Proposal of milestones to map and understand the uses of sport for development and peace

Received: 6 April 2021
For correspondence:
gadais.tegwen@uqam.ca

Tegwen Gadais¹⁻², Brice Favier-Ambrosini¹⁻²⁻³ & Michel-Alexandre Rioux⁴

¹Université du Québec à Montréal (Canada)

²Chaire UNESCO de Développement Curriculaire

³Laboratoire Analyse Comparée des Pouvoirs (ACP) - EA 3350 - Université Gustave Eiffel (Paris - France)

⁴Université de Sherbrooke, Longueuil, Québec, Canada

Please cite as: Gadais, T., Ambrosini, B. F., & Rioux, M. A. (2021, April 7). Proposal of milestones to map and understand the uses of sport for development and peace. <https://doi.org/10.31236/osf.io/rjvcf>

ABSTRACT

Physical activities and sport have been used to serve multiple international development issues since 2000. Football matches are organized to build social peace between divided populations, sports activities are offered to bring young people back to school, and/or sports tournaments are organized to regain possession of territories that have been contested and affected by armed conflicts. Although current research offers a variety of perspectives on sport for development based on several scientific disciplines, many questions remain unanswered. In particular, researchers are questioning the uses in which sport is implemented, the forms that sport takes in the context of development, and the goals that are targeted through sport, such as education, health, gender equality, reduced inequality and peace, among others. This chapter aims to clarifying the uses, forms, features and purposes of sport that international, national, regional or local organizations set up on the field. We present a model with two milestones (why and how), levers and mechanisms to help practitioners to position themselves in SDP, as well as for researchers to map the mechanisms of using sport to serve development, and more particularly by focusing on the sustainable development goals established by the United Nations on different scales.

Key words: Sport for development, Sport for peace, Sustainable development goals, didactics, pedagogy, interventions.

1. Introduction

The Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) movement has been growing rapidly since the 2000s, both locally and internationally. More and more organizations are using sport¹ as a development tool (Svensson & Woods, 2017). They target several objectives directly or indirectly linked to the major international guidelines of the United Nations through the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2015-2030 (UN, 2015). Several works have focused on this movement, which is defined as "the intentional use of sport, physical activity and play to achieve specific development objectives in low- and middle-income countries and disadvantaged communities in high-income areas" (Richards et al., 2013, p. 1). It includes "all forms of physical activity that contribute to physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction, such as play, recreation, organized or competitive sport, indigenous sports and games" (Gadais, 2019).

These SDP definitions seem deliberately broad for the sake of usefulness, but also and above all to take into account the variety of objectives that stakeholders set for themselves by using sport as a tool in the service of society (Joly & Le Yondre, 2020, p. 4). As such, the literature reviews in this field of research (Coakley, 2011; Cronin, 2011; Darnell, Chawansky, Marchesseault, Holmes, & Hayhurst, 2018; Hermens, Super, Verkooijen, & Koelen, 2017; Holt et al., 2017; Jones, Edwards, Bocarro, Bunds, & Smith, 2017; Wealty-Peachey & Cohen, 2016; Schulenkorf, Sherry, & Rowe, 2016; Svensson & Levine, 2017; Whitley, Massey, Camiré, Blom, et al., 2019; Whitley, Massey, Camiré, Boutet, & Borbee, 2019) indicate that SDP covers topics as varied as "sport and disability" (SDG10); "sport and education" (SDG4); "sport and gender" (SDG5); "sport and health" (SDG3); "sport and peace" (SDG16); "sport and social cohesion." SDP research therefore aims to understand the uses of sport as a development tool from several perspectives (e.g., evaluation of programs and impacts, case studies, action research; Gadais, 2019, Joly & Le Yondre, 2020). At present, they agree on the fact that the positive effects of sport (e.g., its integrative, social and psychological benefits) are conditional on quality intervention by a duly trained person (Gasparini, 2008, 2011; Gasparini & Vieille Marchiset, 2008).

However, this broad understanding of SDP is vague and complex, which makes it difficult to define its boundaries. The questions emanate as much from the practitioners who question themselves about their actions and interventions (e.g., Parlavecchio, Moreau, Favier-Ambrosini & Gadais, accepted; Whitley, Farrell, Wolff & Hillyer, 2019), as from the community of researchers who are trying to identify and differentiate approaches and uses of SDP (Coakley, 2011; Coalter, 2010; Welty-Peachey, Schulenkorf, & Spaaij, 2019; Schailée, Spaaij, Jeanes, & Theeboom, 2019; Schulenkorf, 2017; Shin, Cohen, & Welty-Peachey, 2020; Whitley, Massey, Camiré, Boutet, & Borbee, 2019). Indeed, many organizations and programs² use the term "SDP". They use sport not in a competitive perspective but in a way that is conducive to the development of the participants, be it on a psychological and/or social level in particular. A comparison of the available work on the actions carried out by these programs reveals great heterogeneity; both in terms of the values put forward (axiology), the purpose (goal), and the actions and mechanisms put in place to achieve them (objectives). Thus, while SDP has been developed internationally in a spontaneous and instinctive way by practitioners

¹ The term "sport" is considered here in its broad sense and not only in its triple dimensions: movement, competitive codification and institutionalization (Parlebas, 2016).

² The term "program" is used consistently throughout the chapter for clarity. The authors are aware, however, that SDP initiatives are sometimes referred to as organizations, projects, or other names, and that naming is itself a strategic social issue.

(Svensson & Woods, 2017), it is possible today to begin to understand its uses scientifically.

To better understand the development and use of programs, Funnell & Rogers (2011) address three complementary theories: program theory, theory of action and theory of change. Program theory is "an explicit theory of how an intervention is understood to contribute to its intended or observed outcomes; ideally includes a theory of change and a theory of action" (p. 34). Theory of change refers to "the central processes or drivers by which change comes about for individuals, groups, or communities; it can be derived from a research-based theory of change or drawn from other sources" (p. 34). Theory of action references "the ways in which programs or other interventions are constructed to activate these theories of change" (p. 34) (Funnell & Rogers, 2011). These three theories address programs at a high level of abstraction. They propose broad lines of interaction, without positioning themselves in a particular science, from which researchers and practitioners can draw inspiration to reflect and build a program. While this rather meta-proposal allows us to understand and explain many of the elements underlying the use of the programs, some areas remain unclear, particularly for the specific application of the field of SDP. More specifically, the philosophical and societal values promoted by these programs (the why), as well as the complex interactions between the facilitator, the beneficiary, the supported objective of the intervention and the implementation context (the how), need to be accurate and detailed when it comes to mapping³ the programs or understanding their mechanisms. Some models more specific to education and sport interventions could be used to complement these theories in order to refine their application in an SDP program context. Therefore, it is necessary to use a structure specific to SDP to clarify the underlying fundamentals of "why sport is used (sport FOR...)" and the levers and mechanisms of "how sport is used (sport AS...)".

The objective of this chapter is therefore to propose a two-milestone model to map (i.e. identifying, differentiating and modelling; Favier-Ambrosini & Quidu, 2015) and help better understand the diversity of uses of sport from an SDP perspective. The first milestone is to clarify program theory (Funnell & Rogers, 2011), i.e., the fundamental aspects of the SDP program, its intentions, and its direct (or indirect) links with the SDGs. The second milestone is to integrate the theory of action and the theory of change (Funnell & Rogers, 2011), through the concrete implementation of SDP interventions. More specifically, it focuses on the relationships and interaction between the different components of the SDP program: practitioners, participants, knowledge in the field of SDP, and context. These two milestones will help map and report on the diversity of the fundamentals but also the levers and mechanisms of intervention that are used by SDP programs.

Specifically, this chapter will help practitioners to better position their program in the area of SDP with respect to their intentions (Milestone 1) and interventions (Milestone 2). For research purposes, it will help address some of the gaps identified in the literature (e.g., bridging theory to practise, but also support actors in the field; Gadais, 2019) and propose avenues for future research specific to the SDP topic. Three programs will be discussed in this chapter (Box 1). These will be analyzed in light of the proposed model to illustrate different ways of using sport from an SDP perspective. The analysis of the programs will be carried out in parallel with the theoretical explanation to illustrate the point. First, the model and the main milestones will be presented and explained. Then, several nuances to the model will be noted

³ The term "mapping" here refers to the idea of schematizing, establishing a conceptual map or a representation of uses based on benchmarks and indicators. It refers to the proposals of Favier-Ambrosini & Quidu (2015), i.e. first identify, then differentiate and finally represent by modelling.

regarding its use in the discussion.

Box 1. Presentation of the Three SDP Organizations

Pour 3 points (<https://pour3points.ca/>): is a Canadian Non-Profit Organization (NPO) that operates in Montreal mainly in underprivileged schools in the region. The organization trains sports and life coaches to intervene in the extracurricular sports activities of schools with various youth teams. P3P uses coaching as a lever to help and guide less affluent youth, and in particular to reduce school drop-out rates.

Youth Centre Hockey Activity: is a rehabilitation intervention using the medium of ice hockey as a pretext for psycho-educational intervention with youth exhibiting disruptive behaviours and receiving services from the *Direction de la protection de la jeunesse* (DPJ) du Québec. The objectives of the program are to develop skills that promote social integration and a sense of hope. In order to achieve this, the coach-educators use each component of the intervention (i.e., youth, group, coach-educators, hockey, structured and functional aspects) to improve self-esteem, develop allocentric thinking, promote the learning of pro-social behaviours and reduce the participants' sense of stigmatization (Rioux, Laurier, Terradas, Labonté & Desormeaux, 2019).

Bel Avenir (<https://ongbelavenir.org/>): is an NGO in the South-West of Madagascar that uses education as an engine of development for the most disadvantaged populations of the country. The NGO uses certain leisure activities (e.g., music, arts and sports) to contribute to better education, health, environment and peace. It has its own sports school to offer, among other things, a variety of physical activities to occupy the youths' free time so that they do not end up on the street, a situation that presents many risk factors of insecurity, malnutrition, child labour, juvenile prostitution, negative encounters, etc.

2. Model for Mapping and Understanding SDP Uses

The following model maps the "why" and "how" of the SDP program based on two milestones (Figure 1). More specifically, it identifies the "why" (Milestone 1) and the "how" (Milestone 2) by integrating program theory and the theories of action and change, respectively, into the logic of Funnell & Rogers (2011). The choice of the Education and Physical Activity Sciences model is proposed as a complement to the proposals of Funnell & Rogers (2011). It then becomes a tool for thinking beyond the sciences that underlie it, and thus opens it up to other disciplines. Box 3 provides a psychological understanding of the mechanisms of change among participants in a SDP program that fits into the proposed model.

Stemming from the first milestone are the fundamentals and intentions (sport for...) to express the uses of sport. The second milestone involves the "levers of intervention"⁴ and "mechanisms of intervention" (sport as...) that help to

⁴ The term "levers of intervention", or "mechanisms of intervention", refers to the elements that can be used to propose an intervention and adjust it according to the intention, participants, context, etc. In intervention, the concept of intervention lever refers to elements, moments, characteristics, etc., on which it is possible to base one's intervention ("which thread can I pull? From what angle can I have an effect on what I am trying to influence?") The intervention mechanism corresponds to the tinkering that practitioners do before, during and after the action in order to implement their intervention with the participants, in accordance with their intention.

understand and identify the components implemented in the program activities that are based on SDP. It should be noted that several elements simultaneously interact with each other when implementing SDP programs. A number of studies on physical activity have begun to identify these levers (Baranowski & Jago, 2005; Gadais, 2015; Gargano & Turcotte, 2019) but still too little research has been done on SDP (Cardenas, 2013; Gadais, 2019, Hills, Gomez Velasquez & Walker, 2018).

Figure 1. SDP Uses Mapping Template

3. Milestone 1: SDP Program Rationale (Axiology (Aim) – Purpose (Goal) – Objective (Why))

The first milestone identified refers to the rationale for the SDP program; to position it in terms of the fundamentals that underlie its creation and operation. It helps to define the program theory (Funnell & Rogers, 2011). A tryptic can then be detected in this milestone, which corresponds to three interlocking levels of positioning: axiology, purpose and objective (APO) (Figure 2). This is typically taken from education (Herr, 1989; Reboul, 1989) or studies on sports programs (Favier-Ambrosini, Delalandre & Quidu, submitted). It can be represented by a funnel where the axiologies determine the purposes that will involve particular objectives, all in a reciprocal process where the objectives can also influence the purposes and axiologies.

Figure 2. Triptych Axiology - Purpose - Objective (A-P-O)

3.1 Axiology

The concept of axiology⁵ refers to the study of "that which is worthy of esteem (in Greek: axion), of what it is worth" (Heinich, 2006; Reboul, 1989). In other words, the axiology of a program represents a hierarchy of the values it wishes to convey. The latter may justify the existence of an SDP program. The axiology thus makes it possible to grasp what type of society model, what type of Human (in the broadest sense of the term), the organization wishes to participate in through a specific use of SDP. For example, the Bel Avenir and P3P programs seek, at the axiological level, to participate in a fairer society that does not perpetuate social inequalities. However, it must be said that the value system adopted by a program is not systematically explained. Rather, it may be simply present in the background, without being declared. Moreover, some organizations may sometimes choose not to display their axiology for strategic reasons, for example because the axiological system carries certain values linked to political visions.

3.2 Purpose

The term "purpose" is understood in Hameline's (1979) sense, i.e., an affirmation of principle through which a society or social group identifies and conveys its values. It therefore provides the broad guidelines for an intervention system and helps to identify the values that a program wishes to defend. It is often formalized in the form of expected results that the SDP program sets out to achieve, and there may in fact be one or more goals. By way of illustration, P3P's goal is to prevent drop-out by helping young people from disadvantaged backgrounds to stay in school (e.g., capacity building and empowerment). Similarly, the UN has formalized 17 SDGs for the period 2015-2030 (UN, 2015). These are categorized under broad goals such as SDG5 "Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls".

3.3 Objective

The third level refers to the definition of the objective(s) that the organization sets for itself in its use of SDP.

⁵ The concept of axiology is used here in reference to the classical definitions used in works pertaining to sociology of values (Heinich, 2006; Reboul, 1989).

According to Herr (1989), the concept of objective is understood as the realization, the implementation of a purpose. It is a question here of defining concrete goals for the use of SDP. These objectives may be qualitative and/or quantitative. To return to the previous example, SDG5 is broken down into six "targets" representing concrete objectives, such as "5.1 End all forms of discrimination against women and girls worldwide". They are often formalized by activities to be implemented or indicators, whether quantified or not, to achieve the desired goals (expected results). For example, in order to prevent dropping out of school, one of P3P's objectives is to train a certain number of coaches per year in so-called humanistic intervention (Lombardo, 1987). The latter is an approach to sports training that focuses on developing the autonomy, motivation and well-being of young people beyond mere athletic performance. The coach therefore not only intervenes on the sports component but accompanies the youth from a holistic perspective in order to prevent dropping out of school (Falcão, Bloom & Sabiston, 2020).

Box 2. Updating SDP Program Theory: Example of Knowledge Co-modelling.

In order to meet their objective of highlighting the theory of an SDP program, Rioux et al. (2019) use the knowledge co-modelling method. The proposed method essentially consists of concept mapping sessions conducted jointly by researchers and practitioners. These sessions are organized around the three pillars of the SDP program: expected results, activities implemented, and contextual factors that may help or hinder the achievement of these results. In this way, researchers and practitioners co-construct the concept map around these three cornerstones in real time with the support of a computer program. The concepts generated by the practitioners are then identified, organized and linked to each other. Following this session, the researchers do a thematic analysis and generate a more refined concept map supported by verbatim excerpts from the participants. This concept map is then presented to practitioners in a second concept mapping session. Practitioners are invited to modify or adjust the researchers' analyses and continue the conceptualization work. The researchers move back and forth between the analysis and the concept mapping sessions until the concept map represents practitioners' thinking about their program theory.

4. Identified Uses of Sport "FOR"

The theory of an SDP program, deconstructed by the "axiology - purpose - objective" modelling, points to the intended purpose of the program. In other words, sport at this level is used "FOR" a particular purpose. In this respect, several uses of sport have been identified by the literature and by major international organizations (UNICEF, 2008; UNOSDP, 2017). Some fit perfectly with the SDGs, others, on the contrary, are not directly connected to them. This list is not exhaustive, but it illustrates the varied uses of sport FOR a purpose. Furthermore, it is important to note that when we talk about the use of "sport for", this implies an intentional use of SDP by competent practitioners, as opposed to an understanding that sport is essential by "nature".

4.1 Sport for Health (SDG3)

A strong scientific and international consensus exists between sport and health, especially in the use of sport for

the prevention of health problems⁶. It is therefore logical that this theme is considered by SDP organizations and programs to ensure healthy living and promote the well-being of all people of all ages. Sport can be used for health through a wide range of outcomes associated with improving or maintaining physical, mental and social well-being. SDP programs also include prevention of risk factors for communicable and non-communicable diseases (De Cárcer, 2020). The studies examine the role that sport can play in preventive education and health promotion interventions (Duffey et al., 2019; Richards, et al., 2016; Whitley et al., 2017).

4.2 Sport for Education (SDG4)

Several programs use sport to advance education⁷, youth development, and life skills. Sport is used in an attempt to provide quality, inclusive and equitable education throughout a lifetime. Inclusive sport activities have long been used to promote education and advance certain rights; for example, the right to education for women and girls, but also to encourage the inclusion of people with disabilities and vulnerable or underrepresented individuals. In addition to focusing on sport education, this purpose also addresses the role of sport in achieving educational and social outcomes for young people (Farello, Blom, Mulvihill & Erickson, 2019; Wright et al., 2018).

4.3 Sport for Gender Equality Work (SDG5)

Sport is also used as a platform for advocacy and awareness-raising on gender equality⁸ and particularly the empowerment of women and girls. Some programs use sport primarily to help reduce discrimination against women and girls. They aim to challenge gender norms in disadvantaged areas. Finally, sport can provide a safe and equitable environment, for example in refugee camps, while building girls' self-esteem and confidence (Meyer & Roche, 2017; Zipp & Nauright, 2018).

4.4 Sport for Peace (SDG16)

Sport is used to promote peace building⁹ but also to link peoples or communities that have been affected by conflicts (Cardenas, 2013). There have been several instances where sport has played a key role in supporting formal peace building and conflict resolution processes. For example, the Open Fun Schools project in Bosnia and Herzegovina has, since its inception in 1998, brought together tens of thousands of children from formerly opposing communities to play football together (Gasser & Levinsen, 2004). In other cases, sport has been used to resolve conflicts, bring divided communities together, or as an alternative to violence and destructive conflict (Giullianotti & Amstrong, 2011; Ravizza, 2011; Woodhouse, 2010).

4.5 Sport to Respect Human Rights (SDG16)

Several official, legal and international documents, such as the UNESCO International Charter of Physical

⁶ According to UNOSDP (2017), in particular the targets of SDG3: 3.1-3.5, 3.7, 3.9.
⁷ According to UNOSDP (2017), in particular the targets of SDG4: 4.1, 4.3-4.5, 4.7, 4.a-4.c.
⁸ According to UNOSDP (2017), in particular the targets of SDG5: 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.c.
⁹ According to UNOSDP (2017), in particular the targets of SDG16: 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.5, 16.10.

Education and Sport (2015b) or the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), explicitly define the "right to sport" for human beings. This implies: 1) the right to the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health; 2) the right to education for the fullest development of the human personality; 3) the right to participate in cultural life; 4) the right to rest and leisure; 5) the right of children to engage in play and recreational activities; 6) the right of women to participate in recreational and sports activities; 7) the right of persons with disabilities to participate in sports on an equal basis with others. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) also stipulates that "access to physical education and sport shall be ensured and guaranteed for all human beings". Access to these rights becomes an argument in context for practitioners to justify the use of sport for development and for all (inclusion) in their programs (Beutler, 2008; Burke, 2017; Haudenhuyse, Hayton, Parnell, Verkooijen & Delheye, 2020; Lambert et al., 2020).

4.6 Sport for the Support of Employability and Decent Work (SDG8)

Many SDP programs use sport to promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, such as productive and decent jobs for all¹⁰. The growing size of the sport industry, whether local, national or international, and its links to other sectors, provide opportunities for economic growth and decent employment, while developing hybrid organizational models in the SDP sector (Svensson, & Seifried, 2017). Thus, sport programs can help foster greater employability of women, people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups, thereby contributing to inclusive economic growth (Warner, Robinson, Heal, Lloyd, O'Connell & Rose, 2021). In addition, sport-based educational programs provide employability skills and opportunities for youth to enter the job market. Finally, sporting goods and equipment that must be produced in compliance with labour standards, in the absence of forced and child labour and discrimination of all kinds, support SDG8. This sector could generate a bright future for SDP, particularly with regard to social enterprises (Giulianotti, Coalter, Collison & Darnell, 2019).

Other uses of "sport for" a particular purpose are not directly related to SDGs but have been identified in relation to SDP.

4.7 Sport for Social Cohesion

Sport is used to strengthen social cohesion. It includes projects where sport is used in the field of community empowerment, social inclusion/integration and diversity management. For example, Farello et al. (2019) showed that participation in a supervised sport and physical activity program helped several young refugee women develop positive experiences to strengthen their sense of belonging, autonomy and relationships. The program therefore assists them in building their adaptability and helping them resettle in their host community. Obviously, links could be made with SDG10 "Reducing Inequality" (UNOSDP, 2017). Typically, research focuses on social impact assessments and capacity-building initiatives that can lead to social cohesion, skills enhancement and overall community development (Welty-Peachey, Schulenkorf & Spaaij, 2019; Whitley et al., 2017).

¹⁰ According to UNOSDP (2017), in particular the targets of SDG8: 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.5-8.7, 8.9.

If the axiologies are sometimes not asserted by the organizations as underlined above, the aims and objectives are very often asserted. Indeed, they enable them to communicate concretely about their actions and thus to demonstrate a certain readability to the general public on the one hand, and to donors and evaluation bodies on the other hand (Jany-Catrice, 2012). Ultimately, the A-P-O triptych represents a model capable of reflecting both the diversity of the fundamentals and the depth of the anchoring of the major orientations of programs that use sport with a human and societal development objective. However, this milestone remains insufficient to map the practical applicability of these fundamentals, hence the complementarity and relevance of the second milestone. It is also important to remember at this stage that the use of "sport for" is conditional on its proper implementation by duly trained and preferably qualified practitioners or administrators. Thus, the positive virtues of sport are not automatic but depend on the conditions of the intervention.

5. Milestone 2: Implementation of the SDP Program (Intervention Levers and Mechanisms, How?)

The choice of the model from the field of education sciences was made because it provides a good understanding of the components and their interactions that comprise an intervention, particularly those of SDP. It is therefore used as a tool for thinking, but it is not limited to education as a science. Thus, the terms "pedagogy", "didactic" or "training development", etc., are not to be understood only in educational terms, but as an illustration of the interactions that play out in the SDP intervention. Other disciplinary and scientific fields (e.g., sociology, psychology, criminology) could therefore benefit from this tool.

The second milestone used to map SDP refers to the implementation of uses (Figure 3). Drawing on models from the field of education sciences (Houssaye, 1988; Legendre, 2005), the template for Milestone 2 proposed below consists of the following elements: (a) three major poles (A-P-O, Subject and Agent), (b) three relationships between these poles (Didactics, Pedagogy and Training Development) as well as (c) the implementation context (environment, situation). The model thus created aims to better understand the practical applicability (e.g., tool, method, materials, approaches, intervention techniques) that is carried out by practitioners (agent) in relation to the beneficiaries (subject) of SDP programs to achieve their intent (A-P-O) in the program. In other words, linking the elements of this systematic model help to achieve the first milestone of A-P-O through SDP programs and to explain the diversity of intervention levers and mechanisms, i.e., the "how" or theory of action and change (Funnell & Rogers, 2011).

Figure 3. SDP Uses Intervention Mechanisms

In the first family of elements, *A-P-O* refers to the elements outlined in the first milestone of this chapter ("why"), or the rationale, the purpose of the program. Then, the *agent* (or practitioner, "by whom") is the person(s) in charge of intervening in SDP but also in charge of planning, carrying out and sometimes evaluating the activities implemented. Depending on the context, this may be a coach, a teacher, an educator, a monitor, a social worker, a psychologist, etc. Of course, it is essential to consider their personal characteristics (e.g., gender, age, socio-economic category, education, training, qualifications, sector of activity, professional order) in order to understand their implications for the program. In the case of P3P, they are the coaches who are trained by the organization to work with young people. They receive training as humanist coaches to accompany youth in their daily life difficulties. Bel Avenir hires local Madagascans who are trained by Bel Avenir or its partners to intervene in a specialized manner with sports. Finally, to complete the triangulation, the subject (or beneficiary, "for whom") is the person taking part in the program. As with the agent, the personal characteristics (e.g., gender, age, socio-economic category, education, needs, motivation, interests) of the subject must be taken into consideration when implementing the activities. Moreover, they are often even the very reason for the program's existence. P3P works with young people from disadvantaged areas in Montreal high schools (Falcão, Bloom & Bennie, 2017; Falcão, Bloom & Sabiston, 2020). These youths often come from single-parent families, who are experiencing unemployment, precariousness or abandonment. At the Bel Avenir sports school, they are the most disadvantaged young people in the region who experience insecurity, malnutrition and child labour, etc. on a daily basis (Décarpentrie, Gadais & Bélanger, 2021; Gadais, 2019).

The second family of elements concerns the relationships that are played out between the basic poles and represent "how" the concrete application is carried out. *Didactics* is the relationship between the A-P-O and the agent. In SDP, it refers, among other things, to two elements: on the one hand, the choice of physical activity used as a support for the

program (e.g., sport, traditional play, artistic activity, free play); on the other hand, the transformation of the support, i.e., the process of didactic transposition (Chevallard, 1986, Amade-Escot, 2007) which is on an axis ranging from the cultural and societal respect of the chosen activity without transformation of its anthropological meaning (e.g. football at 11-a-side, basketball at 5-a-side) to an activity completely transformed, or even invented from certain elements of cultural reference (e.g., Parlavecchio, 2015). For example, some SDP practitioners invent their activity with participants by co-constructing the purpose and rules of the game (Parlavecchio et al., accepted), while P3P sets up a didactic of the intervention based on benchmark social practices (i.e., football and basketball) with the objective of starting from the representations of the youth, in order to engage them to take part in the competitive teams of the extracurricular sport. Bel Avenir offers a variety of occupational physical activities (e.g., football, basketball, rollerblading, athletics) to meet the interests and motivation of the youths, again starting from their representations in order to engage them in the process. *Pedagogy* is the relationship between the agent and the subject. In particular, it includes intervention styles that can be thought of on a continuum from an authoritarian, top-down style to a less controlling style that favours processes of co-construction of rules as well as more horizontal relationships between agent and beneficiary. This relationship also includes various relational aspects that can take many forms (e.g., pedagogical relationship, therapeutic relationship (see Box 3), group climate, communication strategies, but also all the families of feedback that are delivered to the subject by the agent (e.g., motivation and encouragement, safety management, proposed tasks, task expectations)). P3P implements a humanistic pedagogy, i.e. a less controlling pedagogical style to promote the role of the coach as a tutor of resilience, but also creativity, trust between coach and athlete, etc. This humanistic pedagogy, implemented by P3P coaches, helps to make an impact on the young person's life beyond sport (Falcão et al., 2017). Finally, the *learning, development* or *training* relationship is played out between the subject and the A-P-O. It refers to the levels of acquisition, learning and/or development that the subject will achieve according to the target set on the A-P-O by intended purpose and is consistent with the theory of change (Funnell & Rogers, 2011). This relationship includes the levels, but also the expectations in terms of development that can be expressed through knowledge (knowledge), know-how (skills), know-how to act (techniques), but above all in SDP, know-how to be (attitudes, behaviours and actions).

Box 3: Relational Aspects in SDP Programs: Illustration of the Therapeutic Relationship – (*Relationship "Pedagogy"*)

Results from the Rioux, Laurier, Terradas, Carrier and Labonté (2020) study show that relational aspects between participants and between participants and practitioners led to therapeutic changes (theories of self and the world) among participants in an SDP program. Although these changes are specific to each participant, Rioux et al. (2020) identify a general process leading to therapeutic change: experiencing different ways of entering or being in a relationship (directly or witnessing it) or an intervention by a practitioner that differs from the meaning previously attributed to it. Integrating this new perspective or design into the participant's system of representation leads to new theories about himself or the world. For example, a participant is led to revisit his perception of relationships with others previously perceived as lacking or marked by aggressiveness, by witnessing the friendly relationship between the SDP program coach-educators. Indeed, this leads participant to glimpse the possibility of, and desire for, such friendly relationships for himself in the future.

Finally, the third family of elements refers to the context in which the SDP program is implemented. The implementation situation is crucial since it must be considered as "situated"; that is, carried out in a particular place according to certain local characteristics and specificities (e.g., language, culture, ethnicity, traditions, societal values, social relationships, legal aspect). It must be understood that this context is sometimes related to a field that guides it and imposes certain characteristics of sport use (e.g., competitive sport, school physical education classes, extracurricular or leisure activities) but also to a particular sector (e.g., health, school, community). In fact, and most importantly, it is impossible to attempt to disconnect the context in which an SDP program is implemented, since it is in itself one of the major levers for intervention (Box 4). P3P is a competitive extracurricular sport organized in high schools in the greater Montreal area. By being in school but through a non-academic activity, coaches develop a privileged relationship with the youths to act as mentors and thus advise them in their life choices. This is more difficult to build for teachers who have different expectations of the young people such as having them work to succeed, but also to receive a grade.

Box 4. SDP Program Context

The Bel Avenir sports school has several elements to take into consideration when considering the Malagasy context in which it operates. First of all, it is located in the heart of the city of Toliara, to allow easy and quick access to all youth in the city. It is open 24/7 with the permanent presence of a janitor to provide a safe environment and to facilitate access with the least possible restriction for approximately 400 young people on a daily basis. Secondly, the school is staffed at fixed hours by Malagasy speakers from the region, who understand the local culture and above all speak the Malagasy dialect of the region. Once or twice a year, these six practitioners receive training to improve their interventions. Finally, the school offers a variety of physical activities (e.g., basketball, soccer, rollerblading, track and field, tchoukball, handball) to offer young people a wide variety of activities adapted to their interests but also to develop various skills related to physical activity (e.g., tactics, techniques, interpersonal relations, self-esteem). These activities are proposed based on the availability of local infrastructure (1 soccer field, 2 basketball courts and 2 handball courts on concrete slabs, some athletic facilities) but also respectful of local customs and habits (Décarpentrie et al., 2021; Décarpentrie, Guirao, Bélanger & Gadais, 2018).

6. Identified Uses of Sport "AS"

The second milestone thus invites us to consider several uses of sport AS a lever or intervention mechanism. The scientific literature on SDP and major international organizations (UNICEF, 2008; UNOSDP, 2017) have indeed identified several of these uses. Again, the proposed list is not exhaustive, but it does provide some clues to what has been identified by several SDP researchers. It is important to remember that sport use implies the intentional use of SDP by trained and qualified practitioners.

6.1 Sport as a Universal Language

Sport can be used as a common and popular cultural language that transcends national, cultural, socio-economic

and political boundaries, to be invoked in virtually every community around the world. Language then becomes a resource in the pedagogical relationship (e.g., speaking a language that makes sense to young people; Travert, 2003) as well as a didactic lever that the practitioner can use in order to develop motor or psychosocial skills (e.g., using the names of players recognized for their exemplary behaviour, in order to develop, by imitation, certain positive attitudes in the beneficiary).

6.2 *Sport as a Medium*

Sport can be used as a medium of intervention, as a means for a practitioner(s) to deploy an intervention. In general, there is a hidden agenda behind the use of sport. The intervention is more related to the problem underlying the implementation of the SDP program (e.g., dropping out of school, juvenile delinquency, complex traumas) than to sport as such. Sport becomes a kind of intermediary between the agent and the subject in order to respond to a problem through an intervention. The type of intervention depends, among other things, on the orientation adopted in relation to the problem (e.g., educational, sociological, psychological, criminological, etc.) as well as the theoretical allegiance (approach) of the practitioner (Rioux, Laurier, Gadais, & Terradas, 2017). For example, Rioux et al. (2019) show that sport can be used as a pretext for a psycho-educational intervention (approach) with young people with disruptive behaviours (problematic) aiming, among other things, to improve self-esteem and reduce the feeling of stigmatization (orientation).

6.3 *Sport as a Tool or Strategy*

In many contexts, sport is used as a tool or strategy to achieve a goal. It is one of the most cross-sectional development and peace tools used. Unlike sport as a medium, sport as a tool or strategy refers to the use of sport itself. As a tool, it is part of the approach used to do a job. As a strategy, it is the coordinated plan of actions. As an illustration, sport, supervised by well-trained instructors, also allows the release of certain physical or emotional tensions in the form of secure catharsis in physical education in particular (Gagnaire & Lavie, 2005). Others examples show that sport can be used to promote and maintain the health of populations or prevent disease, strengthen youth development and education, foster social inclusion, prevent conflict and build peace, promote gender equality, strengthen inclusion such as the integration of people with disabilities, and promote employment and economic development. In each of these cases, the sport is chosen and adapted through various forms (e.g., play, guided or free activity, competition, differentiation) to serve as a means for practitioners to achieve the targeted objective.

Sport can also be used as a strategy like any other (e.g., music, arts) to achieve a development goal (Décarpentrie et al., 2018; Décarpentrie et al., 2021). Sport can be a very effective and inexpensive way to reduce the individual and public costs associated with development challenges. In this regard, it was noted that Sport for Development and Peace initiatives can play an important role in both prevention and helping to address a wide range of social and economic challenges (Hills, Gomez Velasquez & Walker, 2018). However, while sport may be very attractive to some target groups, other groups may not feel the same way about it. For example, other strategies such as music, dance, art or technology may be more effective than sport in certain contexts (Décarpentrie et al., 2021).

6.4 Sport as a Hook

Sport can be used as a hook (Hills et al., 2018), considering two components: the use of sport to attract participants, and the use of sport as a condition for obtaining other basic social services, such as education, tutoring or counselling (Green, 2008). For example, sport was used in San Salvador to oblige young people to attend school if they wanted to participate in municipal sports tournaments (Gadais, Webb & Garcia, 2017). Also, extracurricular sports teams have been used by P3P to reach and attract young people in order to prevent them from dropping out of school through the support offered by their coaches (Falcão et al., 2017). In addition, the value of sport as a hook can be attributed to its global audience and the particularly strong ties that sports fans have with clubs or athletes (Stevens & Rosenberger, 2012).

6.5 Sport as a Diversion and/or Reintegration Tool

Sport can be used as a means to distract beneficiaries from violent behaviour and even promote reintegration. Based on criminology perspectives, physical activity can help prevent deviant and antisocial behaviour by distracting the subject from a place or time potentially conducive to the adoption of this type of behaviour (Nichols & Crow, 2004). SDP programs, implemented in disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Colombia and Brazil, have led to a decrease in criminal behaviour by involving youth in sports rather than street crime (Cardenas, 2013; Hills et al., 2018).

Also, in Uganda, sport, supervised by trained facilitators, was used to engage child soldiers in the disarmament, demobilization (e.g., official registration in society such as ID, bank account, etc.) and reintegration process (Ravizza, 2011). On one hand, child soldiers who had just been demobilized and quit the rebel army started to play soccer to experience a more “normative” childhood. On the other hand, soccer matches between rebels and local communities have been used to promote the reintegration process of young people (rebels and locals) severely affected by the civil war (Ravizza, 2011). The Football for Peace program brought together young Palestinians and Israelis for peaceful football games and established mutual respect between the two communities during the project (Dart, 2019; Schulenkorf, Sugden & Burdsey, 2014). By playing together, football was the distraction used to avoid focusing on social tensions.

6.6 Sport as a Microsociety

From a pedagogical and didactic point of view, sport can be used as a way of reproducing a society in which young people develop their relationship to the rules as well as their relational skills, under the supervision of a facilitator (e.g., Parlavecchio, 2015). As a team, with partners to collaborate with and opponents to oppose, participants can learn social rules of conduct, participate in a reintegration process, or develop relational skills that are transferable to their daily lives (Siedentop, 1998). For example, in his *Sport Education* initiative, Siedentop suggests organizing physical education around the construction of a micro-society in the classroom. In rotation, the students are thus called upon to become administrators, tournament organizers, but also participants as athletes and coaches, allowing them to develop a whole range of psychosocial and citizenship skills.

Finally, it is important to note that other more global uses of "sport as" (because they are aimed at audiences beyond the scope of a specific intervention) have been identified by the studies and have been reused by international

organizations (UNICEF, 2008; UNOSDP, 2017). This applies for example, to the use of sport as a communication platform that helps to reach a wider audience than the beneficiaries directly targeted by the programs. In El Salvador, for example, sports tournaments organized by the municipality have brought young people and their parents together to convey public messages to the community (Gadais, Webb & Garcia, 2017). By extension, high-performance athletes have also become global celebrities in their own right, enabling them to serve as powerful ambassadors, spokespersons and role models for development and peace initiatives (UNICEF, 2008).

7. Discussion of the Model

The purpose of this chapter is to propose elements for discussion in order to clarify the definition of "sport for development and peace" and to map its uses. This reflexive itinerary has allowed two milestones to emerge for a better understanding of the uses of SDP. It is now necessary to clarify certain nuances for its use by practitioners and researchers.

The first nuance concerns the importance of understanding the model as a complex system that functions systematically around its two milestones ("why" and "how"). This way of thinking in the form of "recursive loops" (Morin, 1990) back and forth specifies the importance and relevance of the arrows in the model. This allows for adjustment to the complexity of the reality of the program and of the human beings taking part in it (agents, subjects). Thus, the formalization of objectives may result in a redefinition of axiologies or purposes, as well as didactics, pedagogy and training or development. Also, this model does not include a diachronic dimension (before, during and after the program) or even the temporal evolution of its participants. However, programs and participants evolve over time (Chen, 2015), and the categories are therefore not fixed and should not be considered as such.

Second, another nuance concerns the second milestone of the model, for which it seems important to specify that the practical application of the model is more subtle than it appears in theory. Thus, if in the model the didactic and pedagogical dimensions are clearly distinguished, in practice they are intimately intertwined. Authors in Education Sciences underline the fact that in the pedagogical relationship between the agent and the subject, didactic issues are inevitably implicated. Petiot (2019) thus prefers to speak of "modalities of intervention" in order to overcome a "persistent dichotomy between what would be of the order of knowledge transmission and what would be more related to the relational dimensions between the teacher and the students" (Petiot, 2019, p. 38). In other words, didactic processes are sometimes played out within the pedagogical relationship itself. Their separation is thus only useful for the purpose of modelling the uses of the SDP and not to account for the complexity of what is at stake in the situation.

The third nuance refers to the "magical effect" of sport, i.e., the idea that sport has the potential to solve, by its very nature, all problems related to human development or related to SDGs. Practitioners and researchers alike must remain cautious on this point. The use of Sport for Development and Peace is based, in practice, on the fact that actors recognize that sport, in its various forms, has attributes that enable it to bring particular value to development and peace processes. The value of sport as a lever is an attribute of the SDP, but it also has its limitations. In this sense, the proposed model makes it possible to go beyond this magical thinking to align with the desire to propose well thought-out, well-organized activities with an emphasis on the "why" (Sport used for...) and the "how" (Sport used as...). It is important to

remember that these conditions can only be met when the sports activity is set up by a duly trained and qualified person, a condition that is essential to good SDP practice.

In addition of nuances, the proposed model allows for the integration of program theory (why) and theories of action and change (how) into its two milestones. It includes these three theories in a synchronized operation. The models proposed in this chapter therefore seek to go further by integrating models specific to the fields of education sciences and physical activity. They then become complementary tools closer to concrete SDP intervention, in order to complete the reflection on SDP programs. The model should therefore not be reduced to its original scientific and disciplinary fields, but rather propose a broadening of its uses. Thus, on the one hand, it allows researchers to enhance their recommendations, particularly in terms of program monitoring and evaluation, and on the other hand, it allows practitioners to better assimilate and orient the use of SDP.

The modelling advanced here aims to put forward suggestions to better identify the diversity of levers and intervention mechanisms used in the field of SDP. It thus seems complementary to the models proposed in this field and more particularly to the one formulated by Coalter (2010). This author has indeed proposed a distinction between two major approaches to the uses of sport. The first, known as "Sport Plus", brings together initiatives that use sport to develop its internal dimension in order to achieve a series of objectives (e.g., remove barriers to sports participation by the general population or specific target groups, train and support leaders and coaches, develop sports skills among practitioners, develop a sustainable economy of sports organizations). The second, known as "Plus Sport", brings together programs that use sport as a means to an end or as a support to aim for transformations in individual behaviour (e.g., psychosocial skills) as well as social impacts related to SDGs (e.g., using sport's capacity to bring together large numbers of young people to achieve the objectives of health and social programs). Non-sports outcomes (e.g., HIV/AIDS education and behaviour change) are more important than long-term sustainable sports development. While Coalter's proposal has the merit of identifying various uses of SDP at a global level, the modelling we propose seeks to complement it by focusing more precisely on the intervention mechanisms employed by practitioners using sport for development purposes. The scale of analysis is thus shifted in order to report, more precisely, on the operationalization of SDP uses by practitioners. We thus hope that it can provide tools for both field practitioners in their practices and researchers in their activities, thus providing a relevant resource common to both worlds, facilitating bridges between theory and practice (Gadai, 2019; Welty-Peachy et al., 2019).

Thus, the model makes it imperative to consider the contexts and issues underlying SDP programs. While the SDGs strongly orient actions in the field, the analysis of SDP uses carried out in this chapter shows that their use is more subtle and varied than responding only to the SDGs. One must therefore remain cautious and respect the fact that programs often start from a specific issue or context that is the starting point for their initiatives. These specific elements help to better understand the SDP program, situate and contextualize it, and thus propose an adequate and adapted analysis. This analysis helps to better define the contours of the SDP program and thus understand its uses. Finally, the model helps to realize that SDP does not correspond directly to all SDGs, but that its use depends on how practitioners utilize it in their contexts to address their problems.

The participant's experience is also essential to consider in ensuring the success of SDP programs. Often,

programs or their materials provide effective links between their targeted intentions and the proposed interventions (Gadais, Webb & Garcia, 2017). However, what about the participant's actual experience? That is, how does the recipient perceive the program or proposed activities? Do these really change anything for him? To our knowledge, only a few studies (Parlavecchio et al., accepted; Rioux et al., 2020) have been focused on the participant's experience in SDP programs in order to truly understand what they experience, learn and develop. However, it is crucial to take into account the singular experience of the participants. It would allow for the revision of program or action theories. Similarly, it is also relevant to question the experience of the facilitator, but also that of the program administrator. Indeed, their voices are rarely included in SDP studies. This difference between the intervention and the participant's experience could potentially become a third milestone in our model.

Finally, beyond "sport for" and "sport as", the development of the model raises the question of considering sport as an end in itself. Indeed, until now, sport has been systematically considered as a means of intervention for more global axiologies, goals and objectives. But can we think of sport, physical activities or traditional physical games as an end in themselves? Some so-called "culturalist" conceptions in physical education defend a similar idea according to which physical and sports activities are thought of as the products of a culture, i.e. reflections of human intelligence crystallized in sophisticated body techniques (Delignières, 2019; Delignières & Garsault, 2004). In this regard, sport and its techniques can be thought of as a goal in itself, as they represent a cultural and historical heritage to be transmitted. This is not only a recognition of local particularities (Jaouen, 2016; Parlebas, 2016) and regional cultures that UNESCO is working to promote, in particular through traditional games (Jaouen, 2016; UNESCO, 2005), but also of a common global culture through institutionalized sports.

8. Conclusion

This chapter aimed to map the various uses of SDP by proposing guidelines for reflection and understanding of programs that target UN SDGs in particular. Based on the current literature in the field of SDP and on the analysis of three programs, this chapter proposes a model composed of two milestones for mapping the uses of SDP. It therefore helps to better understand the theoretical (rationale) and practical (levers or mechanisms of intervention) application that is carried out by the organizations setting up these programs. This model helps to recognize the heterogeneity of the axiologies, goals, and objectives of SDP programs, but also the nuances that exist in the way in which they are put into practice. The reflections then led to the identification of a diversity of uses of SDP, in particular the sport used "for" and "as", whether or not directly related to SDGs.

The milestones proposed in this chapter should help practitioners to better position their program in the area of SDP based on their intentions (Milestone 1) and interventions (Milestone 2), and to clarify the levers and mechanisms they use. For researchers, the proposals should help to better understand and study the work of practitioners in the field and thus propose avenues for future research specific to the SDP theme, particularly in relation to SDGs. The model must now be tested on an international scale in relation to SDP programs and their implementation in the field. It is now up to practitioners to strengthen this model based on their issues and contexts of SDP use. It is also up to researchers to support this approach based on the needs of practitioners.

9. References

- Amade-Escot, C. (2007). *Le didactique*. Paris : Revue EPS.
- Baranowski, T., & Jago, R. (2005). Understanding the mechanisms of change in children's physical activity programs. *Exercise and sport sciences reviews*, 33(4), 163-168.
- Beutler, I. (2008). Sport serving development and peace: Achieving the goals of the United Nations through sport. *Sport in society*, 11(4), 359-369.
- Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (1991). *De la justification. Les économies de la grandeur*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Burke, M. (2017). *Using sport as a global change agent: The United Nations model of sport for development*. Senior Honors Projects, 2010-current. 314. <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/honors201019/314>
- Cárdenas, A. (2013). Peace building through sport? An introduction to sport for development and peace. *Journal of Conflictology*, 4(1), 4.
- Chen, H. T. (2015). *Practical program evaluation. Theory-Driven Evaluation and the Integrated Evaluation Perspective*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.
- Chevallard, Y. (1986). *La Transposition didactique : du savoir savant au savoir enseigné*. Grenoble : La Pensée Sauvage.
- Coakley, J. (2011). Youth sports: What counts as “positive development?”. *Journal of sport and social issues*, 35(3), 306-324.
- Coalter, F. (2010). Sport-for-development: going beyond the boundary? *Sport in Society*, 13(9), 1374-1391.
- Cronin, O. (2011). *Mapping Research on the Impact of Sport and Development Interventions*. Manchester: Comic Relief Review.
- Darnell, S. C., Chawansky, M., Marchesseault, D., Holmes, M., & Hayhurst, L. (2018). The state of play: Critical sociological insights into recent ‘Sport for Development and Peace’ research. *International review for the sociology of sport*, 53(2), 133-151.
- Dart, J. (2019). Sport and peacebuilding in Israel/Palestine. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 1-22. DOI: 10.1080/24704067.2019.1604073
- De Cárcer, C. (2020). El fútbol como factor de prevención primaria contra el VIH-SIDA, Malaria, y como elemento de Salud e Higiene Básica en escolares de un centro educativo de Camerún. *Revista Internacional de Ciencias del Deporte*, 16(61), 298-317. doi: 10.5232/ricyde
- Décarpentrie, L., Gadais, T. Bélanger, C., (2021). Could leisure activities contribute to the well being of youth developing in an extreme context? The case of Malagasy youth, Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), 25 April - 2 May 2021, Seattle, USA.
- Decarpentrie, L., Guirao, J.L., Bélanger, C. & Gadais, T. (2018). Effets d’activités musicales et sportives sur le

développement psychologique et social de jeunes défavorisés de Madagascar : Élaboration d'un projet de recherche en partenariat ONG Bel Avenir - UQAM. Groupe de Recherche en activité physique adaptée (GRAPA), UQAM, Septembre 2018.

Delignières, D. (2019). Culture, enseignement, et Éducation Physique et Sportive. Site personnel. Retrieved from <https://didierdelignieresblog.wordpress.com/2019/02/05/culture-enseignement-et-education-physique-et-sportive/>

Delignières, D., & Garsault, C. (2004). *Libres propos sur l'Éducation Physique*. Paris: Editions Revue EPS.

Duffey, K., Zulu, J. M., Asamoah, B. O., & Agardh, A. (2019). A cross-sectional study of sexual health knowledge, attitudes, and reported behavior among Zambian adolescent girl participants in a football program. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 7(12), 46-58.

Falcão, W. R., Bloom, G. A., & Bennie, A. (2017). Coaches' experiences learning and applying the content of a humanistic coaching workshop in youth sport settings. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 4(3), 279-290.

Falcão, W. R., Bloom, G. A., & Sabiston, C. M. (2020). The impact of humanistic coach training on youth athletes' development through sport. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 15(5-6), 610-620.

Farello, A., Blom, L., Mulvihill, T., & Erickson, J. (2019). Understanding female youth refugees' experiences in sport and physical education through the self-determination theory. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 7(13), 55-72.

Favier-Ambrosini, B., Delalandre, M. & Quidu, M. (2021, submitted *Loisir et Société*). Revendiquer l'innovation dans le champ de la culture physique. *Loisir et Société*.

Favier-Ambrosini, B. & Quidu, M. (2015). L'ancrage symbolique des œuvres épistémologiques de Gaston Bachelard, Michel Serres et Edgar Morin. *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 113(4), 645-677. doi : 10.2143/RPL.113.4.3136932.

Funnell, S. C., & Rogers, P. J. (2011). *Purposeful program theory: Effective use of theories of change and logic models* (Vol. 31). John Wiley & Sons.

Gadais, T. (2015). Les stratégies d'intervention pour aider les jeunes à gérer leur pratique d'activité physique. Une revue de la littérature. *Staps*, 109(3), 57-77.

Gadais, T. (2019). T Sport for Development and Peace: Current Perspectives of Research *IntechOpen*. doi:10.5772/intechopen.89192

Gadais, T., Webb, A., & Garcia, A. (2017). Using report analysis as a sport for development and peace research tool: The case of El Salvador Olimpica Municipal's programme. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 6(10), 12-24.

- Gagnaire, P., & Lavie, F. (2005). Cultiver les émotions des élèves en EPS. In L. Ria (Ed.), *Les émotions* (pp. 81-98). Paris: Revue EPS.
- Gargano, V., & Turcotte, D. (2019). Helping factors in an outdoor adventure program. *Journal of Social Work, 0*(0) 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017319863708>
- Gasparini, W. (2008). L'intégration par le sport. Genèse politique d'une croyance collective. [Integration through Sport]. *Sociétés contemporaines, 69*(1), 7-23. doi:10.3917/soco.069.0007
- Gasparini, W. (2011). Un sport européen ? Genèse et enjeux d'une catégorie européenne. *Savoir/Agir, 15*(1), 49-57. doi:10.3917/sava.015.0049
- Gasparini, W., & Vieille Marchiset, G. (2008). Sport, quartiers populaires, politiques publiques : des catégories à l'épreuve des sciences sociales. In W. Gasparini & G. V. Marchiset (Eds.), *Le sport dans les quartiers : pratiques sociales et politiques publiques* (pp. 17-57). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Gasser, P. K., & Levinsen, A. (2004). Breaking post-war ice: Open fun football schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Sport in society, 7*(3), 457-472.
- Giulianotti, R., & Armstrong, G. (2011). Sport, the Military and Peacemaking: history and possibilities. *Third World Quarterly, 32*(3), 379-394.
- Giulianotti, R., Coalter, F., Collison, H., & Darnell, S. C. (2019). Rethinking Sportland: A new research agenda for the sport for development and peace sector. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 43*(6), 411-437.
- Green, B. C. (2008). Sport as an agent for social and personal change. *Management of sports development, 3*, 130-145.
- Haudenhuysse, R., Hayton, J., Parnell, D., Verkooijen, K., & Delheye, P. (2020). Boundary Spanning in Sport for Development: Opening Transdisciplinary and Intersectoral Perspectives. *Social Inclusion, 8*(3), 123-128.
- Heinich, N. (2006). La sociologie à l'épreuve des valeurs. *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie, 121*, 287-315. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3917/cis.121.0287>
- Hermens, N., Super, S., Verkooijen, K. T., & Koelen, M. A. (2017). A systematic review of life skill development through sports programs serving socially vulnerable youth. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport, 88*(4), 408-424.
- Herr, M. (1989). Les textes officiels et l'histoire : analyse de trois textes relatifs à l'Education physique In P. Arnaud, J.-P. Clément, & M. Herr (Eds.), *Éducation physique et sport en France 1920-1980* (pp. 281-293). Clermont-Ferrand AFRAPS.
- Hills, S., Gomez Velasquez, A., & Walker, M. (2018). Sport as an analogy to teach life skills and redefine moral values: A case study of the 'Seedbeds of Peace' sport-for-development programme in Medellin, Colombia. *Journal of Sport for Development, 6*(10), 25-37.

- Holt, N. L., Neely, K. C., Slater, L. G., Camiré, M., Côté, J., Fraser-Thomas, J., . . . Tamminen, K. A. (2017). A grounded theory of positive youth development through sport based on results from a qualitative meta-study. *International review of sport and exercise psychology*, 10(1), 1-49.
- Houssaye, J. (1988). *Pratiques pédagogiques*. Bern: P. Lang.
- Jany-Catrice, F. (2012). *La performance totale : nouvel esprit du capitalisme ?* Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.
- Jaouen, G. (2016). Jeux traditionnels d'adultes et environnements institutionnels. In P. Parlebas (Ed.), *Jeux traditionnels, sports et patrimoine culturel*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Joly, F., & Le Yondre, F. (2020). Sociologie du sport pour le développement : état de l'art anglo-saxon et projection en sociologie française. *Staps, Prépublication*(0), 111-21. Retrieved from <https://www.cairn.info/revue-staps-2020-0-page-111.htm>
- Jones, G. J., Edwards, M. B., Bocarro, J. N., Bunds, K. S., & Smith, J. W. (2017). An integrative review of sport-based youth development literature. *Sport in Society*, 20(1), 161-179.
- Lambert, E. V., Kolbe-Alexander, T., Adlakha, D., Oyeyemi, A., Anokye, N. K., Goenka, S., ... & Salvo, D. (2020). Making the case for 'physical activity security': the 2020 WHO guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour from a Global South perspective. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 54(24), 1447-1448.
- Legendre, R. (2005). *Dictionnaire actuel de l'éducation*, 3^e édition. Montréal : Gaétan Morin.
- Meyer, K. L., & Roche, K. M. (2017). Sports-for-development gender equality impacts from basketball programme: Shifts in attitudes and stereotyping in Senegalese youth and coaches. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 5(9), 49-57.
- Morin, E. (1990). *Introduction à la pensée complexe*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Nichols, G., & Crow, I. (2004). Measuring the impact of crime reduction interventions involving sports activities for young people. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(3), 267-283.
- Parlavecchio, L. (2015). *L'alternative Explosive!* Laval: Institut DesÉquilibres.
- Parlavecchio, L., Moreau, N., Favier-Ambrosini, B. & Gadais, T. (2021, Accepted Journal of Sport for Development). Principles-of-action used by an eductrainer to create social bonds through sport in a psychosocial intervention program.
- Parlebas, P. (2016). Le jeu fait-il partie de la culture ? In P. Parlebas (Ed.), *Jeux traditionnels, sports et patrimoine culturel*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Petiot, O. (2019). Favoriser l'engagement des élèves dans les activités d'apprentissage en EPS dès le début de l'année scolaire: modalités d'intervention d'enseignants d'EPS experts, dispositions à agir sous-jacentes, et effets sur l'engagement des élèves. (Ph.D). Thèse de doctorat, Université de Nantes, Retrieved from

<https://www.theses.fr/2019NANT2017>

- Ravizza, D. M. (2011). *We don't play war anymore: Sport and the reintegration of former child soldiers in Northern Uganda. Sport for peace and development*. Champaign, IL: Common group Publishers.
- Reboul, O. (1989). *La Philosophie de l'éducation* (9e édition ed.). Paris: PUF.
- Richards, J., Kaufman, Z., Schulenkorf, N., Wolff, E., Gannett, K., Siefken, K., & Rodriguez, G. (2013). Advancing the Evidence Base of Sport for Development: A New Open-Access, Peer-Reviewed Journal. *Journal of sport for development*, 1, 1-3.
- Richards, J., Sherry, E., Philpott, O., Keane, L., Schulenkorf, N., & Bauman, A. (2016). Evaluation protocol: Netball to promote physical and mental health in Samoa and Tonga. *Journal of sport for development* 4(7), 1-11.
- Rioux, M.-A., Laurier, C., Gadais, T., et Terradas, M. (2017). De l'entraîneur à l'intervenant : réflexion sur l'apport des connaissances issues des sciences sur sport aux interventions basées sur le sport auprès des jeunes contrevenants. *Revue de Psychoéducation*, 46(2), 313-336.
- Rioux, M.A., Laurier, C., Terradas, M., Carrier, M., & Labonté, M. (2020). Rehabilitation Intervention in an Ice Hockey Context: What Changes under the Helmet. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 118. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105351>
- Rioux, M. A., Laurier, C., Terradas, M. M., Labonté, M., & Desormeaux, R. (2019). Co-Construction of an Intervention Model Using Sports in a Rehabilitation Setting: A Collaboration Between Researchers and Practitioners. *Residential Treatment for Children & Youth*, 36(1), 54-80.
- Schaillée, H., Spaaij, R., Jeanes, R., & Theeboom, M. (2019). Knowledge translation practices, enablers, and constraints: Bridging the research–Practice divide in sport management. *Journal of sport management*, 33(5), 366-378.
- Schulenkorf, N. (2017). Managing sport-for-development: Reflections and outlook. *Sport Management Review*, 20, 243-251.
- Schulenkorf, N., Sherry, E., & Rowe, K. (2016). Sport for development: An integrated literature review. *Journal of sport management*, 30(1), 22-39.
- Schulenkorf, N., Sugden, J., & Burdsey, D. (2014). Sport for development and peace as contested terrain: Place, community, ownership. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 6(3), 371-387.
- Siedentop, D. (1998). What is sport education and how does it work?. *Journal of physical education, recreation & dance*, 69(4), 18-20.
- Shin, N., Cohen, A., & Welty Peachey, J. (2020). Advancing the sport for development field: Perspectives of practitioners on effective organizational management. *Journal of sport for development*, 8(14), 36-52.
- Stevens, S., & Rosenberger, P. J. (2012). The influence of involvement, following sport and fan identification

- on fan loyalty: An Australian perspective. *International Journal of Sports Marketing & Sponsorship*, 13(3), 221-235.
- Svensson, P. G., & Levine, J. (2017). Rethinking sport for development and peace: The capability approach. *Sport in Society*, 20(7), 905-923.
- Svensson, P. G., & Seifried, C. S. (2017). Navigating plurality in hybrid organizing: The case of sport for development and peace entrepreneurs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(2), 176-190.
- Svensson, P. G., & Woods, H. (2017). A systematic overview of sport for development and peace organisations. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 5(9), 36-48.
- Travert, M. (2003). *L'Envers du stade. Le football, la cité et l'école*. Paris : L'Harmattan.
- UNESCO. (2005). *Rapport préliminaire sur l'opportunité et la portée d'une Charte internationale des jeux et des sports traditionnels*. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/fr/ev.php-URL_ID=28597&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- UNESCO. (2015a). Éducation physique de Qualité. Retrieved from: https://eps-canada.ca/sites/default/files/content/docs/resources/UNESCO%20-%20QPE_FR.pdf
- UNESCO. (2015b). International Charter of Physical Education, Physical Activity and Sport. Retrieved from: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13150&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- UNICEF. (2008). Introduction to Sport for development and peace. Retrieved from: <https://www.sportsthinktank.com/uploads/sport-for-international-devt.pdf>
- United Nations (UN). (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved from: <https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html>
- United Nations (UN). Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development, & Peace. (2003). Sport for development and peace: Towards achieving the millennium development goals. United Nations Publications. Retrieved from: https://www.sportanddev.org/sites/default/files/downloads/16_sport_for_dev_towards_millennium_goals.pdf
- United Nations (UN). (2015). Sustainable Development Goals 2015-2030. Retrieved from: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/>
- United Nations Human Rights. (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child. Retrieved from: <https://www.ohchr.org/fr/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx>
- United Nations Office of Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP). (2017). Sport and the sustainable development goals. Retrieved from: https://www.un.org/sport/sites/www.un.org.sport/files/ckfiles/files/Sport_for_SDGs_finalversion9.pdf

- Warner, M., Robinson, J., Heal, B., Lloyd, J., O'Connell, P. & Rose, L. (2021). "A comprehensive sport for development strategy using collaborative partnerships to facilitate employment among youth facing barriers." *Journal of Sport for Development* 8(15), 10-24.
- Welty-Peachey, J., Schulenkorf, N., & Spaaij, R. (2019). Sport for Social Change: Bridging the Theory–Practice Divide. . *Journal of sport management*, 33(5), 361-365.
- Welty-Peachey, J., & Cohen, A. (2016). Research partnerships in sport for development and peace: Challenges, barriers, and strategies. *Journal of sport management*, 30(3), 282-297.
- Whitley, M. A., Farrell, K., Wolff, E. A., & Hillyer, S. J. (2019). Sport for development and peace: Surveying actors in the field. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 7(12), 1-15.
- Whitley, M. A., Massey, W. V., & Farrell, K. (2017). A programme evaluation of 'Exploring Our Strengths and Our Future': Making sport relevant to the educational, social, and emotional needs of youth. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 5(9), 21-35.
- Whitley, M. A., Massey, W. V., Camiré, M., Blom, L. C., Chawansky, M., Forde, S., . . . Darnell, S. C. (2019). A systematic review of sport for development interventions across six global cities. *Sport Management Review*, 22(2), 181-193.
- Whitley, M. A., Massey, W. V., Camiré, M., Boutet, M., & Borbee, A. (2019). Sport-based youth development interventions in the United States: A systematic review. *BMC public health*, 19(1), 89.
- Woodhouse, T. (2010). Peacekeeping, peace culture and conflict resolution. *International Peacekeeping*, 17(4), 486-498.
- Wright, P. M., Jacobs, J. M., Howell, S., & Ressler, J. D. (2018). Immediate outcomes and implementation of a sport for development coach education programme in Belize. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 6(10), 51-65.
- Zipp, S., & Nauright, J. (2018). Levelling the playing field: Human capability approach and lived realities for sport and gender in the West Indies. *Journal of Sport for Development*, 6(10), 38-50.

Declaration of interest statement

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

Authors would like to address a special thanks to all field and research collaborators in our SDP projects. Also a special thanks to Dawn Deakin for English translation and revision.