

Assessing the Evidence in Sport for Development and Peace: Findings and Recommendations

Meredith A. Whitley

June 13, 2018

With acknowledgements to William V. Massey, Martin Camiré, Lindsey C. Blom, Megan Chawansky, Shawn Forde, Simon C. Darnell, Mish Boutet, & Amanda Borbee

Introduction

- Ongoing concerns:
 - Assumption that sport is inherently good
 - Rigor (and focus) of research
 - Isolation within/outside the field
 - Inputs, processes, outcomes, and impacts

Coalter, 2007, 2010, 2013, 2015; Cronin, 2011; Levermore, 2008, 2011; Jeanes & Lindsey, 2014; Jones et al., 2017; Langer, 2015; Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011; Massey & Whitley, 2016; Darnell et al., 2018

Purpose

- Outline findings related to the current state of evidence in sport for development and peace, based on:
 - Empirical research
 - Recently published reviews
 - Three systematic reviews:
 - A systematic review of youth-focused sport for development programs in six global cities: Cape Town, Hong Kong, London, Mumbai, Nairobi, and New Orleans.^a
 - A systematic review of sport-based youth development programs in the United States.^b
 - A systematic review of the efficacy of sport for development programs in the promotion of psychological, emotional, and social health outcomes in youth populations.

^aThis systematic review was funded by the Laureus Sport for Good Foundation and the Commonwealth Secretariat.

^bThis systematic review was funded by the Laureus Sport for Good Foundation USA.

Findings and Recommendations: Rigor

- Limited efficacy data in both academic and grey literature that is publicly shared
- Quality of methods and evidence largely classified as weak or rarely coherent
- Recommendations:
 - **Use systems thinking to incorporate a holistic approach to SDP research** through both instrumental/positivist (i.e., quantitative) and descriptive/critical (i.e., qualitative) research.
 - **Assess program quality and fidelity.**
 - Utilize multiple groups.
 - **Incorporate multi-site comparisons.**
 - **Pursue longitudinal designs.**
 - Use valid, reliable, culturally relevant measures.
 - Account for confounding variables (e.g., maturation bias, selection bias).
 - Measure behavior change directly and objectively, rather than relying on attitude, knowledge, and/or perception.
 - Integrate studies across philosophical, theoretical, methodological, and analytical perspectives.
 - **Contextualize research within geographical, social, political, developmental, and historical landscapes.**
 - **Implement quality training and education for researchers** (i.e., academics, measurement and evaluation personnel).

Coalter, 2013; Massey & Whitley, in press

Findings and Recommendations: Program Theories

- Program theories inconsistently outlined, adopted, and studied
- Greater focus on program outcomes and impacts
- Recommendations:
 - **Outline and adopt program theories** (e.g., theories of change, logic models).
 - **Strategically and rigorously test program theories through longitudinal studies and/or long-term data collection efforts.**
 - **Measure change over time.**

Coalter, 2013, 2015; Cronin, 2011; Jones et al., 2017; Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011; Weiss, 1995

Findings and Recommendations: Systems Thinking

- Systems thinking and systems change are rare
- Linear, isolationist, individualistic planning, implementation, and evaluation of SDP programs still the norm
- Recommendations:
 - **Consider multiple systems** (e.g., microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem), **levels of influence** (e.g., individual, school, community, policy), and **influencers** (e.g., parents, peers, youth workers, teachers, funders, government, corporations).
 - **Consider the interaction of the above factors over time and within an historical context.**
 - **Use transdisciplinary research teams.**
 - **Seek strategic collaboration, formal partnerships, and possible mergers with organizations and programs within and beyond SDP.**

Coalter, 2010; Green, 2006; Langer, 2015; Massey & Whitley, in press; Ricigliano, 2012

Findings and Recommendations: Complex and Multi-Faceted Roles of Sport

- ‘Sport for good’ remains the dominant (and often only) narrative in SDP
- Recommendations:
 - **Deconstruct the ‘sport for good’ narrative** through intentional, comprehensive, critical exploration of SDP theory, research, praxis, and policy.
 - **Adopt a learning-focused environment.**
 - **Examine assumptions and biases in methods and methodologies.**
 - Report null and negative findings.

Bean et al., 2014; Bean & Forneris, 2016; Coalter, 2010; Gould & Carson, 2008; Langer, 2015; Massey & Whitley, 2016

Findings and Recommendations: Participatory Paradigms

- Inconsistent engagement with a broad and diverse set of actors through participatory research paradigms
- Recommendations:
 - **Incorporate participatory paradigms that work toward flattening traditional power differentials.**
 - **Engage a broad and diverse set of actors.**
 - Gain input from a range of stakeholders.
 - **Examine questions about what constitutes data and evidence.**
 - **Consider innovative and diverse research methodologies that engage with individuals and communities.**
 - Consider the structural, social, political, and economic realities surrounding SDP programs.
 - **Seek to understand existing systems of hegemony and oppression.**

Collison & Marchesseault, 2018; Darnell et al., 2016; Darnell & Hayhurst, 2012; Genat, 2009; Lindsey & Grattan, 2012; Mintzberg, 2006

Findings and Recommendations: Transparency

- Few records with enough methodological details for critical appraisal
- Results shared are largely positive
- Recommendations:
 - **Report research methods and methodologies in research-focused records** (e.g., academic articles, research reports) **in a comprehensive, transparent manner.**
 - **Outline research methods and methodologies in non-research-focused records** (e.g., annual reports), **with links and references to documents with more detailed information.**
 - Examine questions about what constitutes data and evidence.
 - **Report null and negative findings.**
 - **Examine inconsistent and/or contradictory findings.**
 - Discuss practical significance.

Coalter, 2010, 2013; Langer, 2015; Massey & Whitley, in press; Sugden, 2010; Darnell et al., 2018

Findings and Recommendations: Access

- Most records inaccessible to a wide audience due to presentation/dissemination
- Recommendations:
 - **Create and use public outlets beyond peer-reviewed journals.**
 - **Present methods, methodologies, and findings in alternative formats** (e.g., presentations, newsletters, videos, news articles).

Schulenkorf et al., 2016

Conclusions

- Research must be integrated into praxis, funding, and policy in a rigorous, meaningful, systematic manner
- Resources required to achieve this
 - For SDP programs:
 - **Seek a greater number of and more specialized human, financial, and infrastructural resources**
 - **Rethink hiring, retention, and professional development practices**
 - **(Re)allocate budgets**
 - **Make new/revised funding requests**
 - **Reimagine collaboration and partnership norms**

Conclusions

- Research must be integrated into praxis, funding, and policy in a rigorous, meaningful, systematic manner
- Resources required to achieve this
 - For researchers:
 - **Critically examine geopolitics of knowledge production**
 - **Pursue rigorous, longitudinal research that may result in fewer (but hopefully more impactful) publications**
 - **Consider sharing results in accessible forms/formats**
 - **Report null and negative results that may complicate relationships with other actors** (e.g., funders, programs)

Conclusions

- Research must be integrated into praxis, funding, and policy in a rigorous, meaningful, systematic manner
- Resources required to achieve this
 - For funders:
 - **Set expectations (with associated funding and support) for rigorous, (frequently) resource-intensive research**
 - **Cultivate a learning-focused climate over longer funding cycles**
 - **Consider how to communicate expectations about null and negative findings with grantees**

Conclusions

- Research must be integrated into praxis, funding, and policy in a rigorous, meaningful, systematic manner
- Resources required to achieve this
 - For policy makers:
 - **Lobby for and/or develop an overarching policy and funding framework to guide actors in the SDP field and the research supporting these efforts**
 - **Support the development of program theories**
 - **Broaden the conceptualization of what counts as data/evidence and whose voices should be heard**
 - **Reimagine collaboration and partnership norms within/beyond SDP**

Conclusions

All actors in SDP must realize, appreciate, and commit to the integration of research into praxis, funding, and policy in a rigorous, meaningful, systematic manner...

with the understanding that this may require significant changes to the systems, levels of influence, and influencers – and the interaction of these factors – within/beyond SDP.

Thank You

Meredith A. Whitley

Adelphi University

New York, USA

mwhitley@adelphi.edu

[@DrWhitley](https://twitter.com/DrWhitley)

[@AdelphiSBYD](https://twitter.com/AdelphiSBYD)

