da Silva Filho, 2015).

6.4.4 Challenges to achieving empowerment through sport

Based on the literature review, certain key challenges to using sport as a context for children's and young people's empowerment were identified (see Figure 6.5). These challenges include the predominance of both the deficit model of development and adultism, or adult-centric beliefs about children's needs, which can hinder empowerment efforts. Additionally, to improve their effectiveness and the quality of evidence on their use, sport programmes should enhance their intentionality of

Figure 6.5. Challenges to achieving children’s and young people’s empowerment through sport

purpose when designing interventions, while the S4D field as a whole needs to improve the definition and measurement of empowerment. Each of these concepts is explored in more detail in the following subsections.

### 6.4.4.1 Deficit model of human and social development

A deficit model approach to human and social development assumes that the problems faced by vulnerable children and young people and wider society are inherent. This fails to acknowledge the impact of surrounding systems and conditions. As a result, the focus becomes how to fix the problem rather than how to build strengths and capacities. Research shows, however, that a strengths-based approach to youth development is positively associated with empowerment (Whitley and Gould, 2011). S4D organizations have been criticized for tending to adopt a deficit model approach to issues of both human and social development (Coakley, 2011; Coalter, 2010, 2007a; Hayhurst, 2013).

In some ways, the deficit model of development is antithetical to empowerment. Empowerment assumes agency and self-determination of individuals, groups and communities to effect change and affect systems. Meanwhile, the deficit model assumes that the power to effect change lies with external agents tasked with fixing individuals, groups and communities so that they meet with externally imposed standards. If sports coaches and mentors view children and young people as problems to be fixed, they may be more inclined to exert control over their behaviour than to support their autonomy in making decisions. Similarly, if S4D agencies working in low- and middle-income countries view the communities in which they operate as problems to be fixed, they may be less inclined to use participatory approaches or culturally relevant pedagogies, choosing instead prescriptive curricula designed to meet the needs of populations in high-income countries. There is a need to move past the deficit model of human and social development in order to realize empowerment outcomes for children and young people in sport.

### 6.4.4.2 Adultism

Adultism is a form of discrimination based on age that favours adult-centric views of the world, which downplay the importance of children’s and young people’s empowerment and meaningful participation in society (Bell, 1995; Flasher, 1978). In many ways, adultism is diametrically opposed to the autonomy-supportive coaching style that many studies positively associated with individual empowerment of children and young people in sport. Sometimes, adult-centric views may even be culturally sanctioned and intersect with other traditional beliefs. For example, one study showed that parents’ devaluing of education and sport, and lack of active involvement in their children’s lives was associated with resistance to child and youth participation in sport (Kay and Spaaij, 2012). Similarly, another study showed that family values, such as conscription to traditional gender norms, can constrict young girls’ participation in sport (Chawansky and Mitra, 2015). However, the literature review included a study of one programme, which showed that improved family relationships and improved behaviour at home resulted from youth participation in sport (Muller Mariano and Pereira da Silva Filho, 2015). This suggests that sports participation itself may help to address some of challenges faced in relation to family involvement in sport programmes.

Empowerment of children and young people can pose some risks due their increased participation in public life. While awareness of risks is warranted, and steps should be taken to minimize risks where possible, some risk-taking represents a productive form of development, especially during adolescence (Moreau et al., 2014). Rather than shield young people from all risks associated with participation, it may be better to give them the tools to successfully navigate those risks and reap the benefits of empowerment. Nevertheless, there is also a need to remain sensitive to historical, political and cultural values that influence varying conceptualizations of the social acceptability of children’s and young people’s participation in particular contexts (Hart, 2008; Skelton, 2007). It is imperative that empowerment processes promote positive youth development, not only for the sake of individual children and young people, but also for the benefit of the wider community or society, which serves as a context for sustainable development (Coakley, 2011; Lerner, 2015).
6.4.4.3 Intentional design

Sport programmes that are intentionally designed to meet the objectives of children's and young people's empowerment may be more likely to achieve desired outcomes. Simply put, to achieve empowerment outcomes, one must use empowerment processes (Zimmerman, 1995). For example, if a programme aims to teach young people leadership and responsibility but fails to provide them with real opportunities for responsible leadership, then it may be unsuccessful in achieving empowerment outcomes. The intention behind the programme’s design should be evidence-based, however, and therein lies the challenge. According to the theory of developmental intentionality, the most effective youth programmes possess three characteristic traits: (1) sustained emphasis on “shaping learning opportunities rather than shaping youth themselves” to achieve developmental outcomes; (2) active and collaborative involvement of youth in their own learning; and (3) socialization of youth to the benefits of participation in group settings, which can enhance the programme’s goodness of fit and youth’s motivational engagement (Walker, Marczak, Blyth and Borden, 2005, p. 400). Evident in this theoretical model is the minimal requirement that programming decisions are grounded in a deep understanding of the developmental processes that affect learning and that this knowledge is used to design programmes in a way that maximizes their impact.

Across the S4D initiatives reviewed for this chapter, a broad range of sport activities were incorporated into programme designs, though most programmes could be characterized as sport-plus and plus-sport formats (Coalter, 2007b) generally involving local schools and/or communities in some way. The popularity of these sport models among S4D initiatives converges with research evidence in this review that also suggests that young people in programmes which combine sport activities with other extra-curricular activities report greater empowerment outcomes than young people in programmes with only sport activities or no extra-curricular activities (Forneris et al., 2015). This is just one example of evidence arising from the sport literature that can be used intentionally when designing sport programmes for children’s and young people’s empowerment.9

6.4.4.4 Definition and measurement of empowerment

The ways in which sport initiatives defined children’s and young people’s empowerment were wide-ranging and encompassed a longlist of outcomes best defined as ‘empowerment-related’ (see Annex 6.A). This poses a challenge to systematic estimation of the impact of sport on children’s and young people’s empowerment – as differing definitions and reporting styles across organizations make for non-comparable measures and data. As of yet, there is no single comprehensive measure that aligns with the definitions of individual, group and community empowerment as outlined in this chapter. A few different psychometric scales emerged as common measures in the quantitative research literature, however: the Youth Experience Survey, also known as YES (Hansen and Larson, 2005); Youth Experience Survey for Sport (YES-S), a sport-specific version of the aforementioned survey (MacDonald et al., 2012); the Self-Determination Scale (Ryan and Deci, 2000) which is now known as the Perceived Choice and Awareness of Self Scale (PCASS); and the Developmental Assets Profile (Search Institute, 2019). These measures show that sports participation is associated with children’s and youth’s empowerment through development of personal and social skills, and positive experiences in goal-setting and using initiative, as well as access to relational and social support. Additionally, Moore and Fry (2014) created a measure of ownership and empowerment in sport, but that instrument has thus far only been validated using a college sample. Qualitative research, used in approximately 60 per cent of the articles reviewed, is in general a little less concerned with consistency in measurement than quantitative research but could nevertheless benefit from consistency in reporting standards. For example, omission of information about the sample (e.g., size, gender, age, general location) sometimes made it difficult to synthesize information in the literature to evaluate which

9 The UNICEF Sport for Development Programming Survey showed a broad range of objectives and goals among S4D programmes identified as empowerment-focused, including gender equality, education outcomes, social inclusion, health and well-being, and community involvement.
groups benefit most from sport interventions focused on empowerment. The same can be said about the quantitative literature as it pertains to standards for reporting about the programme being studied: It was difficult to assess programme effectiveness when details were omitted such as the scope of the programme’s outreach to participants, and sometimes the processes undertaken by the programme that may help to explain outcomes.

Individual empowerment in sport was the most well studied type of empowerment among the literature reviewed for this chapter. Two different types of disparities were noted for group and community empowerment. First, conceptualizing group empowerment as collective agency would suggest measurement of empowerment at the group level. Empowerment-related outcomes in the literature were almost always measured at the individual level, however, with very few studies employing multi-level models to examine child and youth empowerment in sport (Schaillée et al., 2017). Second, few studies measured or reported on the psychosocial outcomes related to civic engagement. For example, the DesÉquilibres programme in Montréal, Canada, listed civic and collective participation as a major aim, but research on this programme listed only outcomes associated with self-determination and collective agency. Sport programmes may not measure civic engagement because it is a behavioural outcome and changing behaviours can be difficult to achieve, thus making it more difficult to demonstrate the connection between sports participation and community empowerment anticipated by many S4D programmes.

In this chapter, empowerment in sports settings is conceptualized as children’s and young people’s experiences of self-determination, collective agency and civic engagement, through the use of participatory approaches that respect and lift up the voices of young people and contributions in order to promote skills development and teamwork with support from caring coaches, mentors, peers, family members and adult partners within communities. This definition aims to distil a number of otherwise disparate psychosocial factors into three overarching empowerment outcomes at the individual, group and community level, namely self-determination, collective agency and civic engagement respectively. This approach could be a useful step toward developing a standard definition for children’s and young people’s empowerment through sport, with implications for measurement.

### 6.5 Conclusion and recommendations

Using sport as a tool to promote children’s and young people’s empowerment is not without its challenges, and several general recommendations for overcoming some of the challenges in regard to S4D practice, research and policy are made below. Following this, some recommendations specific to each of the three levels of empowerment – individual, group and community – are suggested, along with a theory of change for each level.

#### 6.5.1 Recommendations for individual and group empowerment through sport

Given that individual empowerment and group empowerment are closely linked in the literature, with strategies for group empowerment closely associated with individual empowerment outcomes, recommendations for practice in sport for both levels of empowerment will be discussed in unison. Theories of change for individual and group empowerment around these practices (inputs column) are summarized below (see Figures 6.6 and 6.7).

**Train coaches and mentors**

Given the degree of importance assigned to the relationships between children/young people and sports coaches/mentors, a key recommendation is to train adult leaders of sport programmes in providing autonomy-supportive, mastery-oriented, motivational climates for skills development, as noted in the literature. A few articles provided evidence-based suggestions of how to enhance coaching relationships to optimize children’s and young people’s individual empowerment and related outcomes, for example, through coaches expressing interest in young people’s input, praising young people for autonomous behaviour and using supportive instruction that emphasizes affiliation in the coach-athlete relationship rather than control or blame (Almagro et al., 2010; Conroy and Coatsworth, 2007). Meanwhile, the Empowering Coaching method, which is designed to
Figure 6.6. Theory of change for individual empowerment through sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Strategies, Processes, Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact on SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • sport contexts have the potential to empower individual youth through the satisfaction of their basic psychological need for self-determination | • trained coaches and mentors  
• evidence-based experiential learning models such as TPSR | • Skill development  
• Autonomy-supportive, mastery-oriented motivational climate  
• team sports  
• individual sports  
• deliberate practice  
• healthy competition at sporting events | • trained coaches and mentors  
• % fidelity of implementation of evidence-based models  
• % youth taught new skills  
• % youth who master new skills  
• # team sport events | • Self-determination  
• Autonomy  
• Perceived control  
• Self-regulation  
• Initiative  
• Competence  
• Confidence  
• Positive self-concept  
• Self-efficacy  
• Self-esteem  
• Relatedness | • SDG 16 - justice for all  
• SDG 5 - gender equality |

Figure 6.7. Theory of change for group empowerment through sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Strategies, Processes, Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact on SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • sport contexts have the potential to empower groups of youth through their experience of collective agency while working in teams with the support of caring coaches and mentors, and positive peers | • trained coaches and mentors  
• evidence-based experiential learning models such as TPSR  
• clearly defined team goals | • Teamwork  
• team sports  
• leadership roles for youth  
• peer collaboration  
• healthy competition at sport tournaments  
• Caring coaches, mentors, and peers  
• caring climate  
• adult support  
• positive peers | • trained coaches and mentors  
• % fidelity of implementation of evidence-based models  
• % youth who enjoy working in teams  
• % of youth in leadership positions  
• # team goals set  
• % of team goals accomplished | • Collective agency  
• Leadership  
• Responsible decision making  
• Perceived  
• Social support  
• Quality relationships  
• Resourcefulnes s | • SDG 16 - justice for all  
• SDG 5 - gender equality |
help coaches maximise the motivational climate to make sport more enjoyable and engaging, was evaluated as part of the Promoting Adolescent Physical Activity (PAPA) programme, which works with grassroots football organizations in Europe (Duda, 2018; Duda and Appleton, 2016). Thus far, evidence suggests that the coach training programme supports sustained engagement in sport for girls and boys aged 10–14 years at varying levels of specialization. This and other evidence-based coach training programmes can possibly enhance coaches’ and mentors’ preparedness to support children’s and young people’s individual and group empowerment in sport.

Of the 56 empowerment-focused S4D initiatives identified in the UNICEF Sports for Development Programming Survey, 47 initiatives reported how individuals working on delivery were trained. Of these, 72 per cent noted awareness courses on child violence, 66 per cent education or teacher training, 62 per cent sport training, 51 per cent informal training and 34 per cent other training.

Use evidence-based experiential learning models

Depending on the specific empowerment-related skills that a sport programme is aiming to develop, various evidence-based experiential learning models can potentially be used to support programme implementation. For example, some sport-plus and plus-sport programmes may focus on building children’s and young people’s resilience and socio-emotional skills. The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) provides useful information, guidelines and evidence on teaching socio-emotional skills that align with empowerment-related outcomes such as goal-setting, expressive communication and responsibility (Payton et al., 2000), which may be of interest to practitioners looking to use sport as a tool for individual and group empowerment. Meanwhile, sport-specific evidence-based interventions such as the TPSR model and the SUPER programme model may also be useful for individual and group empowerment, by helping young people to develop life skills and a sense of responsibility – both of which are hallmarks of good citizenship (DeBate et al., 2009; Goudas and Giannoudis, 2008; Hellison, 2003) (see Box 6.4).

Set high expectations for individual achievement

Part of setting the tone of the motivational climate and supporting experiential learning is to set high expectations for young people, so they remain engaged and feel empowered and motivated to do their best. Deliberate practice to master skills and the display of these skills at competitive sporting events can connect young people with an intrinsic sense of power and control and build their confidence and self-determination.

Establish clearly defined team goals

It is important to have goals to work toward together as a team to reinforce the group’s collective agency. These can vary from sport-based, mastery-oriented team goals such as beating the team’s personal best score from last season, or relational goals such as supporting one another in efforts to gather resources and raise funds for team uniforms, transport for away games or new equipment. Tying these joint efforts to achieve goals to the context of team sports can help bonds to develop among peers and between children and young people and adult leaders such as coaches and mentors.

6.5.2 Recommendations for community empowerment through sport

Many of the recommendations for individual empowerment and group empowerment also apply to community empowerment, but sport programmes should also include additional intentional features to make explicit the connection between sport and young people’s civic engagement using participatory approaches and by building intergenerational ties. These recommendations for practice in sport for community empowerment are presented and a theory of change for community empowerment around these practices (inputs column) is summarized below (see Figure 6.8).

Establish advisory boards

Intentional efforts such as setting up advisory boards to elicit the participation of young people and community stakeholders may go a long way toward young people’s empowerment through sport and toward building intergenerational partnerships. Various advisory boards can be set up for groups representing the interests of young people, family and community members, and
Young people’s advisory boards are a meaningful way to cultivate their voices and participation, not only in programming decisions, but also in debating social issues that affect their lives and in advocating for changes that address issues of social justice and equality. Advisory boards comprising parents and other community members can be involved in various stages of programme design, implementation and evaluation, either indirectly through consultations or more actively as trained coaches, volunteer mentors or trained evaluators. Finally, cross-sector systems advisory boards can be useful in pooling resources to provide additional support and wrap-around services for sport programmes serving vulnerable young people. What these advisory boards do is empower young people to become directly involved in the community and also get the community directly involved in young people’s empowerment efforts, thereby expanding young people’s networks of social support.

Clearly define targets for social change

To make advisory boards effective and maximize young people’s civic engagement, they should work toward clearly defined targets for social change; even more importantly, these advisory boards should be empowered to set their own goals and educated in the process of critical analysis of social issues to help with problem identification. One systematic way to achieve this is to involve advisory board members, especially young people, in participatory action research such as in activities related toM&E or through photovoice, a technique which engages young people to actively construct and take photographs rather than only being
the subject. Such participatory techniques have the potential to positively contribute to sustainable programme and community development when implemented effectively. Finally, the activities and accomplishments of advisory boards involved with youth sport programmes should be widely publicized in community campaigns and events (e.g., friendly games, competitive tournaments). Using this form of recognition can help to maintain high levels of engagement.

6.5.3 Recommendations for stakeholders working on empowerment through sport

To overcome some of the shortcomings of designing S4D programmes based on a deficit model of human and social development, programme practitioners can use a strengths-based approach, which provides a better fit with child and youth empowerment (Camiré, Forneris, Trudel and Bernard, 2011; Coakley, 2011; Holt and Neely, 2011; Larson, 2000; Lerner, 2015). Similarly, to overcome adultism, practitioners can use participatory approaches and partnerships between adults and young people (Zeldin et al., 2013, 2005). These combined strategies will also potentially help in achieving evidence-informed intentional design, which is a sometimes elusive, yet critical, feature of empowering settings (Walker et al., 2005). One caveat, though, is that intentional design should not be construed in a manner so rigid that it hinders support for young people’s autonomy, agency and voice – in fact, to do so would defy the evidence that part of the reason for organized activities being effective in promoting empowerment is the ‘just right’ amount of structure they offer, which is greater than in leisure time activities but considerably less than in formal classroom settings (Larson et al., 2006).

Policymakers should consider that as well as focusing on the development of M&E frameworks and measurement tools, similar importance needs to be given to setting standards for reporting on research related to S4D initiatives – so that evidence is comparable across programmes, regions and types of literature. This would make it easier to synthesize S4D programme research in ways that facilitate the translation of knowledge into policy and practice.

Integration of programme design and M&E systems is required, but knowledge of cultural considerations regarding varying conceptualizations of children’s and young people’s empowerment and participation is also important to enhance the relevance, validity and practical utility of research results (Hart, 2008; Meir, 2017; Skelton, 2007). Thus, while there is clearly a need for M&E systems to better assess the relationship between S4D and outcomes (Coalter, 2006), including empowerment, this should be informed by a better definition of children’s and young people’s empowerment in sport. It seems necessary to move beyond the indicator approach of evaluation and measurement to include psychometric scales, because children’s and young people’s empowerment in sports settings is a complex, multifaceted latent psychosocial variable. Therefore, assessing sport’s impact on individual, group and community empowerment may require equally complex multi-level models and analyses that reflect the nested nature of data related to sport and young people’s empowerment (young people are nested in teams/programmes, which are in turn nested in communities).
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Annex 6.A. Defining the empowerment of individuals, groups and communities through sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of empowerment</th>
<th>Anticipated benefits of empowerment through sport</th>
<th>Associated outcomes in the literature</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Self-determination: A form of optimal intrinsic motivation that arises from the satisfaction of basic psychological needs: autonomy, relatedness and competence</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Thinking and making one’s own choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived control</td>
<td>Belief that one can influence the outcome of events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>Managing thoughts, emotions and actions for goal achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Engaging in goal-setting, planning and effort to accomplish tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Ability to perform a task well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Belief and assurance in one’s competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>Perception of one’s own ability to succeed at a task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>The level of regard that one has for oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>The value ascribed to one’s self-concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>Development and maintenance of quality relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Collective agency: Thinking, doing and acting together as a group to achieve shared or common goals</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Assuming responsibility for others, and for making decisions that affect achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible decision-making</td>
<td>Making sustainable choices in the best interests of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived social support</td>
<td>Belief that others care about one’s life experiences, to which they are willing to make positive contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality relationships</td>
<td>Healthy, positive interactions with others over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resourcefulness</td>
<td>Ability to source, pool, manage and direct resources needed to achieve goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Civic engagement: Informed, active involvement with community life and participation in public institutions</td>
<td>Critical awareness</td>
<td>Knowledge and analysis of social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Meaningful participation in community organizations and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public and institutional participation</td>
<td>Visible engagement with public institutions to bring about change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil discourse</td>
<td>Honest and respectful debate that engages opposing views on socio-political and socio-economic issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Annex 5.A. Summary of literature with child protection outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study information</th>
<th>Programme design/delivery method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Study method</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiva, Cortina</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Smith (2014)</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=979 (53% female)</td>
<td>Participatory approaches: youth participation in programming decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States (four states, unnamed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forneris, Camiré</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Williamson</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2015)</td>
<td>n=329 (57% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of extra-curricular activities on developmental outcomes and school engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald,</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côté, Eys and</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin (2011)</td>
<td>n=510 (aged 9–19 years, 52.5% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exames association of motivation and enjoyment in sport with positive and negative experiences; sport as a motivational climate for skills development, teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDonald,</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côté, Eys and</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin (2012)</td>
<td>n=637 (aged 9–10 years; 52.3% male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schailée,</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theeboom and</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Cauwenberg</td>
<td>n=200 (aged 10–24 years, 100% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2015)</td>
<td>Urban dance, martial arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flanders, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strachan, Côté</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Deakin (2009)</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=74 (aged 12–16 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manitoba and Ontario, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachele,</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaakkola,</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington,</td>
<td>n=272 (aged 12–15 years, 65% female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuddihy and</td>
<td>Physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPhail (2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould, Flett</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Lauer (2012)</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detroit, Michigan, United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>What sports were used?</th>
<th>How were sports used/role of sport?</th>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>For whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Participatory approaches: youth participation in programming decisions</td>
<td>United States (four states, unnamed)</td>
<td>Youth; youth in after-school programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Impact of extra-curricular activities on developmental outcomes and school engagement</td>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>High school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
<td>Exames association of motivation and enjoyment in sport with positive and negative experiences; sport as a motivational climate for skills development, teamwork</td>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Young athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Multiple sports</td>
<td>Youth Experience Survey for Sport (YES-S); what youth are learning/skills developed in sport</td>
<td>Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Young athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Urban dance, martial arts</td>
<td>Examines relationship between peer group composition and positive youth development</td>
<td>Flanders, Belgium</td>
<td>Disadvantaged young women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Swimming, diving, gymnastics</td>
<td>Developmental sports participation model: ‘sampler’ vs ‘specializer’ participation in sport</td>
<td>Manitoba and Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Young athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Physical activity</td>
<td>Examines effect of autonomy on levels of physical activity</td>
<td>Brisbane, Australia</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Baseball, softball</td>
<td>Sport to teach life skills; examines leagues for association among coaching climate, developmental outcomes and reported gains</td>
<td>Detroit, Michigan, United States</td>
<td>Middle and high school students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## What are the results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased perception</td>
<td>Empowerment, self-determination</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Motivation, initiative, goal-setting</td>
<td>Reduced violence, conflict resolution</td>
<td>Positive values; (education = commitment to learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>bystander behaviour</td>
<td>Integration with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Security, safe space</td>
<td>decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td>None (negative associations with perceived autonomy and physical activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Motivation, initiative</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Health and wellbeing (general)</td>
<td>Physical skills; positive peer influences; other factors involved climate (caring) and youth characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation, initiative</td>
<td>Goal-setting</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Increased sport/activity</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-setting</td>
<td>Positive values, (education = commitment to learning)</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive values, (education = commitment to learning)</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Other (general)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration with community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (negative associations with perceived autonomy and physical activity)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Other (general)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical skills; positive peer influences; other factors involved climate (caring) and youth characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td>Other (general)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Study Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QL</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QT</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Mixed Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op</td>
<td>Opinion Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Study Participants/Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>practitioners (volunteer or professional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▲</td>
<td>participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◇</td>
<td>Community members (not practitioners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>other professionals (e.g., multicultural workers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Other program partners or stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>project leader/office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>Other program partners or stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Study method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadesse, Asmamaw, Mariam and Mack (2018)</td>
<td>QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halsall and Fornieris (2018)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreau et al. (2014)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitley, Hayden and Gould (2016)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin, Dworkin, Eames, Menconi and Perkins (2007)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond-Diedrich and Walsh (2006)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller Mariano and Pereira da Silva Filho (2015)</td>
<td>QL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the results?</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (general)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased drug/alcohol use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and well-being (general)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-regulation**

**Personal and community development, community included participation, sense of community, greater partnerships**

**Individual and group outcomes**

**Generation of ubuntu (respect and caring for others); positive self-concept; creativity; technical skills; self-regulation**

**Positive behaviour/attitudes; future orientation; empathy**

**Positive behaviour; external use/appropriation of activities in other spaces; improved family relationships**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Study method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>What were sports used?</th>
<th>Programme design/delivery method</th>
<th>Where?</th>
<th>For whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wamucii (2012)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Examines Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) programmes for leadership, skills development, and job access.</td>
<td>Mathare, Kenya</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemphill, Janke, Gordon and Farrar (2018)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>● n=36 (58% male)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Examines practitioners’ strategies; development of sport-based positive youth development model; conflict resolution using the TPSR model and restorative justice practices</td>
<td>Wellington, New Zealand</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meir (2017)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>● ● ○ ○</td>
<td>Netball, table tennis, volleyball, football, rugby</td>
<td>Examines Leadership and Empowerment through Sport (LETS) programme for issues, possible reasons and solutions</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean, Fomeris and Halsall (2014)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>● ● ○ ○</td>
<td>Kick-boxing, lacrosse, volleyball, basketball, dance, skating, yoga, swimming, walking</td>
<td>Evaluates Girls Just Wanna Have Fun programme; TPSR model; cooperative games for communication, teamwork, confidence, seeking help, leadership, goals</td>
<td>Eastern Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chawansky and Mitra (2015)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>Programme used Women Win model in after-school programme; examines how family matters support or constrict participation</td>
<td>Delhi, India</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay and Spaaij (2012)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>● ● 181 individual and focus group interviews across all three studies; n=157 surveys from Vencer study, Brazil (unit of analysis = secondary data sources)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Multiple programmes; examine influence of family context on participation in sport; promote HIV/AIDS awareness</td>
<td>Lusaka, Zambia; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Aali Gaon, India</td>
<td>Girls, disaffected youth, youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaillée, Theeboom and Van Cauwenberg (2017)</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>● 200 (from 15 programmes)</td>
<td>Urban dance, martial arts</td>
<td>Determine relationship between coach- and peer-created motivational climates and positive/negative experiences</td>
<td>Flanders, Belgium</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the results?</td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Child protection</td>
<td>Health and well-being</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Empowerment; self-determination, agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Empowerment; self-determination, agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Cultural capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical consciousness; (engagement = civic participation)

Not applicable; conceptual framework

Not specified; more focused on challenges

Relational time; youth voice; leadership opportunities

Critical awareness of gender stereotypes; perceived familial support

Individual and team benefits; mastery-oriented motivational climate important; negative experiences higher for youth from non-intact families
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Study method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>What sports were used?</th>
<th>Programme design/delivery method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moore and Fry (2014)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>n=414 (m=21.25 years, 63% female)</td>
<td>Aerobics, weight training</td>
<td>College exercise classes; test validity of measure of ownership and empowerment in sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest region, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayhurst (2013)</td>
<td>QL</td>
<td>Participants: n=8 (100% female) Practitioners: n=11</td>
<td>Martial arts</td>
<td>Examines experiences in sport, gender, and development programme for empowerment (to improve health, education, self-respect and gender relations); self-defence; training as coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winita, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What are the results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child protection</th>
<th>Health and well-being</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
<td>Increased inclusion</td>
<td>Change in perceptions</td>
<td>Empowerment, self-determination, agency</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Skills development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moore and Fry (2014)
QL
\( n = 414 \) (\( \text{age} = 21.25 \text{ years}; 63\% \text{ female} \))
Aerobics, weight training
College exercise classes; test validity of measure of ownership and empowerment
Midwest region, United States
College students
Caring motivational climate and mastery goal orientation positively associated with ownership

Hayhurst (2013)
QL
\( n = 8 \) (100% female)
Participants:
Practitioners: \( n = 11 \)
Martial arts
Examines experiences in sport, gender, and development programme for empowerment (to improve health, education, self-respect and gender relations); self-defence; training as coaches
Winita, Uganda
Girls
Self-defence skills; employment training; subversive agency; resistance

---

**Caring motivational climate and mastery goal orientation positively associated with ownership.**

**Self-defence skills; employment training; subversive agency; resistance.**
Getting into the Game
Understanding the evidence for child-focused sport for development

#sport4change