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Abstract

Sport is currently considered a legitimate means to progress global health, education, development and peace (UN 2006). However, upon close examination, Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) still follows the traditional trajectory of international development which predominantly involves the supposedly apolitical transposition of resources from donors (Global North) to implementers (Global South)\(^1\) (Briggs 2008). These include the less tangible resources that include Global Northern knowledge, ideologies and practices which are transposed in a unidirectional pattern from the North to the South. Undoubtedly, the transposing of the less tangible resources listed above consequently normalizes the legitimate ways of approaching and doing development (Sidaway 2008). The SDP movement has taken an uncritical posture of the ideological underpinnings of SDP programmes and approaches.

This disparity could be seen as an extended notion of a colonial discourse: that truth about development is constructed in the Global North and implemented in Global South. Recent postcolonial studies have called for a critical analysis of the “colonizing tendencies” within the SDP movement because certain dominant Western conceptualisations and discourses would legitimate Northern-driven hegemonic practices (Darnell 2011: 183). In the SDP sector the partnership approach “has become ubiquitous as a *modus operandi*” (Lindsey 2011: 517). While partnership discourse puts emphasis on reversing power relations in the development aid chain, asymmetric donor-recipient relationships continue to exist in SDP.

The aim of this dissertation was to contribute to a critical understanding of power relations in the sport for development sector and to explore alternative development and SDP partnership perspectives by investigating the case of the Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) in Kenya. This study focused on the relationships between MYSA, a Southern key player and pioneer in the global Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) movement, and their donors in the Global North. A postcolonial and actor-oriented approach of analysis was applied to understand North-South power relations and alternative development perspectives.

The dissertation employed an extensive literature review, field work, and interviews conducted with MYSA members and vested interests in the MYSA saga to draw attention to some crucial questions around the legitimacy of SDP as promoter of development and the Millennium Development Goal “global partnerships”. The study is qualitative in nature and was conducted by the principles of participatory action research.

The study looked in-depth at the case of MYSA with a focus on the narratives which evolved around the current conflict with the long-standing international partner Strømme Foundation. It explored different perspectives and meanings attributed to MYSA and its development model within a range of vested interests, both in the Global South and North.

\(^1\) The use of the categories of North/South or Third World/First World in the development literature are linked to ideological and geographical binaries which are highly controversial (Hayhurst et al. 2011). This study uses the terminology of “Global South” and “Global North” (Kidd / Donnelly 2007). According to Mwaanga (2012: 12) the term Global South “denotes a community of people at different geographical locations who experience a common set of problems – problems which emanate, by and large, from deep inequities of power within and between nations”. Other critical writers make similar distinction based on power and not on geography, for instance ‘Two-Thirds World’ or ‘majority world’ (to refer to the Global South) and ‘One-Third World’ or ‘minority world’ (to refer to the Global North) (Hayhurst et al. 2011; Kidd / Donnelly 2007)
A whistle blower report in 2011 has exposed a number of allegations against MYSA, ranging from misappropriation of funds, corruption, sexual harassment, and abuse of girls and young women (Strømme 2012). These serious allegations by the Strømme Foundation have evoked much debate in the SDP field. Moreover, the withdrawal of the main donor caused a severe crisis for the Southern NGO and a dramatic cut back of their sport programmes targeting youth in the slums in the Nairobi Eastlands.

The study has examined discourses on development and partnership conflicts. The central themes which emerged in data analysis, were (1) competing social constructions of MYSA (before and after the conflict), (2) MYSA self-identity, (3) meanings of development, (4) negotiating and contesting partnerships, and (4) visions of reform.
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Chapter 1: Introduction: Context and Relevance of Topic

1.1. Sport for Development and Peace: A contested arena about development

Academic interest regarding the relationship between sport and international development is a rather new phenomenon (Kidd 2008). Sport was not considered to have any relevance for the development process. Only over the last 15 years the mobilisation of sport as a “new” means for achieving development goals emerged into an accepted field within international development practice and policies. In the aftermath of the adoption of the United Nation’s resolution 58/5 on “Sport as a means to promote education, health, development and peace” in 2003 and the International Year for Sport and Physical Education (IYSPE) in 2005, the sector has experienced a phenomenal growth. One visible aspect of this expansion has been the mushrooming of sport and development initiatives in the Global South (Hartmann / Kwauk 2011, Levermore 2011, Levermore / Beacom 2009a). Sport for development became synonymous with a new social movement which has gained global momentum. Due to its close alignment with the United Nations and the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) policy agenda the emerging sector was termed “Sport for Development and Peace” (SDP).

As popularity, recognition and institutionalisation of sport’s role in international development have increased, so has also the interest in research on SDP (Darnell 2012). This emerging scholarly attention facilitated the establishment of sport and (international) development as a new academic field of study (Kidd 2008, Mwaanga 2013). Most of the studies attempted to evaluate how sport is linked to and can be mobilized towards the attainment of development goals, such as health promotion, education, conflict resolution, gender equity or the empowerment of young people (Beutler 2008, Coalter 2013, Schwery 2008, Gasser / Levinsen 2004). SDP actors and scholars alike engaged in an effort to provide evidence for the utility of sport, and to demonstrate that sport is in fact a “remedy” for the progress of international development (Kay 2011).

Partly as a critique of these instrumentalist approaches, a body of research in critical sociology of sport and development emerged, analysing the movement from a broader perspective. A main focus of these recent critical studies is the examination of dominant discourses and practices and the

---

2 The United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace has defined sport in context of development, as “all forms of physical activity that contribute to physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction, such as play, recreation, organized or competitive sport, and indigenous sports and games” (UNOSDP n.d.)

3 Several writers use the number of registered SDP initiatives on the International Platform on Sport for Development and Peace (www.sportanddev.org) as an indicator for rapid proliferation of the movement (Kidd 2008). Mwaanga (2013) observes that between 2008 and 2011 the number of registered SDP organisations globally have nearly doubled to 366. In the period from 2011 until August 2013 the number has increased to 499. However, the majority of SDP initiatives in sub-Sahara Africa are not featured on the platform website (Platform 2012). For example in Zambia only 11 of the more than 90 SDP projects in Lusaka were registered in 2011 (Mwaanga 2011). The Beyond Sport World website lists for Zambia 17 and for Kenyan 58 SDP or sport for social change initiatives as members (www.beyondsportworld.org).

4 I will use the term “Sport for Development and Peace” to refer to the wider sector of institutions and agents using sport as a tool for attaining international development goals (e.g. MDGs) or engage in sport-based peace-building and conflict resolution efforts. In addition more specific terms such as sport for development, sport and development, sport-in-development and development-through-sport are also used (Levermore 2008). Black (2010) and Darnell (2007) refer to the sport for development area as “Development Through Sport” (DTS), which has gained only limited acceptance.
workings of power within SDP (Black 2010, Darnell 2007, Darnell 2011, Darnell / Hayhurst 2012, Giulianotti 2010, Mwaanga 2011, Nicholls et al. 2010). While this strand of literature is rather diverse in terms of content and applied methodology, they all seem to acknowledge - as Darnell has put it - the “importance of critical self-reflection upon the relations of power” within the fields of development and sport (Darnell (2012: 2). It could be said that they call for a critical analysis of the “colonizing tendencies” within the SDP movement and the underpinned concepts, because certain dominant Western theories and conceptualisations would legitimize Northern-driven hegemonic practices (Darnell 2011: 183). A core issue of the critique is the notion of “development”, especially as seen and interpreted by modernisation theorists.

Within the sport and development field, the meaning of “development” and “sport” are often taken for granted and assumed rather than contested. It is established that both are social constructions which have assumed shifting meanings for different vested interests and over time. Contemporary mainstream conceptualisations of “development” and “sport” are informed by colonial discourses and a neo-liberal development paradigm, the latter tends to recycle older elements of modernization theory (Manzo 2007). Put differently, neo-colonial and neo-liberal notions of development are therefore (re-)produced in discourses5 which are sustained by unequal power relations (Mwaanga 2011).

The argument brought to the fore that if uneven power relations and related structural issues which sustain dominant discourses are consequently overlooked, it will ipso facto impact the sustainability and effectiveness of sport and development. A sport-based development intervention based on neocolonial notions of “benevolence” and “aid” may have negative effects. In this case SDP does not facilitate social progress, but contributes to inequalities and under-development (Sidaway 2008).

As Hartmann and Kwauk (2011) argue, well-intended sport-based interventions can have counterproductive results, if they are based on a dominant, normative vision of development. The authors caution that without a critical analysis of how “knowledge is (re)produced and relations of power are (re)enacted” the use of sport may contribute to an extension of “Western cultural neo-colonialism in the name of education and development” (Hartmann / Kwauk 2011: 293). In such a critical discursive perspective, sport for development does not represent a new and benign model of development, but is a contested arena about the meaning of development (Manzo 2011: 59, Long 2001).

However, in-depth empirical studies are truly lacking in the recent body of critical research on “neo-colonial” relations within SDP. This methodological gap in the current hegemonic strand of SDP literature is also acknowledged by Lindsey and Grattan (2012). They identify “a significant need for methodologically justified research that seeks to understand sport-for-development from the perspective of actors in the Global South” (Lindsey / Grattan 2012: 96). Therefore, this study will use an actor-oriented, social constructivist research approach.

1.2. Partnership and power relations between donors and NGOs

In international development literature the term ‘partnership’ has progressively been used in policy documents and in practice to depict the relationship between Northern donors and Non-Governmental

---

5 It should be noted that within development studies ‘discourse’ is a contested concept. A generic but useful definition is provided by Baaz (2005:11): “A discourse can be defined as a historically, socially and institutionally specific structure of representations or articulations through which meanings are constructed and social practices are organized.” For a more detailed discussion of the concept see chapter 2.
Organisations (NGOs) in the Global South (Harrison 2007, Lister 2000). The idea of partnership working attained prominence in the 1990s partly as response to the critique of the old model of development aid. While in development aid the delivery of “development” is top-down based on a strict hierarchical aid chain, “development co-operation” is now supposed to be governed by a new relationship between equal “partners” (Kontinen 2007: 18).

In academic research on development issues of asymmetrical power relations between Northern “donors” and Southern “recipients” of development aid have been raised over the last 25 years (Ferguson 1994; Groves / Hinton eds. 2004; Kothari 2001). In contrast to a donor-driven, top-down development model, the novel development approach of ‘partnership’ claims to increase efficiency and effectiveness of development practice in two ways. First, by making better use of limited resources through partnership synergies and, second, that a “devolution of power” (Banda et al 2008: 15) would allow for local ownership and increase sustainability. In brief, North-South partnership working presents the promise of increasing the legitimacy of development aid while reducing costs (Lister 2000). Subsequently, the notion of partnership quickly diffused into development policy papers and discourses of aid agencies and NGOs. This process was also facilitated by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD (DAC 1996). Partnership as the new way of doing development evolved into a development paradigm. Consequently, ‘partnership’ also emerged into a key notion within current sport and development discourse.

In the SDP sector the partnership approach “has become ubiquitous as a modus operandi” (Lindsey 2011: 517, emphasis in original). Partnership is not only a preferred method of doing “sport and development”; it is also a development goal in itself (Levermore 2009). The Millennium Development Goal (MDG) number eight calls for establishing “Global partnership for development”. In the dominant SDP discourse, sport is purported to be the ideal model for achieving a ‘Global partnership for development’.6

Preceding the International Year for Sports and Physical Education, the United Nations declared that “sport offers endless opportunities for innovative partnerships for development and can be used as a tool to build and foster partnerships between developed and developing nations to work towards achieving the millennium development goals” (IYSPE 2005). This statement clearly reveals a consensus-based SDP policy discourse on partnership. As it also becomes evident from the above quote, partnerships are considered as a neutral and mutual beneficial instrument for a more efficient SDP practice or in the words of Levermore (2009: 289): sport is thought to provide “natural and non-political environments where partners can meet and deliver development.” However, this instrumental notion of partnership within SDP is unable to explain the common phenomena of conflict and tension in North-South relations.

Furthermore, the attempt to establish a new division of power between Northern and Southern actors seem to contradict hegemonic ‘regimes of truth’ in international development discourse, as identified above (Gledhill 1996: 126, Kontinen 2007). Notions of ‘partner’, ‘partnership’, ‘empowerment’ and ‘participation’ have become key aspects of development policy (Baaz 2005). In particular, the partnership concept with its claims of establishing more mutual and equal relationships between ‘donors’ and ‘partners’ and the premise “that the ownership of any development process should be in

6 In the programme of the 3rd International Forum on Sport for Peace and Development it is argued that “partnerships are key to maximising the positive impact of sport, especially outside the competition arena. The MDG 8, ‘Global partnership for development’ perfect model that would make sport a factor in development” (UNOSDP 2013)
the developing world” (Kontinen 2007: 11) seem to contradict the assertion that “colonizing tendencies” permeate SDP (Darnell 2011: 183).

Notwithstanding, the establishment of egalitarian relationships in development practice, have proven difficult if not controversial at best. The SDP movement has to ask why partnership repeatedly remains an empty promise, rather than establishing a new quality of relationship. The frequent disparity between reality and rhetoric of partnership working between NGOs is often attributed to the single issue of funding (Lister 2000). The control of financial resources on part of the Northern donor or funding NGO would impede the development of “authentic partnership” (Fowler 1997:109). Elliott (1987: 65 qt. in Lister 2000: 229) summarize this ambivalence as

“a dialogue of the unequal, and however many claims are made for transparency or mutuality, the reality is – and is seen to be – that the donor can do to the recipient what the recipient cannot do to the donor. There is an asymmetry of power that no amount of well-intentioned dialogue can remove.”

While partnership rhetoric “focuses on reversing the power relations in the aid chain”, asymmetric donors-recipient relationships continue to exist in SDP (Harrison 2007: 391). Despite the laudable new policy effort, in practice North-South partnerships in NGO development cooperation turn out to be paternalistic and based on patronage (O’Reilly 2010).

Baaz (2005:26) contends that the dominant partnership discourse “disavows paternalism and emphasises partner responsibility”. In a pioneering ethnography of development, Crewe and Harrison (1998: 188) observed that a “yawning chasm remains between the stated goals of development and its practices and outcomes. Ambitious aims of partnership.. often appear disappointingly empty.” Despite well intentioned aims the practice of North–South partnerships in development are rarely consensual or frictionless.

Another explanation for the failure of true partnership is to view partnership as a conscious tactic, an empty rhetoric orchestrated by the Northern-led “development industry” to enhance the legitimacy of their operations (Baaz 2005, Lister 2000). Conversely, this study rejects such simplistic readings of partnership issues, because they are based on a simplistic notion of power. Since Foucault it is known that power does not work “solely repressive” (Cole 2004: 211). In the same way, Baaz (2005: 9) rejects a conspiratorial and intentional understanding of partnership, because “discourses are not closed systems but open-ended and related to other discourses”. Hence, Baaz’ dynamic reading of partnership “as harbouring different conflicts and tensions” is shared (Baaz 2005: 9).

Despite the salience of partnership in SDP policy and practice, only a handful of studies have analysed and theorized partnership relations (Lindsey 2011, Banda et al. 2009, Banda et al. 2008, Lindsey / Banda 2010). In the wider field of development, the empirical research on NGO partnerships is dominated by functional perspectives, which can be converted into practical guidelines (Lister 2000, Morse 2006). Specifically in the Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) sector, there is a need for a critical reflection on partnership relations. This dissertation intends to fill this research gap and will contribute to a better understanding of North-South partnerships in SDP.

1.3. The case of MYSA and its relevance for Sport for Development

Within the current SDP paradigm, NGOs have become the dominant organisational form for advancing development through sport (Mwaanga 2014). While ‘sport development’ is by large an endeavour for sport organisations, NGOs have come to be the leading actors in pursing SDP (Kidd
In international development studies, the meteoric rise of NGOs is interpreted in the context of a new, neo-liberal aid paradigm which evolved since the late 1980s (Coalter 2010a, Desai 2008).

Within the international SDP movement, the Mathare Youth Sport Association (MYSA) is arguably the most prominent sport and development NGO in the Global South. MYSA, established by the Canadian development consultant Bob Munro in 1987 in the Mathare slum in Nairobi, grew into the biggest African NGO in the field of sport and community services, with approximately 25,000 young participating members (Coalter 2009; Hognestad / Tollisen 2004). On a global level, Akines and Kirwin (2009: 223) name MYSA together with Right To Play and SCORE in South Africa as the most “prominent examples of many sport-in-development NGOs.”

Around Mathare valley and its neighbouring areas MYSA runs extended youth football leagues for both boys and girls who are linked with compulsory clean-up activities and other community services. In addition started or facilitated self-help SDP projects in other parts of Kenya and in other African countries including a youth project in Southern Sudan (Leahy / Ahmed n.d.). A key element of MYSA’s various programmes and projects is the education and training of young people, including HIV/ AIDS prevention, peer leadership, peer coaching/ refereeing and the promotion of gender equity and youth rights. But MYSA is also a highly successful sports development project with the professional football club Mathare United playing in the Kenya’s premier league and continuously developing talents for the national teams of Football Kenya Federation (FKF), in particular for the senior teams Harambee Stars (men) and the Harambee Starlets (female).

However, a whistle-blower report in September 2011 by a Norwegian couple confronted MYSA with allegations of sexual harassment, age cheating and misappropriation of funds. In March 2012, a subsequent drafted investigation report made public by Strømme Foundation - MYSA's biggest Northern funding partner - seemed to confirm the allegations in three areas. First, age cheating and identity theft in connection with the participation in international football tournaments (e.g. Norway Cup), second, misuse of funds (e.g. scholarship monies) and third, sexual abuse of minor aged girls by coaches (Strømme 2012, see also Appendix 1). The allegations by the Norwegian Stromme Foundation (SF), MYSA's key donor since 1996, and a report on previous incidents published by MYSA have evoked much debate in the field of SDP, both in Kenya and Norway as well as on an international level.

These serious allegations prompted the Norwegian donor to put their core funding on hold while also other Northern donors withdrew large parts of their funding. In the process, SF expressed their accusations in the public media and demanded profound changes in the leadership of MYSA. MYSA rejected the accusations and blamed Stromme Foundation of harming the good reputation and image of the organisation. Finally, in April 2012, Strømme foundation ended the 16-year partnership.

The conflict between the Stromme foundation and the highly decorated global pioneer of SDP and the accompanying discourses is not only relevant for the organisations involved, but may reveal ruptures in the wider sport and development field. After all, these reported cases have brought forth more essential questions about the dominant discourse. Who might profit from the current dominant discourse and its accompanying ‘SDP definitions, concepts and policies’ and who is marginalized from it and whether it promotes development and empowerment or its contraries (Hayhurst 2009: 215)?
The significance of MYSA

The question needs to be asked why do we consider the case example of the Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) to be relevant for studying relations of power and how they frame SDP practice and thinking? What is the significance of the specific MYSA case for the global SDP movement at this particular point of time?

First, MYSA’s significance for sport and development is partly derived from its unique, pioneering status (Brady / Khan 2002, Willis 2000). The mushrooming growth of the SDP initiatives kicked-off in the late 1990s, with the foundation of organisations such as Magic Bus (1999), Edusport Foundation (1999) and Kicking AIDS Out network (2001) (Coalter 2013). But MYSA was established since a decade earlier, in 1987. That it is still in operation, demonstrates its resilience.

Second, the new SDP sector started to speak the language of partnership and MYSA seems to be the embodiment of a “good” and “credible” partner in the Global South (UNOSDP 2013, Coalter 2013). This was due to a growing number of professional staffs who were liaising with mainly European NGOs, companies, and sport organisations. From 1987 till 2010 MYSA has carried out project activities with at least 49 international partners (MYSA 2011- Frequently asked questions). Therefore, MYSA became a key player in an increasingly transnational and globalized SDP movement and entertains a multitude of partnerships, networks and cooperation within a “multilateral chain of international aid delivery” (Akindes / Kirwin 2009: 223).

Third, the MYSA approach with its focus on deprived youth, environment, community development, gender equity and HIV and AIDS prevention had a great appeal in the emerging academic field of SDP. MYSA became a popular and accessible object of SDP research and evaluation. Also the sheer quantity of involved participants – usually the figure of “25,000 youth” is given - helped to create the image of a true “success story”. Unlike any other initiative in Africa, MYSA attained the status of a ‘darling’ project of the new SDP movement (Coalter 2013).

Fourth, the case MYSA of is also significant due to its geographical location and the close links with institutionalized football. Over the last decade (anglophone) sub-Saharan Africa became the prime target area for SDP interventions and football constituted its principal tool. In this regard, urban slums like Mathare in Kenya became “geographical focal points of numerous SDP activities” (Mwaanga 2011). This SDP focus relates partly to the global HIV/AIDS pandemic and its discursive nexus with “black” Africa (Negri / Hardt 2011: 136). The hosting of the first FIFA World Cup on the African continent and the FIFA programmes gave momentum to the focus on the social utility of football in Africa (SAD 2009, Alegi 2010).

Many SDP scholars would agree that the pioneering MYSA initiative evolved into probably the most renowned sport and development NGO in the Global South (Levermore 2011). MYSA was widely portrayed as a sport-for-development ‘success story’ and “has become a model for many other communities around the world” (Laureus n.d.: 10). Nonetheless, with the recent disputes and allegations the SDP ‘role model’ is contested and scrutinized by actors, both in the Global North and in the Global South. Thus the distinctive model status within the SDP movement seems to be challenged.

1.4. Personal motivation behind the topic

Reflecting on my personal interest on why I chose this particular case study and the themes, I refer to three contributing factors.
First, my professional partnership experience with MYSA. My organisation, the international NGO Vienna Institute for International Dialogue and Cooperation (VIDC) has been the lead agency in a European development education project called ‘Football for Development’. MYSA was among other African Sport and Development NGOs an associate project partner (VIDC 2010). During two meetings I got to know MYSA staff members and started to develop interest and sympathy for the organisation. In 2010 and 2011 I organized tours of a mixed MYSA youth groups in Austria.

Second, another reason for investigating issues of North-South relationships is linked with the experience of a previous conflict between a NGO partner in East Africa and my employer, VIDC. From 1992 until 2008, it sustained a successful partnership with a Uganda-based dance group, which is one of the leading actors in the field of culture for development. The role of VIDC was comparable to the one of Strømme Foundation (SF), namely the channelling of (substantial) funding from the national aid agency and other sources to the local partner. In 2008 reports, it became public that the director of the cultural troupe was abusing young female artists (Otuka-Karner 2009). The Ugandan partner rejected the allegations and VIDC halted funding. After 16 years, the “successful” North-South partnership was terminated. When looking at the MYSA - Strømme conflict, I assumed it not be a singular case but rather indicated a wider problem in the relations between Northern funders and local NGOs. Moreover, within the “development industry” the above described conflicts seemed to occur on a regular basis, but tend to be silenced or downplayed. This is partly because of the fear that bad news about African partners and failures of development projects could reiterate racist stereotypes and undermine public support for development cooperation.

Finally, a key interest also derived from my multi-faceted experience as an anti-racism activist in European football. As the managing coordinator of the pan-European NGO network Football Against Racism in Europe (FARE) from 1999 until 2010, I have been confronted on a weekly basis with the ‘dysfunctional’ and ambivalent aspects of sport. Football is not only a universal, uniting tool but an arena for racism, sexism, far-right extremism, homophobia and other forms of discrimination - which cuts across the entire ‘football family’, not only fans. Thus actors within sports’ movement or within the SDP movement can actually promote inequality, rather than equality. This is a fundamental, but often neglected aspect of sport and that is also an additional motivation for this work.

1.5. Aims, Relevance and Scope of the Study

Study Aims

The present study is qualitative in nature and is guided by the precepts of an actor-oriented, participatory action research approach. The aims of this dissertation is two-fold; first, to gain a critical understanding of relations of power in the sport for development sector by examining the case example of the Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) in Kenya. A second aim is to explore alternative development perspectives and partnership models which can reduce inequalities and contribute to a decolonisation of SDP. The study will examine the partnership dynamics between donors in the Global North and MYSA as an implementing NGO partner in the Global South in depth. A focus will be put on the exploration of discourses surrounding the recent conflict between MYSA and a Northern donor.

An analysis of the narratives and discourses around the MYSA –Strømme Foundation conflict offers a study that unites an empirical, in-depth focus upon struggles about the meanings of ‘what counts as development’ with the examination of wider issues of how neo-colonial relations of power are (re)enacted within SDP.
Against this background, the aim is to answer the following four research questions:

1. Why and how did MYSA evolve into an iconic and paradigmatic model NGO within an emerging international SDP sector?
2. How do the involved SDP actors in the Global South construct notions of development?
3. How do different MYSA stakeholders and vested interests - with a focus on southern stakeholders - perceive partnership relations between MYSA and Northern donors?
4. How could alternative sport for development interventions, in particular partnership models, be framed to reduce existing inequalities and contribute to a decolonisation of northern-led sport for development practice, policy and research?

Relevance and Scope of the Study

It is expected that a critical analysis of the MYSA case will increase the understanding of power relations and how they impact SDP practice and inform notions of legitimate SDP models. Within SDP, empirical, in-depth accounts on the relationship between Northern donors and implementing NGOs in the South are missing. By applying an ethnographic perspective on sport and development practice this inquiry intends to fill this gap within SDP research. Moreover, with an analysis of controversial discourses around partnership using postcolonial and actor-oriented approaches the aim is to contribute to a systemic and evidence-based criticism of the Eurocentric nature of SDP (Baaz 2005).

The fiercely fought debate between MYSA and Strømme Foundation present one of the rare examples where a donor - partner conflict is in the open and shared in the public domain. As experienced by the author at several sport & development conferences and seminars, the usual pattern is a more in direct and hidden form of criticism on the part of Southern SDP NGOs. This more subtle method of ‘resistance’ can be attributed to a strategy not to jeopardize the viable funding link to the Global North. For that reason, the selected case example is of particular relevance for broadening the perspective on SDP practice.

Accordingly, this study will deploy a postcolonialism theoretical perspective focusing on two key levels of the SDP discourse: first, the dominant Northern perception of MYSA and how the organisation has been constructed into an iconic “flagship” of the global SDP movement, and second, the indigenous narratives around the incidents and how the current development model of MYSA and donor dependency is perceived.

An enquiry into the conflicting discourse that developed around the alleged incidents is not only relevant for understanding the specific relations between the organisation under study and its partners, but the tensions and conflicts are supposed to be characteristic for North-South partnership relations in the wider sport and development context (Hartmann / Kwauk 2011). When adopting such a critical perspective we hope to be able to uncover and challenge wide-spread “common-sense” assumptions within the SDP movement. Such a critical exercise is hoped to provide further empirical substance to the analysis of the neo-colonial legacies of sport and development interventions.

Furthermore, the case study bears relevance for the entire SDP movement, since it will generate more generalized insights on the relation between SDP and human-rights which go beyond the particular case at one point in time in the sport and development sector.
Finally, the research will make a contribution to the development of an alternative, postcolonial model relevant not only for MYSA or other community-based sport NGOs in Kenya but for the wider SDP sector. A reflection on an alternate, non-colonial framework of North-South partnership grounded in a theoretical perspective of empowerment will yield two advantages. First, it will increase the sustainability of development through sport programmes, and second, it will improve the legitimacy of the SDP approach.

The dissertation draws on extensive literature review, observation and interviews conducted with vested interests in the MYSA saga and MYSA members to point out some crucial questions around the legitimacy of Sport for Development as promoter of development and “global partnerships”. The case study is empirical and places significant weight on the substantial narratives of Southern SDP practitioners and stakeholders regarding sport and development practice and partnerships.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

This chapter aims at critically reviewing the literature relevant to the case study and understanding power relations and partnership discourses among SDP NGOs. It will start with a critique of mainstream notions of sport and development by confronting them with new body of critical research into the sociology of sport (Black 2010, Darnell 2011).

This will be followed by an interrogation and discussion of the concepts of power and discourse which are connected with different theories of power. This exploration will be crucial in outlining a postcolonial theoretical framework relevant for a thorough understanding of MYSA and power dynamics in SDP North-South partnerships.

Moreover, we also look at the colonial discourse about the ‘utility’ of football and how football in Sub-Sahara Africa (SSA) as a distinct colonial cultural form may influence contemporary social realities. The third section relates the emergence of the neo-liberal development paradigm with the salience of the NGO phenomenon within the SDP sector. This is followed by critical analysis of the contested concept of partnership in SDP and finally, we will look at the influential studies on MYSA and how they contributed to construct MYSA as a paradigmatic model in sport and development.

2.2. Critique of dominant perspectives in Sport for Development

SDP Essentialism: Sport Evangelism and Functionalism

The sport and development movement has been critiqued for their obsession with practice and project implementation which has led to a lack of “critical and theoretically-informed reflection” (Black 2010: 122). A great deal of sport-in-development research is preoccupied with questions of effectiveness of SDP projects and programmes. This focus on praxis comes at the expense of a critical reflection about the ideological, normative and historical underpinnings of SDP programmes and approaches (Kay 2009). Only lately, a growing body of critical research on the SDP has drawn attention to issues of asymmetric power relations and Northern hegemony that underpin the international SDP movement (Black 2010, Darnell / Hayhurst 2011, Darnell / Hayhurst 2012, Hayhurst 2009, Mwaanga 2011, Nicholls et al. 2010). These uneven power relations are seriously affecting sport for development practice and “undermining attempts at partnership” (Nicholls et al. 2010: 257).

According to the sociologist Giulianotti (2011), SDP interventions without a thorough critical reflection may run the risk of re-inscribing “imperialistic and neocolonial (indeed, NGO-colonial) relationships between Global North and Global South”. The internationalist school within SDP argues that a dominant discourse informs the hegemonic model of SDP. But there is a need to be more specific about the meaning and characteristics of those underpinning dominant ideals and concepts. Hence, a discussion of essentialist and reified notions of how sport is allegedly linked with development in needed, namely the two interrelated notions of ‘sport evangelism’ and functionalism.

First, Coalter’s and Giulianotti’s critique of an overtly normative view on sport is examined. In this context Giulianotti (2004: 356) aptly uses the term ‘sport evangelism’. To a large degree SDP policies and programmes are based on essentialist conceptualisation of sport. Sport unlike other cultural forms is not conceived as a social construct, but as possessing a universal core which is fundamentally ‘good’ and ‘pure’ (Coakley 2011: 307). Underpinned by a firm belief in the inherent power of sport,
SDP proponents assume a positive impact of sport participation on a broad range of societal problems (Levermore 2011). To describe this widespread assumption Coalter (2013:20) refers to the “mythopoeic status” of sports. A mythopoeic or myth-making view of sport is based on populist and idealistic ideas “that are produced outside sociological analysis” (Coalter 2013: 21). Coalter (2013) argues that mythopoeic concepts of sport would underpin – what Gulianotti (2004: 356) has aptly termed- ‘sport evangelism’, typical for contemporary SDP rhetoric. Among the producers of the sport-for-development mythology are “conceptual entrepreneurs”, which are busy “in claim-making activities to persuade others of the importance of their proposed solution” (Coalter 2013: 21). Coalter identifies a whole “industry” of conceptual entrepreneurs who would establish new journals, organisations, departments, conferences or websites to construct sport and development “as if it is a new field and a new area of study” (Coalter 2013: 42).

In comparable terms Giulianotti (2004: 367) points out that sport cannot a priori be considered to be a force for good. Only ‘sport evangelists’ would employ rather naïve arguments to claim “sport’s innate goodness” (Giulianotti 2004: 367, emphasis in original). Likewise Coakley (2011) unpacks popular assumptions about the relationship between sport and development. ‘Sport evangelists’ would claim that sport participation inevitably contributes to development because “sport’s assumed essential goodness and purity is passed on to those who partake in it” (Coakley 2011:306). Put differently, irrespective of time or geography, positive changes occur whenever groups or individuals engage in sport (Coakley 2011: 307).

Second, attention should be paid to functionalist perspectives, which is still pervasive in the discourse on sport and development. Coalter locates the idealistic notions of ‘sport evangelists’ outside the sociological thought, it is maintained that essentialist ideas about the relationship between sport and social outcomes do also feature in certain theories of sport, namely functionalism. The overtly instrumentalist notion of sport-in-development is rooted in consensual, functionalist models. Functionalist perspective has been contested for its ideological underpinnings, for instance that it is a view that celebrates the status quo and does not account for social conflict or change. Functionalism may be considered an outdated theory in the sociology of sport, but it still features prominently in SDP policies and in the majority sport and development programmes (Gulianotti 2004).

**Sport-in-Development as neo-colonial repositioning?**

In a critical analysis of youth sports and the ideological assumptions which it entails, Coakley argues that ‘sport evangelists’ would not only perpetuate and promote beliefs of sport’s purity and goodness, but these beliefs would then inspire neoliberal approaches to development. In this perspective, the developmental benefits of sport are taken for granted. The unproven claim is that if individuals participate in or consume sport, it will automatically “create healthy, productive people; decrease deviance and disruptive actions, and alleviate boredom and alienation”. (Coakley 2011: 307).

In a comparable way also colonial pedagogy saw Western sports as a remedy to educate and shape the behaviour of boys. Earlier studies on the spread of British sports during colonialism highlighted attempt to link education and sport to a wider development agenda (Mangan 1986, Mählmann 1992). At the beginning of the 20th century the “morals and muscles” discourse of Western colonial agents (administrators, missionaries) has built on the concept of ‘muscular Christianity’ and British philosophies of ‘rational recreation’ (Manzo 2007: 2). The public school system in England represented such a model. Games and sporting exercises were supposed to “instil discipline and order” (Mählmann 1992: 125) in “a fledgling working class and offset both idleness and potential unrest” (Manzo 2007: 2). At the core of the imperialist “sport & development” model was the
instilment of Western moral values and inducing personality change among the young males (Manzo 2007). Colonial sport pedagogy will be discussed in more detail further below.

Likewise, Coakley (2011: 306) argues that a key element of a neo-liberal approach to SDP is the method of using sports to “create among young people the attributes needed to achieve personal success” (Coakley 2011: 306). In this respect an element of continuity between the colonial and neoliberal assumptions can be recognized. Coakley maintains that “the collective claims of sport evangelists and their disciples are informed by neoliberal ideology focusing on personal development and success and discounting social issues and the need for progressive change at a collective or community level” (Coakley 2011: 308). Coakley attributes the recent salience of the neoliberal paradigm to the rise of a “global social problems industry funded primarily by North Americans and Northern Europeans” (Coakley 2011: 309). This ‘social problem industry’ emerged in the 1980s and 1990s in the USA and elsewhere as a result of the cutbacks in public and social services (Coakley 2011). In this context, Giulianotti (2004: 356) argues that neo-liberal notions of sport for development which originated in the Global North and are implemented in the Global South may constitute “a form of neo-colonial repositioning”.

“Through the twentieth century, sports evangelism at home had sought to promote organized sporting activities to dissipate the lower orders’ dangerous energies and to divert them from ‘licentious’ social practices (such as drinking, gambling, casual sex, and the following of youth subcultural styles)” (Giulianotti 2004: 356).

Giulianotti concludes that there is no evidence that normative approach of sport evangelism influencing young people works in the North. Nevertheless, SDP interventions in the Global South are sustained by the assumption that “young people in the old colonies may be more readily organized to receive and internalize the tendentious, self-controlling messages buried within sports” (Giulianotti 2004: 356-7).

Critique of the postcolonial critique of SDP

Nonetheless, the current critique on postcolonial perspectives in SDP is not acclaimed by all sport and development academics. Critical scholars who call for a deconstruction of dominant development concepts and question the effects of Global Northern knowledge production in SDP are dubbed by Coalter (2013: 50) as idealistic “liberation methodologists”. This school of thought within SDP would argue with crude, essentialist assertions, instead of engaging in empirical research. Coalter (2013: 46) claims that the arguments of the critics are mounted “in terms of homogenising polarities” and hazy terminology such as “neo-colonialism, the ‘Global North’ and ‘Global South’”. Coalter argues that “such terms may serve the interests of political activism and political correctness”, which would be of limited use for understanding context and policies (Coalter 2013: 46). Coalter pretends that the critics would follow ideological and political motives that could therefore obscure the search for scientific “truth” (Coalter 2013: 46).

Coalter rejects the recent postcolonial critique within SDP as too general and “derived from first principles” (Coalter 2013: 170). Referring to potential conflicts between the Northern donors and Southern partners, Coalter argues that “these are matters for empirical investigation, rather than abstract critical assertion, or deduction from theoretical principles” (Coalter 2013: 32). According to Coalter (2013), the study of the relationship between Northern donors and Southern partners has to be based mainly on empirical evidence.
While Coalter’s critique seems to be partly polemic\(^{7}\) and defensive towards a positivist approach of measuring the social impact of sport, the plea for more empirical investigation into post-colonial relationships is useful and valid.

A study of North-South partnerships in SDP can be conducted on different levels (structural, policy, organisational, personal) and from various theoretical perspectives. As identified by previous authors a rewarding perspective to understand SDP practice seems to be a focus on the study of power dynamics (Darnell 2010). For instance Hayhurst (2009: 216) suggests a postcolonial / actor oriented perspective which remains focussed on relations of power and “how the ‘targets’ of SDP take up and inform its practices and policies.” Consequently, the ensuing section draws its attention to (postcolonial) theories of power and discourse and actor-oriented perspective on development.

As shown above, functionalist and instrumentalist theoretical frameworks are incapable of accounting for social conflict, social change and the meaning individuals give to their actions; that is, functionalism and instrumentalism lack any apprehension of the complexities of power. Hence, there is a necessity to refer to conceptualisations of power, which allows asking relevant questions about contested partnership discourses and social change. These search for concepts which are widening the understanding of social, cultural, economic and political dynamics rather than limit the perspective to rigid binaries (e.g. structure vs. agency or superstructure vs. ideology).

2.3. Theoretical Frameworks of Power: Discourse and Postcolonialism

Sociological Perspectives on Power

As described above, international development and also the SDP field is permeated by hegemonic colonising practices and donor-recipient / North to South power relationships (Mwaanga 2011). This calls for closer examination of power and its results in the development framework. The issue of power imbalances in the development context have been raised by range of studies employing different theoretical perspectives; these include structural, post-modernist, feminist and political-economy approaches (see for example the articles in Crush 1995). Three major theoretical approaches to study power can be differentiated. First, from a structural point of view, power is conceptualized as dominance over others; second, from a post-structuralist perspective power is viewed as a ubiquitous and relational resource accessible to different actors, and third, examining power with an actor-oriented, social constructivist theoretical lens; here, power is again not a given, but seen as an outcome of the interaction and struggles of social actors (Mwaanga 2011, Long 2001). This chapter discusses the latter two theoretical frameworks in more depth.

Classical sociologists depicted power as the ability to exert control over people or resources (e.g. Weber 1978). In this perspective, power is grasped as a direct instrument of coercion and domination intentionally employed by privileged actors (Rai et al. 2007). Contrary to this personalized notion of power based on human agency, classical Marxists located power solely on a structural level, independent of individual agency. Power in Marxist terms is as function of class struggles, where the ruling class realizes its interests in opposition to other classes (Poulantzas 1978).

---

\(^7\) For instance Coalter uses the term “political correctness” to criticize the alleged ideological motives of the recent postcolonial research in SDP. The term is itself is underpinned by certain ideologies. In the early 1990s neo-conservative in the US used the term to defame radical feminist and anti-racism groups. In European public and political discourses “political correctness” also quickly assumed a negative connotation and was appropriated by far-right and anti-democratic groups (Auer 2011). If the term is used in an academic context its meaning should be defined.
Table 1: Selected Sociological Theories on Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Authors/Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>power over</td>
<td>power is “the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance” (Weber 1978: 53)</td>
<td>ability to control other people, resources or events, direct, intentional, repressive, exercised by individuals or institutions (e.g. state), notion of agency, based on status</td>
<td>Weber / Classical Sociological theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power as authority</td>
<td>“Power as a positive social capacity for achieving communal ends” (Abercrombie et. al 1988: 193)</td>
<td>a social relationship, ability to influence the behaviour of others, necessary function of a social system, non-elitist</td>
<td>Parsons, Dahl / Functionalism, Pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power as class struggle</td>
<td>‘capacity of one or several classes to realize their specific interests’ (Poulantzas 1978:147)</td>
<td>structural relationship, independent of individual will, function of class struggle and economic relationship, in opposition to other classes</td>
<td>Marx / Marxism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empowerment</td>
<td>&quot;includes both individual conscientization (power within) as well as collective action... to bring about change” (Rai et al. 2007: 2)</td>
<td>linked with politicized power with others</td>
<td>Freire / Critical Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power/knowledge nexus</td>
<td>“Power is... never localized,... never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation” (Foucault 1980: 98)</td>
<td>embodied in discourse and &quot;regimes of truth&quot;, invisible, beyond the structure vs. actor dyad, non-coercive, not personified, hegemonic, can be positive, productive and collaborative</td>
<td>Foucault / Post-Structuralism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This graphic description of influential sociological perspectives on power in Table 1 should help to understand and distinguish different theoretical perspectives on power relations, which occur in the sport and development field and particularly in the relationship between Northern and Southern NGOs. The research questions to be raised and the methodology of inquiry will depend grossly on the adopted theoretical point of view. To discern the MYSA SDP model and the power relations in which it is, embedded the Foucauldian concept of power is interrogated.

Development as a discursive formation: Foucault’s concept of power

The theoretical angle which looks at development practice and policies as a discursive formation is closely linked to the work of Foucault on power/knowledge and discourse (Foucault 1991). As Rossi (2004: 1) points out that this perspective views “development as a historically and culturally specific form of rationality which is inseparable from related regimes of practices and configurations of power”. In this context development is understood as a 'discourse’ and hence embedded in specific (Northern) regimes of truth, knowledge and power (Sidaway 2008). Discourse here may be best understood in line with the definition offered by Grillo (1997): “A discourse (for example, of development) identifies appropriate and legitimate ways of practising development as well as speaking and thinking about it” (Grillo, 1997: 12 qtd. in Rossi 2004: 1). Hence, the Foucauldian notions of power and discourse have been employed to analyse the place of human agency and hierarchy and agency in the development process (Rossi 2004).

To gain a fuller insight into sport and development practice as a discursive formation, first a sketch of the main elements of Foucault’s theory of power is needed. Here it is important to point out that Michel Foucault has revolutionized the understanding of power within social and cultural sciences. Moreover, also in critical SDP research, Foucault’s analysis of power has gained increasing usage (Darnell 2010; Nicholls et al. 2010; Mwaanga 2011). The conceptualisation of power/knowledge is arguably Foucault’s single most important impact and at the same time his most misunderstood and controversially discussed contribution (Cole et al. 2005).

Foucault contested longstanding, traditional understanding of power, which also dominate the analysis of power relations in development and SDP. For Foucault (1998: 63) ‘power is everywhere’, and it permeates all social relationships in capillary way rather than being exerted from one single
Power has no definitive form; it is not possessed or personified by a particular group or individual and is not concentrated in one space (Foucault 1991). While key characteristics of ‘sovereign’ power are coercion and repression, modern power operates cooperatively, productively and efficiently (Cole 2005). Gaventa (2003: 1) summarizes Foucault’s idea of power as “diffuse rather than concentrated, embodied and enacted rather than possessed, discursive rather than purely coercive, and constituting agents rather than being deployed by them.” Modern power would operate invisibly; only the effects of power would be manifest and visible. Contrary to orthodox notions, power is neither a structure nor an agency, but rather a sort of ‘regime of truth’ that permeates society, and which is in continuous negotiation and flux (Colin 1980).

Of cardinal importance in the Foucauldian perspective is the term ‘power/knowledge’ to denote that power is constituted through ‘legitimate’ and received forms of knowledge and ‘truth’. Foucault contends that: “Each society has its regime of truth, its “general politics” of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true” (Foucault 1972). Foucault argues that the dominant ‘regimes of truth’ are not merely ideologies which legitimate oppressive relationships. However, power relations would constitute human subjects who would think and act in particular ways which could not be diminished to “false consciousness” (Gledhill 1996: 126).

For Foucault, ‘truth’ and knowledge are ‘produced’ within discourses. In the Foucauldian notion of discourse, power and knowledge operate jointly: “Power produces knowledge...power and knowledge directly imply one another...there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations” (Foucault 1991: 27). Hence, on one hand dominant discourses reinforce the exercise of power, on the other mechanisms of power create and legitimize distinct types of knowledge and discourse. Foucault suggests that certain types of knowledge act in the service and sustain “technologies of power” (Sadan 2004: 161). For instance, knowledge characterized by neo-liberal notions of competition, achievement and selfish individualism would “turn into a technology in the service of power, which helps deprived groups to be more contented in their deprivation” (Sadan 2004: 161).

Contrary to the classic notion of power as coercion and control, power would follow from a more subtle acceptance of the presented reality as ‘received wisdoms’ (Mwaanga 2011, Long 2001). Foucault (1972) wrote, “there exists a system of power which blocks, prohibits, and invalidates this discourse and this knowledge, a power not only found in the manifest authority of censorship, but one that profoundly and subtly penetrates an entire societal network”. In this view, power is not restricted from being an attribute in the relationship between the ‘ruler and the ruled’ or the dominant and the subjugated, but permeates all social life. Moreover, according to Foucault, power can also be intrinsically emancipatory and productive. Hence, power is not definitive nor can it be possessed by social actors; it is rather a site of struggle (Cole et al. 2004: 230).

Foucault conceptualisations have been critiqued from various positions. A recurrent criticism is the disregard for human agency and the possibility for fundamental social transformation. Since “discourse works as a structure external to individual or collective actors” (Rossi 2004: 2) possibilities for change seem to be missing. Also Anthony Giddens argues that in the Foucauldian notion of history human agency and active subjects are absent; individuals “seem impotent to determine their own destinies” (Giddens 1984:98 qtd. in Rossi 2004: 4). Furthermore, Foucault is contested from a feminist theoretical perspective, because he would fail to acknowledge the gendered-nature of domination. Hartsock (1990:167) argues that the Foucauldian analysis of power is characterized by “profound pessimism”, whereby subjects would be “recreated as passive objects” and “passivity or refusal” would constitute the only available choices for members of marginalized
groups. In fact, Foucault showed little interest on how power relations are actually experienced by social actors which are located on different positions in the hierarchy (Rossi 2004). In addition, Hartsock (1990) even maintains that Foucault’s theory would interpret the social world from the perspective of the ruling group and impedes a movement for fundamental social change. However, and notwithstanding such criticisms, the notion of discourse proposed by Foucault does recognize the possibility of resistance and struggle against hegemony.

Resistance to Hegemonic Discourse and Southern Agency

Foucault suggests a janus-headed quality of discourse which “transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart” (Foucault 1998: 100-1). For Foucault (1998) discourses can be a site of power but it can also be a site of resistance, where marginalized actors contest and subvert strategies of power (Gaventa 2003).

The ability of actors and resist dominant discourses and to induce a degree of change is well summarized by Rossi (2004):

“[I]n the field of development, ...actors (especially the ‘recipients’ of polices and ‘interventions’) are faced with discourses to some degree external to their language, culture, and society. Relative ‘distance’ from the sources of development rationality increases the room for manoeuvre available to the actors involved. But negotiations do not take place between equals. While it is important not to characterize less powerful actors as passive, there is a difference between framing the terms of reference for discursive struggles and being at best able to manipulate dominant orders of discourse subversively (Rossi 2004: 26).

What Rossi reiterates here is a discursive approach to development that does takes account of the role of local agency. The quote suggests that forms of resistance, subversion or manipulation of dominant discourses should be comprehended as a form of power of the otherwise powerless. Foucault contends that marginalized actors are extremely limited in their capability to actively “manipulate knowledge in power games”, Rossi (2004) argues that such a perspective could restrict an understanding of hierarchy and agency in development. In fact, the Foucauldian approach would “fail to address satisfactorily the relation between discourse and agency within hierarchically stratified contexts”, which are so characteristic for the donor-recipient relationships in development practice (Rossi 2004: 2004:1). Drawing on Bourdieu’s notion of capital (economic, social, cultural and symbolic), Rossi argues that Foucault’s power/knowledge would in fact impact on agency, but the shape of these external structures (‘power/knowledge’) would constantly being rewritten and remodelled by the strategies of the actors. Also the degree of being able to reshape the ‘structures’ would correspond proportionally with the relative power of the actors (Rossi 2004: 7).

We conclude that the concepts of discursive formations and discourse as proposed by Foucault are useful for an understanding of the ways in which discourse transmits power (Rail 2002). A discursive approach facilitates discerning the role and impact of power relations and how discourse frames reality; how ‘regimes of truth’ are established and how they underpin partnership relations, MYSA programmes and identities of the partners involved. However, relations of power in the sport and development field in general and in North-South NGO partnerships are more complex and may not fully grasped by a solely Foucauldian perspective.

Postcolonialism\(^8\): An alternative reading of SDP

\(^8\) “Postcolonialism” without hyphen refers to the theoretical perspective; when speaking about the historical era following colonialism it is referred to as “post-colonialism” (Childs / Williams 1997: 19).
As outlined above, an analysis of development as a discursive formation urges to look at a central issue within development: the concept of power and how it shapes developmental thinking, policy and practice (McKay 2004). When it comes to relations of power within the SDP field Mwaanga (2011) argues that dominant hegemonic perspectives of development within SDP, which are underpinned by concepts of modernisation theory and neo-liberalism could best be countered with the alternative theoretical perspective of postcolonialism.

To further explore if postcolonialism is helpful in thinking about alternative forms SDP practice, it is necessary to define how “postcolonial theory” is understood in this study. Basically, postcolonial studies introduced a historical perspective to reflect critically on the cultural legacy of imperialism colonialism and how these legacies shape the contemporary “postcolonial condition” (Childs / Williams 1997, Hall 2007).

We can say with certainty that there is nothing like a “postcolonial theory” in the sense of a neat and well codified framework. In this sense, Childs and Williams (1997: 21) argue that “attempts to suggest homogeneity, uniformity or univocality in post-colonial work can have little credibility”. Rather a range of intellectuals with a non-Western or minority background can be identified – including Edward Said, Frantz Fanon, Gayatri Spivak and Homi K. Bhabha, which all engaged in an intellectual, anti-Western counter-discourse. Their shared intention is to unpack and contest “Western” representations and knowledge about former colonized peoples (Childs / Williams 1997). For that matter, “postcolonialism” may be better characterized as a theoretical perspective that an elaborated theory.

Postcolonial writers are interested in a critical analysis of phenomena (identities, culture, practices) and how they are “informed by more general discourse constituted by colonial history” (Baaz 2005: 4). The colonialisf intervention produced “civilizational Others” (i.e. Africa and Orient); postcolonialism is there to deconstruct such stereotypical representations. Post-colonialism as a historical period is not a simple continuity of colonialism, it is characterized by “different or new relationships concerning power and the control/production of knowledge” (Mwaanga 2011: 20). Spivak terms this new, neo-colonial condition “postcoloniality” (Spivak 1991 qtd. in Childs / Williams 1997:16). The postcolonial approach owes much of its intellectual originality to Michel Foucault’s work. For example, Escobar (1995) comprehends “development” as a discourse and therefore particular (Western) regime of truth, power and knowledge” (Sidaway 2008:19).

When examining SDP closer, neo-colonial relations of dominance become evident. In contradiction to current rhetoric of “development co-operation” emphasising participation, partnership and local ownership (Kontinen 2007), SDP still follows the traditional route of international development which essentially involves the allegedly politically neutral transposition of resources from the Global North (donors) to the Global South (implementers) (Briggs 2008). In this asymmetrical donor–recipient relationship, not only are material resources transferred but also immaterial resources including ideologies, knowledge and practices which are transmitted in a unidirectional mode from the North to the South (Baaz 2005).

From a discursive perspective employing the Foucauldian concepts of power and knowledge, the transposition of these less concrete resources help consolidating hegemonic ‘regimes of truth’ about development (Gledhill 1996: 126). The transposed Global Northern ideologies, knowledge and practices subsequently rationalize ways of doing and thinking about legitimate development (Sidaway 2008). This discrepancy within SDP may refer to a continuity of a notion of colonial discourse: that
truth about development is produced in the Global North and implemented in the Global South. This uneven division of labour between North and South in SDP is ‘based on racialized and spatialized notions of superiority’ and expertise (Darnell 2007: 562).

Mainstream Sport for Development practice viewed through a postcolonial theoretical lens entails, according to Mwaanga (2011) “a system of discursive control and oppression whereby the dominant discourse privileges white, patriarchal knowledge and deems inferior the knowledge stemming from non-whites”. In such a framework of structural domination it is not the local priorities in the South, but the characteristics of the North that are taken to denote the rationale of development (Darnell 2007). A comprehensive analysis of the dominant discourse on development (i.e. modernization theory) and how “legitimate” knowledge is produced and how local knowledge is subjugated, would go beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Critique of Postcolonialism

In particular Marxist scholars raised criticism against postcolonial perspectives. A central criticism is that the postcolonial approach would disregard ‘material practices’ and instead privilege ‘representations’ (Dirlik 1994). The counter argument is that oppressive material practices are legitimized by certain discourses and constructions, which are usually overlooked. Another objection is that postcolonialism would constitute a fashion for middle-class Western-based intellectuals, helpful for advancing university careers in the North but of almost no relevance to the marginalized and impoverished communities in the Global South (Sidaway 2008). Postcolonial approaches have also been criticized for their limitations for accommodating social change. For instance the work of Escobar (1995) has been objected for playing down “the potential for change within development discourse” (Sidaway 2008:18). From a Marxist angle, Negri and Hardt (2011) have criticized that postcolonialism would remain “primarily concerned with the colonial sovereignty.” This would make the postcolonialist perspective a valuable instrument for interpreting history, but it would be “entirely insufficient for theorising contemporary global power” (Negri / Hardt 2011:144). Negri and Hardt (2011:144) argue that in post-modern times a “new political order of globalisation” which they call “Empire” has emerged. And this fundamental new global order is framed by novel logics and structures power, which are not recognized by postcolonial theory, which would still indulge in a modernist concept of imperialism (Negri / Hardt 2011).

Nevertheless, it may concluded that a postcolonial theoretical perspective is fruitful for deconstructing current Eurocentric SDP practices and conceptualisations and allow for a better understanding of ongoing neo-colonial representations of the “developing world” and relations within SDP. Postcolonial theory has contributed to grasp the contradictory nature of “development”, it reiterates that “development” is neither an apolitical nor neutral process but it constantly produces winners and losers (Sidaway 2008: 17). This important point is also brought to the fore by Darnell (2007) and not only that a postcolonial perspective “can serve to unpack the presumably disinterested or apolitical knowledge upon which development practices are based” but also “help to account for why development programmes often fall short of meeting objectives” (Darnell 2007: 563). Postcolonialism allows reflecting on power relations within SDP: who plays the game and who is excluded from it; who defines the rules and who has to follow them? With a postcolonial lens “questions of inequality of power and control of resources, human rights” can be further explored. For that matter postcolonial studies have contributed to the formulation of alternative development approaches such as “indigenous” and “rights-based approaches to development” (McEwan 2008: 127). Consequently, postcolonial theory is helpful to frame less orthodox SDP practice “based on alternative, or, a balanced hybrid of ideological perspectives” (Mwaanga 2011: 16).
To obtain a more holistic understanding of other power relations within SDP a review of theories of power employing actor-oriented and empowerment perspectives seem to be useful.

2.4. People-centred Perspectives on Power: Actor-orientation and Empowerment

Actor-orientation: Power as the outcome of the interplay of social actors

A post-structuralist perspective permits perceiving power not as a given but as a site of struggle (Cole et al. 2004). Nevertheless, Foucault is vague on the role and actual impact of actors in these struggles. To further explore the idea that actors in the Global South are in a position to resist, manipulate, and transform hegemonic development discourse, the Foucauldian notion of development as a discursive formation with an actor-oriented, interactional perspective on development must be broadened.

A stimulating advocate for an actor perspective is Long (2001). Long points out that development studies until the 1990s were dominated by structural theories of development that uphold different forms of institutional hegemony and determinism. Similar to Foucault, Long (2001) does not view power as a given, but as a process and a product of the interplay of various social actors. Long argues that power is the outcome of struggles over resources and “struggles over meanings” (Long 2001:71). Hence, power inevitably breeds resistance.

Key to the an actor–oriented development sociology is the concept of arenas understood as or “spaces in which contests over issues, claims, resources, values, meanings and representations take place”, that is, they are within and across domains” (Long 2001: 242). According to Long these “sites of struggle” or arenas are typified by particular constraints and options for manoeuvre available to actors. The concept of arena when used to analyse development projects would allow for “identifying the actors and mapping out the issues, resources and discourses entailed in particular situations of disagreement or dispute” (Long 2001: 59).

Long resorts to Foucault’s notion of discourse when he argues that:

“social life is never unitary as to be built upon one single type of discourse, it follows that, however restricted their choices, actors always face some alternative ways of formulating their objectives, deploying specific modes of actions and giving reasons to their behaviour” (Long 2001: 18).

Long (2001) suggests here that recognising the fact that alternative discourses are available or employed by social actors challenges the deterministic notion that agency is a simple reflection of the specific structural location of the actor in society.

In view of the current case study an action-oriented, a constructionist perspective as outlined above grasps relations between Northern donors and Southern NGOs as informed by different SDP discourses. These largely unacknowledged discourses construct the social actors and their practices (Gledhill 1996). However, even dominant discourses are not hermetically closed and individual and collective actors are in a position to challenge and change discourse and create “room for manoeuvre”. An arena for such a struggle over meaning are North-South partnerships, which need to be understood as dynamic relationship encompassing different conflicts and tensions and, rather than as inherently positive given of development practice (Baaz 2005).

A social constructionist and actor-oriented perspective constitutes a main methodological shift in the empirical research of social phenomena in the development field and will be further discussed in the
chapter 3 on methodology. A related people-centred concept is empowerment which also focuses on the ability of actors to resist dominant discourse.

A Theoretical Framework of Empowerment

Empowerment has become a “motherhood” term in international development, “comfortable and unquestioned” (Rai at al. 2007:1). Since the 1980s the concept of empowerment has entered international development discourse. Empowerment was used as an alternative approach to describe the phenomena of “local, grassroots community based movement and initiatives” (Hur 2006:523). Only recently, the notion of empowerment gained also prominence in the field of field of Sport for Development (Mwaanga 2011).

The development of empowerment as a theoretical framework can be attributed to Brazilian educationalist Paolo Freire (1974), despite the fact that he never explicitly referred to the term “empowerment”. Freire’s philosophical vision was through the means of education to unfold a process of liberation among the oppressed communities in the developing world. According to Freire, a basic prerequisite of “empowerment” is the need to reflect about social inequalities (“conscientizing”). Only when the oppressed social actors develop a critical consciousness they would be in a position to recognize the predominant „culture of silence“, which is the outcome of a system of dominant social relations. The subsequent step is “inspiring”, which is “encouraging others by making them feel confident about achieving social equality” (Hur 2006: 527). In Freire’s conception of social change, the final phase is understood as “liberating” the disadvantaged and oppressed.

Freire (1974:16) argued that via such a conscious-raising educational process embedded in reflective action people would develop criticality and “increase their capacity to make choices and therefore their capacity to reject prescriptions of others“.

The community psychologist Rappaport (1984 qtd. in Zimmerman 2000:43) was among the first to define the process of empowerment as a “mechanism by which people, organizations, and communities gain mastery over their lives“. From a community development angle Nina Wallerstein (1992) described empowerment as a "social action process that promotes the participation of people, organizations, and communities toward the goals of increased individual and community control, political efficacy, improved quality of community life, and social justice." Both definitions point to the fact that individual actors cannot be separated from their specific social contexts. They suggest that a key element of empowerment is collective action, that actors are capable of jointly changing their political and social realities (Wallerstein 1992). As a result, the empowerment concept is connected with the notion of changing established power relations. In line with a Foucauldian notion of power, power is not a static entity and a zero sum game, but it is grasped “as shared because it can actually strengthen while being shared with others” (Hur 2006:524).

Empowerment might best be perceived as a continuum: On the one end, there is the “psychological empowerment” of the individual and on the other end there is community or political empowerment which is a process of advancing or transforming collectives such as groups or communities (Jennings et al. 2006:33; Rocha 1997; Zimmerman 1995). Empowerment in development is a “value orientation”, a guiding principle how to work with communities in an inclusive and participatory way (Zimmerman 2000:43). But empowerment” is also a theoretical concept to understand the processes and effects “of efforts to exert control and influence over decisions that affects one’s life” (Zimmerman 2000:43).
At this point, the concept of “empowerment” owns four distinct dimensions: First, empowerment is a social process since it develops in social relations and interaction with others. Second, it constitutes a value orientation. Third, empowerment is a phenomenon which occurs on multiple levels ranging from an individual level to the level of the communities and groups. Fourth, empowerment may also be understood as an outcome of a transformative process and therefore it can be enhanced, measured and evaluated. For that reason individuals and communities can be either empowered or disempowered (Hur 2006).

The empowerment discourse in the international development field has been questioned by Rai et al. (2007) for its “profound limitations”. While community-oriented, participatory perspective of empowerment constitute a necessary alternative to the modernist, top-down, state-led international development paradigm, a “romantic equation between empowerment, inclusion and voice” is encouraged (Rai et al. 2007:2). The empowerment approach would tend to disguise “the complexities of em-(power)ment both as process and a goal” (Rai et al. 2007:2).

Consequently, Rai et al. (2007) urge for a more sophisticated analysis of power drawing to the relational concept of power as proposed by Foucault, empowerment could not merely be understood as the capability to exert power over resources and people. Empowerment would not implicate the possession but rather the exercise of power (Rai et al. 2007). Such a notion of power prompts a more accurate understanding: Empowerment cannot “transcend power relations; it is enmeshed in relations of power at all levels of society” (Rai et al. 2007:2). Moreover, Rai et al. (2007:2) contend that “empowerment includes both individual conscientization (power within) as well as collective action, which can lead to politicized power with others to bring about change.”

In the SDP field, Mwaanga (2010) convincingly attempts to develop “sport empowerment” as a theoretical framework. Mwaanga is interested in processes of empowerment and disempowerment among People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) in Zambia.

Drawing on a Foucauldian notion of power, he argues that “power as a relational and ubiquitous resource” would be available to all (Mwaanga 2011:79). In his research on empowerment of PLWHA through Positive & Kicking programmes, Mwaanga maintains a connection between the process of empowerment and dominant ideologies. He claims that hegemonic ideologies “impact the sporting experiences of PLWHA leading to possible disempowerment outcomes such internalising HIV/AIDS related stigma” (Mwaanga 2011:109). Mwaanga explains such a disempowering process as following: In a sport context disempowerment on an individual level would manifest itself through “the development of negative personal perceptions of mastery or feeling of learned hopelessness/helplessness as well as the misinformation on important political issues. In terms of group and community level sport empowerment, disempowerment might focus on understanding the element (pollutes) working against a sport group’s acquisition of resources and skills to increase influence and control within a larger community” (Mwaanga 2011:108).

For instance, a constant victimization based on pervasive colonial mentalities bears an influence on self-confidence, self-consciousness and self-esteem of individuals as well as groups. Such dominant ideologies are “contaminators” for becoming empowered (2011:110). Such a grasping of sport (dis-)empowerment processes helps asking critical questions about the relationship between partnership and empowerment.

By looking through a theoretical lens of empowerment, the normative rhetoric about the empowering effects of partnerships on the Southern partner can be problematized. To expand knowledge and yield
new insights on the issue of partnership in sport and development critical questions about power relations must constantly posed: How is collective and individual behaviour influenced by existing power relations and contrarily, how are power structures transformed and altered by agency even if the actors are marginalized and conceive themselves as powerless?

When do partnerships improve the lives of communities and individuals in the South? Or to put it differently, under which circumstances do partnerships empower members of local sport initiatives and community based organisations, in particular in their ability to increase control in life and to achieve change in the wider society?

The theoretical framework of empowerment seem to be capable of apprehending some of the complexities of the interplay between structure and agency and processes of individual empowerment and the ignition of collective social transformation. In particular, the dimension of social change seems to be captured by the empowerment concept, which lays emphasis on two dimensions: the collective (structure) and the individual (agency).

Before turning to the concept of partnership in development, the following section briefly discusses the colonial legacy of sport / football for development interventions such as MYSA employing a postcolonial perspective.

2.5. Postcolonial perspective on Sport in Africa: Football as a colonial agent for discipline

Giulianotti (2004) and others maintain that the historical contexts of colonialism and imperialism continue to inform SDP’s practice and logic. Giulianotti (2004: 367) argues that there is a “historical relationship of sport to forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism.” Current sport-for-development interventions, do take place against and within a context of colonial history and the contemporary dominant development discourse (Darnell 2007). For example, in the context of colonial education British team sports, particularly football, were introduced to “effect personality change and instil Western moral values” (Manzo 2007: 2). Therefore, there is an imperative for locating sport-for-development projects in SSU and football-based interventions such as MYSA particularly “within their historical contexts” (Giulianotti 2011: 2007).

For sport for development to advance it is cardinal to reflect on the crucial role of sport in neo-colonial processes (Giulianotti 2004, Hartman / Kwauk 2011). Nicholls and Giles (2007) contend that “understanding the ways in which sport has been used as a form of assimilation and domination is necessary in order to create sport in development models that challenge, rather than re-inscribe, colonial legacies” (2007: 64). Research on sport for development interventions in the Global South has been questioned for a lack of recognition of the colonial legacy and a de-contextualized and de-historicized view on the role of contemporary sport, in particular in SSA (Darby 2002). To figure out contemporary, sub-Saharan African notions of sport and football in particular, it is suggested to explore “the construction of football by examining the socio-historical conditions that produce and constrain understandings of sport” (Darnell 2007: 562).

The functionalist view on sport as a cost-effective and simple educational instrument to transform “bad” attitudes of young people seems to be as old as modern sport itself (Vasili 1998). Already in the 1880s local members of Euro-African elite in the British occupation Gold Coast (today Ghana) organized sport activities for boys with a clear moral vision. Athletic afternoons which featured also football should uphold the spiritual well-being of the male youth and keep them away from alcohol (Vasili 1998). This notion of sport is comparable with the understanding of sport in the rational recreation movement in England. In the 19th century, moral reformers and industrialists propagated
“modern” leisure activities, including sports “in an attempt to ‘civilize’ and ‘stabilize’ the working class and the urban poor” (Fair 2004: 104). The mission of these pioneering Ghanaian “sport evangelists” seem to live on in the recent popular discourse on the intrinsic positive values of sport and its capacity of influencing the attitudes of young people (Wachter 2006).

To contextualize and better comprehend today’s role and discourse about football in Kenya, one should investigate how the cultural practice of football and other modern team sports have been diffused in former British colonies in Africa. Obviously, Africa is a vast continent and generalisations must be avoided. However, the development of football in different parts of the continent and the concomitant cultural notions and values can be closely linked to the regime of colonial rule.

In East Africa football arrived in the 1870s together with cricket and field hockey on the islands of Zanzibar. For Kenya Mählmann (1988) describes how Britain disregarded indigenous body and movement cultures like sham fights of the Massai or indigenous hockey among Luo speakers. At the beginning of the 20th century “prestigious” sports such as tennis, cricket and game hunting were promoted among the White community in Kenya, the less esteemed sports such as football or simple physical drills were believed to be appropriate for the (male) “natives” (Mählmann 1988:157).

Only from the 1920s onwards, missionaries, colonial officials, and teachers engaged in a more systematic promotion of football among the colonial subjects. Especially school administrators and colonial District Commissioner - Mangan (1986: 19) refers to them as "muscular missionaries" - harnessed the potential of team sports as an instrument of discipline and moral education of an emerging indigenous male elite. Western sport should assist in the transformation of the "lazy" African character and keep indigenous youth away from the moral temptations of city life (Wachter 2006). By the year 1927 football in Kenya had produced already such an impact on Africans that a report of the department of education of the Kenya colony concluded: “Football and Christianity may save Africa”9

The imperialists saw their humanitarian mission in the protection of their child-like subjects and civilize them - within certain boundaries. In addition to school education for elite boys the colonial agents considered team sports as the ideal vehicle for a moral support. In the colonial sport-for development model football should thus not only shape the body, but also condition the mind (Mangan 1986). Mangan (1986) traces how the ideological belief in the team sport ethics derived from elite English public schools and the upper-class universities like Oxford and Cambridge have been transferred to colonial practice. A constituting element of the colonial ‘games ethic” was to inculcate “manliness”. In the early Victorian era manliness was represented by virtues such as self-denial, rectitude and seriousness; later, masculinity also embraced individual properties such as perseverance, robustness and stoicism (Newsome 1961 qtd. in Mangan 1986). Rather than through textbooks, the colonial subjects should learn via team sports self-control and playing by the rules, develop team spirit and internalize the collective subordination to authority (Mangan 1986). For instance in colonial Kenya the Coast African Schools Sports and Cultural Association (CASSCA) promoted modern sport to “lead primitive instincts into channels of expression closer to the orthodox, civilized outlook” (Dufton 1959).

The organisation of competitive sport by the colonial administration also promised to establish a cultural link between the colonizers and the colonized. The top-down effort to construct a shared pan-

---

imperial identity, an “esprit de corps” (Mangan 1986: 117), should maintain colonial order - an order based on violence, violation of fundamental rights, economic exploitation and gross inequalities along race, class and gender (Darby 2000).

This study does not champion a simplistic model of “neo-colonialism”, which assumes that the colonial experience and its legacies are omnipotent factors determining post-colonial structures and social relations. Such an essentialist view does not account for indigenous agency. The colonial past can best be comprehended as having a significant impact on contemporary conditions and constraints under which individuals and groups make decisions (Terry 1987). Nevertheless, the colonial experience and history does not determine the social reality, but it provides a powerful framework for interpretations of agency (Lachenmann 1992). The history of African football was always a story of the struggle of Africans for the appropriation and reinterpretation of the formerly “imperial” game.

It can be argued that other aspects of football’s colonial culture has found refuge in the heart of African men and has developed in some countries, in fact, to a (masculine) secular religion (Wachter 2002). Football has developed into the most popular sport in Kenya and is a widely accepted cultural legacy of colonial imperialism. Notwithstanding, the Northern dominated political-economy of professional football and the Northern hegemony of football institutions remain, though not without steady and ongoing contestation by stakeholders from the African continent.

2.6. The NGO phenomenon and a new development paradigm within the SDP field

Intro
This section aims at furthering an analytical understanding of the emergence of the neo-liberal development paradigm and the rise of the NGO phenomenon within SDP and how these processes intersect. North-South partnerships such as the relationship of the Southern NGO MYSA with its Northern “partners” do occur in a wider political and economic context underpinned by certain ideologies. A weakness of some of critical studies on neoliberal SDP practice and policies is a rather sweeping reference to “neoliberalism” (Hayhurst et al. 2010). The notion of “neoliberalism” is used as a buzz word, lumping together various phenomena linked to capitalism and evoking a range of normative connotations.

In the following section I take a closer look at the political, economic and social context that gave rise to the emergence of NGOs in sub-Saharan Africa and subsequently the rise of NGOs in SDP. The process of how NGOs – both Northern and Southern - have increased in salience after collapse of the Soviet Union will be examined. NGOs became main development stakeholders amidst a period characterized by a decline of the state sector in Africa and other parts of the Global South (Desai 2008, Kamat 2004, O’Reilly 2010). This discussion will also reveal structural limitations of the NGO model for SDP.

The emerging salience of NGOs and partnerships: From Modernization to Neoliberalism

Following the two decades after World War II when modernisation was the dominant theory of framing “development” Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) or the concept partnership were completely absent in the development discourse. The ideological faith was that a top-down, state-led transfer of Western know-how and technology would transform “traditional societies” via several “stages of economic growth” into advanced industrialized societies (Rostow 1960). For modernization “development” is identical with the attainment of industry-driven, capitalist economic growth regardless of social equality, democracy or human rights. In modernization, there was no
necessity for community-led, participatory approaches to development based on principles of mutual exchange between the state and civil society or between the Global South and the Global North.

It was only in the 1970s when “third sector” agencies such as NGOs and Community-based organisations arrived in the development cooperation sector. As a new phenomenon NGOs first arose in the Latin American context as a reaction to dictatorial military regimes. The pioneering development NGOs where closely linked to left-wing social and political movements within an emerging civil society. The liberating ideas of the *dependency* theory and the Paolo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed were crucial in influencing a new international NGO movement (Zaidi 1999). In India the development of a grassroots and NGO movement came as a response to the weakening and withdrawal of institutional state politics (Zaidi 1999). Overall, the pioneering generation of Southern NGOs tended to be radical critics of national governments and international institutions. They perceived themselves as part of a social movement which advocated for an alternative development model (Zaidi 1999).

Furthermore, the idea of empowerment of the marginalized and grass-root orientations were held as key values. In the early 1980s the Reagan-Thatcher era was characterized by an ideological shift towards the propagation of a deregulated, free market economy and anti-state policies. In such an anti-collectivist model NGOs which were still strongly embedded in social movements were only of partial relevance, however the mainstream development aid system started slowly to work through certain NGOs. It was only with the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the subsequent “neoliberal ascendency” that the development paradigm changed profoundly (McKay 2008:67). The "emergence of an anti-state, anti-interventionist, New World Order” (Zaidi 1999: 261) in the early 1990s sustained the idea that the “non-governmental organizations should play a role in development” (Zaidi 1999: 261). NGOs were celebrated as an alternative to public-sector led development model and were “incorporated into the neoliberal model of civil society” (Kamat 2004: 155).

For Northern donor agencies NGOs became the favourite instrument in working with the poor in the 1990s, as a consequence Sub-Sahara Africa witnessed a meteoric rise in various types of NGOs (Lindsey / Banda 2011). A major reason for the rapid growth of NGOs was due to the “increased availability of large-scale funding” (Desai 2008: 528). It was believed that NGOs - contrary to the African state which was perceived as corrupt, errant and dysfunctional - would deliver “development” to the beneficiaries in a mode that is per se cost-effective, democratic, participatory and community-oriented.

The new development aid paradigm foresees that relations between Northern donors and Southern NGOs should “be based on equal partnership, incorporating transparency, mutual accountability and risk sharing” (Desai 2008: 526). This proves to be difficult since the establishment of many NGOs in the Global South is massively driven by external funding provided by Northern donors. Desai (2008: 528) argues that the advantages of the initial NGO model were cut drastically short due to expanded funding and more bureaucracy and professionalization. This forced NGOs to shift “objectives away from ‘social mobilization’ (which might be less attractive for donors) towards service delivery”. In other words the imbalanced relationship with Northern donors introduced dependency and patronage, rather than true partnership between equal entities (Zaidi 1999).

In the quote above, Desai (2008) refers to the crucial question of accountability and this links to the unequal relations between Northern donors and NGOs in the Global South (Desai 2008: 526). Desai argues that “accountability is crucial for NGOs as they have only their reputation for credibility on which to base their actions” (Desai 2008: 528). NGOs find themselves in-between the conflicting priorities of demands on part of their local communities and the necessity to ‘play according to the
rules’ of the Northern donors to sustain funding. As a consequence, NGOs are forced to adapt to continuously changing global and local agendas, if they want to survive (Desai 2008).

Likewise, NGOs in the sport and for development sector have to operate and adapt into such a competitive setting. For example research on transnational internet platforms in SDP Hayhurst et al. (2010) describes how SDP NGOs10 function in a competitive neoliberal political environment.

To sum up, NGOs were initially the product of alternative social movements which attempted to resist the dominant modernization model. From the late 1980s onwards, the role played by NGOs in development changed. Alternative development notions such as partnership, participation and empowerment have been appropriated by the mainstream development discourse (Rai et al. 2007) and NGOs assumed a central role in neoliberal development practice. Also, in the SDP field NGOs emerged as the dominant organisational form for progressing development in deprived communities and are increasingly incorporated in Northern-led networks which operate in a competitive, neoliberal environment (Giulianotti 2012).

New Development Paradigm: From modernization to neoliberal communitarianism

This shift from modernization towards a neo-liberal development model can also be observed in the policies of global policy institutions, like the Bretton Woods institutions towards sub-Sahara Africa. After WWII the World Bank's development policy was driven by modernization theory and development was identical with economic growth; only in the mid-1970s this approach was complemented by a model of meeting individual basic needs. The neo-liberal recipe of the 1980s was called "structural adjustment" of the economy and the state (Sawyer 1990). In 1980 Kenya was among the first African nations who received a World Bank loan for Structural Adjustment. “Adjustment” meant the “liberation” of markets and trade and the dismantling of the public sector, the retrenchment of health, education and other public services (Bayart 1992). At the end of the eighties when it already became rather obvious that "economic reconstruction" did not yield the expected results, the model was extended by the doctrine of "good governance".

Development strategies should now be based on participation and decentralization to reach out to the mass of the poor (M'Bassi 1995). Civil society organisations including community-based organisations and local NGOs should function as intermediaries between state and the grass-roots (Schuurmann 1996). While modernization theory was essentially anti-collectivist, the new development paradigm, despite its emphasis on individualist entrepreneurship foresees a role for the “community”. However, this concept of “neoliberal communitarianism” is sustained by the functionalist idea of a society free of conflict, confrontation and struggle over power (DeFilippis 2008: 31).

The neoliberal Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) had a direct adverse impact on the urban youth in Nairobi. As Wamucii observed (2012a) they “contributed to the marginalization of young people as they eroded institutions that were geared towards accessing affordable education and health facilities”. Young people were forced to live in slums areas and make a living the informal sector (see also Murunga 1999 qtd. Wamucii 2012a). As Alegi (2010) argues, the neo-liberal

10 Mwaanga (2014: 4) provides a useful definition of SDP NGOs, they “use sport (and other forms of physical recreation) to facilitate social betterment in targeted communities and nations.”
development policies and its impoverishing effects on African communities led to the establishment of NGOs, most notably to the foundation of MYSA.

It can be summarized that within the new, neo-liberal development paradigm, a key function of NGOs is to fill “the gaps left by the partial service delivery of government withdrawing form involvement in provision” (Desai 2008: 526). NGOs benefitted from the deliberate shrinking of the (African) state since functions of the state were relocated to the private sector (Bendaña 2006). In consequence NGOs and Community-based Organisations (CBOs) assumed a crucial role in “mitigating the adverse costs of structural adjustment” (Desai 2008: 526). The thriving of NGOs in the framework of a new neo-liberal policy model was also a result of the pressure by Northern donors for privatization and implementation of structural reforms: NGOs became to be regarded as ideal “service deliverers” (Desai 2008: 525). In short, “there is in any case an undeniable correlation between the advent of neoliberalism and the explosion in the number of NGOs” (Bendaña 2006:14)

There is abundant scholarship about NGOs that is critical about the role of NGOs as promoters of a neoliberal development agenda (Kamat 2004). Instead of building participatory democracy and developing civil society NGOs would atomize “civil society by pushing projects and discourses that celebrate individuals striving to meet individual needs” (O’Reilly 2010: 184). Nevertheless, there should be caution to assume that NGOs as per se advocates of a hegemonic, neo-liberal development model. O’Reilly (2010: 185) argues that one cannot assume that development interventions by NGOs in the Global South would automatically “further neoliberal hegemony”. In fact, such a perspective does not take into account Southern agency, since “local people negotiate and complicate northern definitions of development (O’Reilly 2010: 185).

The discussion in the section above attempted to contextualize the salience of NGOs in international development by linking the emergence of NGOs with political, economic and social factors. Such an analytical perspective helps to avoid an overtly normative interpretation of the NGO phenomenon, whereby the positive role of NGOs is taken “as natural and self-evident” (Desai 2008: 528). On the other hand it is evident that a “smothering blanket” critique of neoliberalism “fails to make room for the agency of local actors” (O’Reilly 2010: 185).

2.7. The contested concept of partnership and (Dis-)Empowerment in SDP

Partnership: the dominant modus operandi within SDP

I now turn to the critical interrogation of the key concept of partnership within SDP using a theoretical framework of power and empowerment. Since the turn of the millennium, the emerging field of Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) is characterized by an enormous proliferation of projects and NGO actors all engaged in partnerships\(^\text{11}\). A central concept in the discourse on sport and development, both among practitioners and academics, is the notion of partnership.

As outlined in Chapter 1, the partnership concept emerged within the context of a shifting development aid paradigm due to changing attitudes in the Global North (Desai 2008). From the late 1980s Northern development NGOs (NNGO) changed their approach towards the Global South, instead of implementing projects directly they moved towards a “partnership approach” (Desai 2008,\(^\text{11}\).

\(^{11}\) According to Levermore and Beacom (2009a: 9) 93 % of all sport-in-development initiatives were formed from 2000 onwards.
It is believed that partnerships with Southern NGOs are more egalitarian since they should rest upon principles of transparency, openness and mutuality and that they are more effective in delivering development. However, not only that the “precise nature and terms of such partnerships often remain unclear” (Desai 2008: 527) there is also a tendency to view partnerships as something intrinsically “good”.

This is also the case in the field of SDP. Different forms of partnerships including those between the donors and funders in the Global North with grass-roots organisations in the Global South (NGOs, local initiatives and networks) are viewed as inherently positive for sport and development interventions to be sustainable (Kidd 2008). The percept of North-South partnerships seems to lie at the very foundations of the SDP approach. Northern Sport for Development and Peace stakeholders and progressively also in the Global South call for partnerships as an effective path to attain policy goals (Lindsey / Banda 2010). As Lindsey (2011: 517) has observed, the partnership approach “has become ubiquitous as a modus operandi” within SDP. Moreover, partnership is not only a favourite mode for achieving development through sport; it constitutes a goal in itself since the MDG 8 requests explicitly to „Develop a global partnership for development“ (Levermore 2009, IYSPE 2005). Levermore (2011: 289) argues that the prevailing perception is, that sport is capable of linking a diversity of different of partners and that sport is believed to offer “natural and non-political environments where partners can meet and deliver development.”

Mwaanga (2014) claims that in SDP a consensus discourse has become prevalent, which obliterates the complex realities of SDP practice framed by processes of conflict and tension. A consensus-based discourse of partnership is omnipresent in many SDP policy papers, for instance the recommendations of the 2nd International Forum on Sport for Peace and Development at the UN head office in Geneva calls “for major efforts to reinforce partnerships between the Olympic Movement, governments, the UN system and civil society on sport for development and peace” (IOC-UN 2011). Furthermore, it urges sport and SDP stakeholders “to strengthen their activities as partners for development and social change, in close cooperation with governmental institutions, the private sector, and civil society organisations” (IOC-UN 2011).

Such statements disclose that partnerships within SDP are perceived as an unquestioned “good” and a “natural” constituent indispensable for sport and development practice. Just like in international development, also in SDP “everybody wants to be a partner with everyone or everything, everywhere” (Fowler 2000 qtd. in Harrison 2007:391). In this respect partnerships have not only emerged as a dominant issue in SDP policy, but have almost become a mantra in the SDP discourse.

Against this background, partnership is not an analytical concept but a value-laden and ambiguous term and its meaning differs grossly depending on the context and the vested interests. And even more importantly, it is rightly argued that the contemporary discourse on ‘partnership’ contributes to “disguise the fact that power differences exist” (Fowler 2000 qtd. in Harrison 2007: 395). In short, partnership cannot be viewed as a “natural” given of development practice but is a contested concept infused by relations of power.

In fact, partnerships take place in a wider context. First, in a structural context of power imbalances, which impact North-South relations. Nicholls et al. (2010: 250) argue that “often partnerships are infused with power relations that polarize partnerships into those that have the funding and those that need it.” Second, partnerships take place in an ideological context. Different conceptualisations and perceptions of “development” and “aid” sustained by the mainstream development discourse underpin partnership relationships.
Several critical development studies have analysed the role of power dynamics in partnership relations (Bebbington 2005, Baaz 2005, Lister 2000, Mancuso Brehm 2004). Nevertheless, the dominant development model “tends to downplay the unequal power relations that characterise the aid relationship” (Baaz 2005: 74). In fact, little empirical research or anthropological field work has been conducted on North-South relationships in SDP. The few critical studies tend to look at the issue from the perspective of Northern SDP actors (Tiessen 2011). For instance the work of Darnell (2007) focuses on North American and European volunteers of the Canadian SDP NGO Right to Play. An exemption is the field work conducted by Lindsey and Grattan (2012) on indigenous SDP organisations in Lusaka. The two case studies present counter-examples to the internationalist, “Northern hegemony” literature in SDP.

Current research focuses on SDP partnerships and how relations of power are affecting the field of SDP and undermine efforts for true partnership (Nicholls 2010).

Power over: Hierarchies and Control within Partnership

Fowler (1997) contends that “authentic partnerships” with more egalitarian relationships between North and South turn out to be illusionary, as long as Northern funding NGOs or donors are in control of the financial means. Donors and international NGOs are in the driving seat when it comes to define priorities and setting the agenda, because tend to have the power over the allocation of financial resources. Nicholls et al. (2010: 259) have stressed that also within SDP the structural hierarchies between North and South “are continually reified by funding relationships because funders control the majority of the plans and processes.”

In a critical study on donor-NGO partnerships in a Ugandan setting Reith (2010) observes that partnerships in the development field tend to be rather unique and complex, nevertheless she argues that relationships are likely to be “based on patronage and control rather than partnership” (Reith 2010: 448). Drawing on the work of Lister (2000) Reith (2010:448) argues that the imbalances and inequalities in donor-NGO partnerships stem in the first place from the “power endowed to donors” though the control of money and therefore their “ability to control how NGOs work and what they work towards”. In the 1980s when donors acknowledged NGOs as partners, they started to use them in pursuing their own agenda, such partnership relations increasingly led to a side-lining of the agenda of Southern NGOs (Reith 2010). Reith (2010: 448) characterizes the Northern donor- Southern NGO relationship aptly as “giving the gift of money, tacking the gift of power”. The consequences of the “act of receiving” the “gift of money” may range from certain conditionalities at best to a means of control or form of patronage (Reith 2010: 448). Reith summarizes this partnership dilemma as following:

“donors giving money to NGOs tie themselves into a partnership which immediately creates a hierarchy of power, where the donor takes control by turning the NGO into a recipient and, in some cases, a dependant of the donor. The gift of money is something that is given, received, and somehow repaid.” (Reith 2010: 448).

In the context of such donor-NGO partnerships, donors put pressure on NGOs to meet the conditions and demands of Northern donors. This takes place in an increasingly competitive development environment, where donors can always opt for other “partners” who are more ready to meet conditions (Reith 2010: 449). The room for decision-making and ownership on part of the Southern NGO who are situated on the receiving end of the international development aid chain is limited. In a context of scarce resources and economic deprivation, the options for community-based organisations and local NGOs to turn down Northern funding are extremely restricted. Due to the competition for
external funding Southern NGOs tend to accept ‘the strings attached’ to funding and may even risk to compromise on their initial goals and become “servants of an externally imposed agenda” (Commins 1997 qtd. in Reith 2010: 449).

The control of funding and other resources by donors do not only influence the relationship between the Northern donor and the Southern recipients but impacts the relationship between the Southern NGOs and the final beneficiaries such as community groups. The unequal allocation of power tends also to be reproduced in local “partnerships”, where relations between NGOs and their constituents tend to be based on a patron-client relationship. Based on a case study from India O’Reilly (2010) argues that despite that fact that the implemented projects aimed at advocating neo-liberal ideals (e.g. individualized empowerment) Southern “NGOs and the poor act in ways that sustain mutually dependent relationships (O’Reilly 2010:182). In addition, when examining sport-for-development partnerships in Zambia fighting AIDS/HIV, Lindsey and Banda (2011: 93) detected tense competition among different SDP NGOs. The “fragmentation of the NGO sector and competition for scarce resources” impeded the establishment of effective partnerships between local NGOs (Lindsey/Banda 2011: 94).

**Partnership Discourse and the Politics of Partnerships**

Reith (2010) and O’Reilley (2010) have elaborated on the significance of direct control and hierarchies of power within North-South partnerships. Nevertheless, one should avoid a simplistic interpretation of the existing imbalances as a conscious strategy by Northern donors to “subjugate” Southern partners (Baaz 2005). As outlined in chapter one, such a reading of partnership is based on a one-dimensional, predominately repressive notion of power. Hence, the failure of partnerships is not grasped as the outcome of a Northern conspiracy; partnership is rather understood as embedded in complex structural relations of power and discourses, which are by definition not closed (Baaz 2005).

In the dominant, neo-liberal model of development, conflicts of interests between donors and partners are downplayed. Hence development interventions, as Long and Long (1992) argue, should not be comprehended as consensual relationship based on mutual interests and goals and but as ‘battlefields of knowledge’ informed by divergent goals and interests (Baaz 2005). In an empirical study about Nordic development workers in Tanzania Baaz demonstrates how tensions and conflicts characterize the partnership discourse in the development aid context. The conflicts would “reveal a discourse that is still constructed around images of the superior, reliable, efficient ‘donor’ in contrast to the inadequate, passive, unreliable ‘partner’ or recipient” (Baaz 2005: i).

Unequal relations of power shape the production of knowledge and discourses (Foucault 1980), which seriously affect the SDP movement and undermining efforts for partnership.

As long as Global Southern partners are not recognized as to provide valuable contributions to the partnership process then “it merely perpetuates a cycle of domination of the donor/recipient relationship instead of a partnership approach” (Nicholls et al. 2010: 250). Despite ongoing post-colonial power relations, it is possible to achieve more egalitarian and empowering partnership relations. According to Nicholls et al. (2010: 257) this is by acknowledging that all parties involved have a credible and legitimate contribution to make, which includes “the privileging of formerly subjugated knowledge”.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, partnerships within SDP have been identified as the dominant modus operandi and a goal at the same time. In the SDP policy discourse, partnerships are understood as a “natural” and
“self-evident” approach for the usage of sport as an instrument for achieving development goals. This functional perception of partnership negates the existence of unequal power relations between Northern donors and Southern recipients, and are reified by the funding relationship and underpinned neo-colonial discourse. Such a normative rather than analytical perspective on partnerships reveals a lack of theorising of the power relations between the Global North and Global South, which underpins an uncritical and essentialist interpretation of partnership. Based on Nicholls et al. (2010) it can be claimed that the SDP discourse is dominated by a language of empowerment and partnership, but the “politics of partnerships” between Northern donors and Southern recipients have a tendency to be paternalistic. The knowledge and expertise contributed by Southern grassroots actors to the partnerships process tend to be regarded as irrelevant and illegitimate, while Northern donors appear in a position efficiency and superiority. Depending on the distribution of power and the underlying discourse partnerships within SDP can either empower or disempower individuals and collective actors.

Through an in-depth study of the perceptions and narratives around the MYSA-Strømme Foundation partnership conflict using a postcolonial theoretical lens, it is hoped to gain insight in wider issues of power distribution and legitimacy of knowledge.

2.8. The construction of MYSA and ‘Celebratory’ SDP scholarship

In the following section critical questions are raised about MYSA, which have not been addressed in the literature so far. The area attempted to uncover is the academic construction of MYSA into a global best practice model within SDP and the underpinning instrumentalist conceptualisations, which have tend to be neglected in the previous studies on MYSA (Hognestad / Tollisen 2004).

MYSA was founded in 1987 by the Canadian UN officer Bob Munro in the Mathare valley slum in Nairobi and is described as “the biggest and at the same time Africa’s most successful self-help project for youth” (DGB 2007: 28). According to Coalter’s (2010) classification, MYSA developed into an ambitious and complex ‘sport plus’ organisation “in which sports are adapted and often augmented with parallel programmes to maximize their potential to achieve developmental objectives” (Coalter 2010: 298). Contrary to Coalter, Akines and Kirwin (2009: 223) describe MYSA as a prominent ‘plus sport’ initiative, where the popularity of sport is used as a magnet or ‘fly paper’ to draw young people into educational programmes and training (e.g. HIV/ AIDS prevention).

The youth-driven NGO MYSA with its multiple of programmes has become to represent an ideal-typical concept of sport for development. Hayhurst (2009: 206) states that “the central premise of SDP is that grassroots, community-based sport, with a focus on participation and increased access, holds considerable promise as a social justice and development strategy.” MYSA became an epitome of a grassroots, community-based, participatory SDP model. SDP-based studies in general have built upon the early article of Willis (2000) on the significance of MYSA (Hayhurst 2009: 206). Willis work on MYSA was pioneering for theorising the role of sport in development.

Furthermore, MYSA has been glorified as a shining global example for the potential power of sports in attaining development goals. For example, the organisation was nominated twice for the Nobel Peace Prize, won numerous awards and hosts a prestigious FIFA Football for Hope centre. It received international acclaims from the entire SDP movement, not only from donors, aid workers or politicians but also from the academic world (Willis 2001, Coalter 2013). In fact, the MYSA organisation became one of the most researched “objects” in the emerging sport for development field

Following the hailing of MYSA achievements by the Canadian development researcher Owen Willis who termed MYSA “Africa’s sporting and development success story” (Willis 2000:830) most of the academic reference to MYSA carries a celebratory undertone (Hognestad / Tollisen 2004). Examples for a thoroughly positive reference to MYSA include: “high profiled NGO” (Burnett 2013: 8), “major and longstanding sport-for-development organisation” (Coalter 2012: 307) and “largest youth soccer programme in Africa” (Coalter 2007:298). Also Brady and Khan (2002: 2) describe MYSA in a very positive light: “This dynamic grassroots organization, which seeks to link youth development, sports, and environmental activism, provides a fascinating example of the role of sports in development, as well as its potential to transform gender norms.”

The pioneering MYSA organisation also became a ‘template’ for subsequent generations of SDP NGOs (Coalter 2012: 307). To sum up, the paradigmatic case of MYSA has become to define the emerging sport and development field.

Previous research on MYSA tended to be based on idealistic functionalism and lacked criticality. In his pioneering study, Willis (2000) already argued that outlook of MYSA is “unabashedly functionalist” and that philosophy of MYSA “endows sport with almost mythical capacities” (Willis 2000: 845). The functionalist view the relationship between sport and society as an inherent positive one: Sport is a valuable social institution that is beneficial for the society as well as the individual (Coakley 2011). Moreover, Rowe points out that functionalism explains the existence of social institutions of sport as an “adaptation to modernization and industrialization. Physical play becomes more structured and regulated, it takes on many of the cohesive values necessary for society to exist (common purpose, mutual support, leadership and discipline)” (Rowe 2004: 99). This orthodox functionalist perspective of the society which is perceived to be in a state of equilibrium and based on shared values such as discipline and leadership resembles the vision of many contemporary SDP programmes including MYSA. MYSA Willis (2000) described the centrality of functionalist thought in the aims and objectives MYSA. As demonstrated in chapter three (results and discussion), functionalist notions can be detected in the recent programme theory of MYSA and the narratives of the practitioners.

Conclusions

In the previous section the discursive construction of MYSA within the SDP movement, namely through a ‘celebratory’ SDP scholarship was explored. Academic and populist representations of MYSA as an global flagship project, for example employed by the UN system and other Northern donors (Laureus n.d.), has led to a popularization of the MYSA beyond a narrow SDP community, which has facilitated to establish the “slum project” MYSA as an object for foreign aid and North-South partnership.

One can conclude that within the emerging SDP movement MYSA was constructed as an ideal model to prove that sport is a powerful instrument for the achievement of social development and that sport can contribute to the MDGs. The dominant SDP model is based on functionalist assumptions that tend to conceal potential conflicts and social divides over power, meanings and resources. MYSA seems to exert a significant influence on current SDP practice and thinking. Consequently, it can be assumed that once the paradigmatic MYSA model is under threat, that this bears also relevance for the entire Sport and Development field. For that reason a deconstruction of the SDP ‘success story’ is likely to expand perspectives on alternative sport and development models.
Chapter 3: Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to familiarize the reader with the core components of the research to make the chosen approaches and tools clear, which must be considered crucial to produce transparent and quality research projects. The different but interrelated aspects of this inquiry, namely the philosophical and methodological characteristics as well as the research methods of the study will presented and critiqued (Denscombe 2007). I will also attempt to justify why a particular approach has been chosen over another and the consequences of these decisions in relation to the ability to answer the research questions.

An overall aim of this research is to gain a critical understanding of the “enduring ‘colonial’ power relationships” (Kay 2009: 1188) in the field of sport for development and peace. To contribute to overcoming dominant neo-colonial and neo-liberal discourses and practices in the SDP field that are still infused by subtle notions of Northern dominance and Southern inferiority, it is vital to think clearly about its own ontological and epistemological points of departure and research paradigm (Guba / Lincoln 1994). This is significant; for example my presumption that knowledge is a social construction bears a whole set of implications – about my own role as a researcher, the way I obtained access or the relationship that was set up with the participants of the inquiry.

Context and Background

The detailing of the background and context and of this empirical investigation enables the reader to acknowledge the possibilities and limits upon which this study is based. As described in the section self-interests in topic, the author has previously worked with MYSA during a joint development education project form 2009 until 2011. In March 2013 I contacted a senior staff at MYSA to explain the rationale of the study and request MYSAs support. Following a request by MYSA I provided further details about the research project, in particular why and where I want to use the MYSA research, how the inquiry will benefit MYSA and the type of information I intend to gather through interviews. Initially, MYSA raised concerns about the provision of sensitive or rather confidential information. A process of communication, clarification and building of trust, which also involved a member of the MYSA board, followed. Finally, MYSA agreed in writing to support the research and they proposed a detailed visiting programme with a schedule for interviewing different MYSA stakeholders (staff, volunteers and board members).

In June 2013, after my arrival in Nairobi, I conducted most of the MYSA interviews at the MYSA headquarters office in Komaroks at the Eastern outskirts on Nairobi. One MYSA staff member offered me the opportunity to stay with his neighbour at a house in Komaroks Estate, a rather middle-class housing area. The house was located in walking distance to the MYSA headquarter, which allowed me to visit the MYSA office on a daily basis and to participate in MYSA various activities. In the process of interviewing MYSA staff my research was received further endorsement. For example, an executive staff expressed the view that the study could be of key relevance for future SDP practitioners: “it’s good you do this study. I was hoping that one day someone will come and look at what happened between MYSA and Stromme, put in perspective, put it on record, so it can be used as a reference meant for people doing sports for development” (Interview 4, MYSA executive staff)
3.2. Critique of the Northern dominance in SDP research

Biased Knowledge Production

In chapter three, asymmetrical donor–recipient relationships were identified, whereby material and immaterial resources including knowledge, ideologies and practices are transmitted in a unidirectional mode from the Global North to the Global South (Baaz 2005). In mainstream Sport and Development, Western notions remain privileged and are exported to the “receiving-end” of SDP. Also approaches and knowledge stemming from the Global South tend to be subjugated and deemed irrelevant for SDP practice and theory (Mwaanga 2011). From a methodological point of view the interesting question is how Southern knowledge is subjugated in SDP?

Mwaanga maintains that an uneven North-South relationship would “fit the modernisation binary world view. i.e. seeing the Global Northern approaches as superior, civilized and further developed compared with the Global South” (Mwaanga 2011: 19). Consequently, a growing number of critical analyses focused on different aspects of the neo-colonial underpinning of SDP practice and scholarship (Black 2010, Darnell 2010, Darnell 2010a, Darnell 2007, Darnell / Hayhurst 2012, Darnell / Hayhurst 2011, Giulianotti 2010, Hayhurst 2009, Mwaanga 2011, Nicholls et al. 2010). A common denominator of these counter-hegemonic studies is the call to “subvert enduring ‘colonial’ power relationships” (Kay 2009: 1188).

Despite the self-perception of SDP of being a “new” movement (Kidd 2008) and acting according to universal principles of global fairness, equality and justice, SDP shares identical issues and challenges with mainstream development cooperation. It is argued that SDP is characterized by an uneven international division of labour, whereby donors and agencies in the Global North devise policies and priorities which are then implemented in the Global South (Darnell / Hayhurst 2012, Mwaanga 2011). Subsequently Northern perspectives dominate the discourse on what constitutes sport and development, alternative and contesting narratives by indigenous agents in the South tend to be subjugated (Kay 2009: 1188). In response to this disparity, a growing number of SDP scholars have suggested to follow critical development studies and urge for a decolonisation of sport for development practice and research (Darnell / Hayhurst 2011, Kay 2009).

From a methodological point of view, Kay urges the movement to critically question what shapes SDP research and to engage “with debates surrounding ‘decolonising methodology and knowledge’ which feature prominently in development studies” (Kay 2009: 1188). However, there is another school of thought in the opposite direction concerning the neo-colonial critique against the operations of SDP.

Questioning the “internationalist focus” in SDP

Based on notions of Southern agency the recent “internationalist focus” in SDP research is challenged. The increasing critique of the Northern dominance in governing SDP is challenged for example by Lindsey and Grattan (2012). Grounded on empirical case studies of two Zambian communities the authors argue that sport–for-development is challenged and shaped to a large degree by local actors and therefore the influence of the Global North on local sport-for-development programmes would be far less than generally maintained (Lindsey / Grattan 2012).

The authors reject the “strong narrative” of the emerging ‘hegemonic’ strand of literature which would describe “development efforts initiated in the Global North as being aligned with the hegemonic maintenance of power relations which continue to subjugate those in the Global South”
The “internationalist focus” of many mainstream academic studies would underpin an “unquestioned understanding”, according to which SDP practice takes place in the South, but is driven and supported by actors in the Global North (Lindsey / Grattan 2012: 93).

Other critiques make the point that the current prevailing perspective on Northern hegemony within the SDP literature is linked to methodological limitations. Conclusions would not be derived from empirical studies, but tend to be based on “critical abstract assertions” about North-South power relations (Coalter 2010: 307) or if empirical investigations are conducted they are either conducted in the Global North (e.g. Darnell 2007, Hayhurst / Frisby 2010) or depend solely on textual analysis of policy documents (e.g. Hayhurst 2009) (Lindsey / Grattan 2012).

The critiques of Lindsey and Grattan (2012) are useful in two ways. First, that there is a need for more empirical research in the Global South to better understand the relative influences of global and local aspects on sport and development. Second, there is sufficient evidence to argue that SDP is an international practice predominately following the agenda of the donor countries in the North. Nevertheless the notion is held that “Northern hegemony” should not be assumed or taken as a given, but has to be analysed within an appropriate, actor-oriented methodological framework, which is able to accommodate Southern grass-roots agency. According to Lindsey and Grattan (2012) such an actor perspective will acknowledge “the capacity of local actors to contextualize, reinterpret, resist, subvert and transform international development agendas, which, in turn, contributes to a diverse array of development practices emerging within local contexts” (Lindsey and Grattan 2012: 95). Such an actor perspective is likely to prove suggestive for the current study, which focuses on local narratives and discourses which evolved around the recent partnership conflict between MYSA and their long-standing European key partner.

3.3. Methodological Position: Actor perspective and Participatory Action Research

This section will examine the methodological foundations of the research, it will discuss the theory about the research methods that were used.

Actor-oriented approach to the study of SDP conflicts

In chapter two an actor-oriented approach has been identified, which is philosophically grounded in a social constructionist perspective and constitutes a major methodological shift in the empirical research of social phenomena in international development. Moreover, this study recognizes an actor-oriented development sociology, as proposed by Long (2001), as a conducive perspective for analysing power relations within SDP.

An actor-oriented / social constructionist approach of analysis is likely to overcome the determinism of previous structural theories. According to Long (2001:1) the old structural theoretical models were on the whole “‘people-less’ and obsessed with the conditions, contexts and ‘driving forces’ of social life rather than with the self-organising practices of those inhabiting, experiencing and transforming the contours and details of the social landscape.“ To escape this “impasse” Long suggests adopting an actor-oriented form of analysis which explores “how social actors (both ‘local’ and ‘external’ to particular arenas) are locked into a series of intertwined battles over resources, meanings and institutional legitimacy and control” (Long 2001: 1). The actor-oriented approach is obviously inspired by the method of ethnographic case-studies, symbolic interactionist approaches and in terms of methodology rooted in social constructionist ideas (Long 2001).
As outlined in chapter one the conflict between MYSA and Strømme Foundation can best be interpreted as an embattled arena. In this arena a multitude of Southern and Northern actors (collective and individual) engage in a contest over “issues, resources, values, and representations” and “deploy discursive and other cultural means for the attainment of specific ends” (Long 2001:59). However, actor-oriented development sociology brings out the crucial point that constructions and strategies adopted by the different actors do not occur totally unpredictedly “but are drawn from a stock of available discourses (verbal and non-verbal)” (Long 2001: 18). Furthermore, these discourses which are available to social actors are not are not closed but must be conceived as “open-ended and related to other discourses” Baaz (2005: 9).

To conclude, the current hegemonic strand of SDP literature reveals methodological shortcomings in terms of capturing Global Southern perspectives. In contrast, an action-oriented approach informed by social constructionism as outlined above is useful for analysing Southern perceptions of sport-for-development and social change. Furthermore, an actor-oriented angle permits to understand the conflictual relations between Northern donors and Southern NGOs as the outcome of ongoing struggles over resources, meanings and control (Long 2001).

**Participatory Action Research**

The debate on how power impacts on the construction of social reality, in particular how power creates and legitimates distinct types of knowledge and discourse, has been addressed in chapter two (Foucault 1991). To recap, unequal power relations impact the production of knowledge and discourses, which seriously mark the SDP movement. The conventional mode of knowledge production within SDP tends to subjugate and consider knowledge stemming from the Global South as irrelevant for SDP practice and theory. Therefore, a research methodology is needed which is likely to generate “de-colonized” knowledge (Kay 2009). In keeping with the goal of this study, i.e. to understand of relations of power in the sport for development sector and to explore alternative development perspectives and SDP partnership models, participatory action research (PAR) is adopted as the key research strategy (Saunders et al. 2009).

This study aims at unfolding action i.e. engaging with structurally marginalized groups in the Global South in an effort of challenging power relations within SDP and is therefore driven and informed by the values of the author, who is also a sport for social change activist. Hence, the adoption of an action research approach seems to be appropriate. Participatory action research (PAR) is a specific mode within the family of action research approaches and is grounded in a people-centred, actor-oriented and social constructivist perspective. Reason and Bradbury (2001: 1) define Action Research as

“a participatory, democratic process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes, .... It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities.”

It is based on critical reflection and action aimed at empowering marginalized communities and igniting social change by challenging of structural inequities (Long 2001, Mwaanga 2011: 112). Within the participatory action research paradigm research is not conducted for potential beneficiaries but with them. A main characteristic of PAR is the democratisation of the generation of knowledge through the participation and involvement of marginalized groups; it “involves collaboration between researchers and stake-holders as co-researchers” (Baldwin 2012: 467). A participatory action research approach - as demonstrated by Nicholls et al (2010) among SDP grassroots practitioners in Southern
Africa - will bring marginalized Southern perspective on processes of North-South partnerships to the fore. In contrast to other research paradigms PAR foresees for the investigator’s a dual role as both researcher and facilitator, which has an influence on the process and outcomes of the inquiry (Mwaanga 2011).

The Study’s Philosophical Position

In terms of philosophical foundations, action research approaches and an actor-oriented approach have much in common. In fact, both approaches share the same ontology and are similar in terms of epistemology (Popplewell / Hayman 2012:3).

Ontology or theory of being is about assumptions that exist and what constitutes social reality; it poses philosophical questions about the nature of reality (Guba / Lincoln 2008). Basically, ontology seeks answers to the question “what is out there to know about?” (Grix 2002: 175; Maykut / Morehouse 1994). In other words ontological claims “are concerned with what we believe constitutes social reality” (Blaikie 2000: 8).

Ontologically participatory action research approach follows the social constructivist paradigm which claims that all knowledge is created socially (Baldwin 2012). While objectivism assumes that social reality has an existence of its own, independent of the social actors, a social constructionist perspective claims that “all knowledge is relative since it is co-constructed by human being in relationship with others.” (Baldwin 2012: 468). Social constructionism, which owes much to Goffman’s symbolic interactionism, assumes “that social phenomena are made up of a multiplicity of constructed and emergent realities” (Long 2001: 2). According to Long (2001: 2) the processes of constructing social reality are usually ambivalent, complex and “highly contingent upon evolving conditions of different social arenas.”

The participatory action research paradigm firmly rests on a participative worldview, we exist in a participatory world. Reason / Bradbury (2001: 8) argue that “participation is fundamental to the nature of our being, an ontological given”. We experience the world at a participatory and interactive interface and our active participation in a co-creative process “gives rise to the reality we experience” (Reason / Bradbury 2001: 8). Participatory action research claims that subject and object are interdependent and rejects the objectivist division between the investigator (“subject”) and those investigated (“object) (Reason / Bradbury 2001). Therefore, to acknowledge the active involvement of research participants in this research project is in line with the ontological position of an action research paradigm.

Epistemology or theory of knowledge deals with assumptions about knowledge creation in society (Guba / Lincoln 2008). It is concerned with “possible ways of gaining knowledge of social reality, whatever it is understood to be” (Blaikie 2000: 8). To restate it is about how we arrive at the point where we know what we know. Epistemologically action research approach claims that the “object” of study cannot adequately be understood through objective knowledge. In fact, the positivist belief that social phenomena can be studied with methods of simple scientific rationalism is regarded as a myth, since all research is embedded within particular value-systems (Carspecken 1996). Social reality is not simply an objective entity independent of our interpretations. Consequently, the challenge for social scientists is to interpret and “grasp the subjective meaning of social action” (Bryman 2001: 12-f).

Reason and Bradbury (2001) argue that a participative worldview with its conception of reality as subjective-objective, which is at the heart of participatory action research, implicates an extended
epistemology. Action research draws “on diverse forms of knowing as we encounter and act in our world” (Reason / Bradbury 2001: 9). In contrast to conventional research, which privileges objective knowledge extended epistemology encompasses four types of knowledge: (1) experiential knowledge, attained through direct contact with places, people and objects; (2) practical or ‘how-to-do” knowledge is connected to competences or skills; (3) presentational knowledge is conveyed through stories, writing, and art to express and symbolize meaning; (4) propositional knowledge is embracing theories about the world, it focuses on ‘knowing that’ (Reason / Bradbury 2008, Baldwin 2012).

Propositional knowledge has dominated the epistemology of the Western, positivist scientific rationality. This positivist epistemological assumption is that the expert researcher and the “object” to be investigated can be kept apart, “it is not grounded in subjective, experiential, and practical knowledge” (Baldwin 2012: 469). To overcome this separation, this study attempts to warrant that propositional knowledge is grounded in the experiences of the research participants. Furthermore, after the case study research project has been approved by MYSA and the data collection was ongoing MYSA staff were involved via email in a reflective process about preliminary findings and the further use of the research results. This collaborative working with research subjects has increased the legitimacy of the produced knowledge.

Researcher reflexivity

Scientific knowledge generated through research is socially created and is necessarily subjective, value-mediated and has a political dimension (Carspecken 1996). As a consequence, the researcher is not an “objective observer”, a neutrum in the social interaction, but inevitable brings in his or her cultural, social, ethnic and political background when interpreting social phenomena. The challenge is therefore to systematically reflect and be clear on one’s subjectivity, values and assumptions (Kelemen 2008). Within PAR or the “critical paradigm” as Creswell and Miller (2000: 126) term it, researcher reflexivity, which is the self-disclosing of beliefs and biases, is a procedure to ensure validity.

As addressed above and in detail in chapter two, knowledge production in SDP tends to privilege a dominant Global Northern perspective. For example, when it comes to the generation of knowledge about sport for development, academics from Northern Europe and North America are highly overrepresented. SDP research is usually conducted on the Global South but hardly by Southern researchers (Mwaanga 2011: 15, Levermore 2009b). Thus, this study aims at challenging the Eurocentric production of knowledge which runs through contemporary SDP research (Kay 2009). I therefore acknowledge that my position as a white, European, middle-class male background informs my interpretative framework. In particular, my privileged background in a poverty stricken context and being male had an impact in the research process and influenced the types of reality I was able to capture. One goal of PAR is eliminate power differences in the research process. For Baldwin (2012:477) this is an overarching claim of PAR, since certain forms of activism of the researcher may exercise and recreated forms of power. While I acknowledge the existence of power differentials in the research relationship, my role to pro-actively alter power differences as a result of structural oppression was limited. Nevertheless, by means of reflecting on the cultural, social, gender and historical forces that shape my interpretations (Creswell / Miller 2000).

3.4. Research Methods and Data Collection

After examining the ontological and epistemological perspectives of this study, this section interrogates the applied research methods which will allow the reader to understand how my thinking has influenced the selection and use of data collection techniques, tools and procedures. Moreover,
the intent of this section is to elucidate the procedures how the research of this dissertation was conducted. This will facilitate the understanding of the setting and circumstances under which the research was carried out and it will allow the reader to evaluate the robustness and credibility of the data (Mwaanga 2011).

Research approach

This study employs an inductive research approach to explore and interpret original data. Inductive research is not about testing an established theory as it is done in the hypothetic-deductive method, but rather to establish a valid proposition or theory as a result of data collected. Put it differently, the approach is to develop a theoretical framework subsequently of the analysis of data and therefore to allow theory to emerge from the data (O'Reilly 2009). The idea is to ask questions about ‘why’ and ‘how’ in order to develop and explain theory (Gratton / Jones 2010).

The inductive perspective has its foundations in phenomenology, which seeks to provide an in-depth reflexive description of how the world is experienced by those involved (Denscombe 2007). The inductive approach does not consider human beings as mere objects of research as in the positivist tradition of science. Human beings interpret their social world; they have consciousness and their own interpretations and views (Saunders et al 2009.). The vision is that an in-depth investigation of the different interpretations and meanings attached to MYSA and the conflictual events by the different vested interests will generate meaningful, qualitative data. The reflection on this data will form the basis to formulate a theoretical informed framework on empowering and non-colonial sport and development partnerships.

Research strategy

According to Saunders et al. (2009) a clear research strategy is important to answer the particular research questions and to meet the study aims. The choice of the research strategy is depending on the “research question(s) and objectives, the extent of existing knowledge, the amount of time and other resources” available, as well as the philosophical assumptions (Saunders et al. 2009: 141). As explained and justified above, participatory action research (PAR) was adopted as the main research strategy. It is assumed that PAR serves best to investigate the research questions and enables me to respond to the underlying issues and needs of this research.

It should be noted that the different research strategies are not mutually exclusive, but may be complemented. Therefore, case study research strategy was also used within the overall PAR strategy.

Robson (2002:178 qt. in Saunders 2009: 146f.) describes case study as ‘a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence’. In particular, a case study allows to obtain “a rich understanding of the context of the research and the processes being enacted” (Saunders et al 2009). While surveys are useful for generating answers to the questions ‘who’, ‘what’, ‘where’, ‘how many’ and ‘how much’, case studies are suitable for answering ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions, which are more explanatory (Yin 2009). According to in Yin (2009: 11) the strength of the case study strategy “is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence – documents, artefacts, interviews, and observations.” In line to the case study perspective within the PAR research strategy this study has drawn from multiple sources of data.

Methods of Data Collection
A critique of Participatory Action Research is that it lacks validity or in other words that the findings of the research are actually “about what they say they are about” (Popplewell / Hayman 2012:12). A way of establishing internal validity on PAR is method triangulation, which is the usage and cross-checking of different sources of data. This study addressed this limitation by generating, collecting and using a variety of data, i.e. interviews, observation, field notes and documents. The triangulation of the different data collection techniques also improved the quality and consistency of data (Saunders et al. 2009). Furthermore, during the entire research process importance was laid on reflexivity, which is a key ingredient for ensuring validity and rigor (Popplewell / Hayman 2012:12).

Regarding research choices, qualitative data collection techniques were employed (Makult / Morehouse 1994). The main interest of research is to explore meanings, notions and interpretations of events i.e. the current conflict, accordingly no quantitative data was be generated. The only quantitative data which were used are statistics about participation figures in the MYSA zones provided by the organisation.

The main source for generating primary qualitative data was in-depth semi-structured interviews. The aim was to “obtain thick, rich data utilizing a qualitative investigational perspective” (Tuner 2010: 744). Elementary to qualitative in-depth interviewing are, first, open-ended questions, which allow the research participant to express her or his experiences and viewpoints in relation to the topic area; second, receptive and careful listening on part of the interviewer to ascertain if the research topics are addressed, and third the interviewer “follows up with probes seeking further detail and description” (Roulston 2010:15). According to Mwaanga (2011: 129) this interactive process “brings the interviewer into the world of the participant, providing understanding of participant perceptions, attitudes, feelings and opinions”. In contrast to unstructured interviews semi-structured interviews are conducted on the basis of pre-specified themes and questions outlined in an interview guide (Roulston 2010). This interview guide approach was also practiced in this study (see Appendix B: In-depth Interview Guide). The approach ensured the necessary flexibility to vary the questions depending on the interviewee, while the overall set of topics remained the same (Saunders et al. 2009). Patton (1990 qtd. in Mwaanga 2011:133) argues that a potential weakness of the use of a general interview guide is that significant themes may unintentionally not be raised. To overcome this limitation the interview guide was piloted beforehand and the topics were reflected with the dissertation supervisor, who is highly conversant with MYSA and the research context.

It should be noted that three broad categories of research participants were interviewed. One group were MYSA members (staff, board members, volunteers), the second group were MYSA stakeholders in Kenya and SSA the third category representatives of vested interests in the other one the MYSA stakeholders located in Europe and Africa including funders, partners and experts. In particular, questions about the MYSA organisation were omitted when interviewing the latter group. The aim of conducting in-depth, face-to face qualitative interviews was to explore the views and perceptions of the different stakeholders on development and partnership and on the current conflict and the changing partnership with MYSA in particular.

Over a three-month period (June - August 2013), a total of 17 research participants were interviewed in the course of sixteen interviews. Twelve of the interviewees were from the Global South, five from the Global North; thirteen were male and four female (for the List of Interviews refer to Appendix A). Out of the 17 three were 21 or younger and qualify as “youth” in the MYSA definition (age limit of 21).

In June 2013, during a three weeks period of field work in the Nairobi Eastlands, eleven research participants were interviewed face to face, including MYSA staff, board members and volunteers and
also a range of indigenous stakeholders in Kenya such as sport administrators and SDP NGO activists which have a connection with MYSA. The interviews lasted between 29 and 139 minutes, an average interview lasting 59 minutes. The interviews were arranged so that there were a maximum of two interviews per day. Face-to-face interviews in Nairobi took place in offices at the MYSA headquarter, at football pitches or in a restaurant. All interviews were conducted in English, which is neither the first language of the Kenyan participants nor of the researcher. The interviews were audio-recorded with the consent of the interviewees, one ‘open air’ interview with a volunteer. Notes were taken during all interviews for two reasons, first to summarize what was actually said which helped the transcription process and, second, for reporting relevant observations about the interview setting, the atmosphere and aspects of non-verbal communication (Denscombe 2007). During an interview with another female MYSA volunteer, no notes were taken since the interviewee obviously felt uncomfortable and distracted. Moreover, the West African SDP NGO expert was interviewed responded to the interview guide in writing via email.

In an effort to capture perspectives from Northern vested interests, selected NGO partners, donors and SDP experts in the Global North were interviewed. In total, five interviews were conducted with six interviewees. Out of the five interviews one was conducted face to face in Vienna and two via Skype and phone by phone.

In addition to semi-structured interviews, qualitative primary data were also gathered through observation research (Denscombe 2007). I engaged in a form of participant observation which is commonly associated with ethnographic field research. According Brewer (2000: 59) participant observation “involves data gathering by means of participation in daily life of informants in their natural setting: watching, observing and talking to them to discover their interpretations, social meanings and activities.” Essential to participant observation is building rapport with the research participants to learn and observe about the normal course of people’s lives (Brewer 2000). The major limitation of all observational techniques and participant observation is the potential bias of the observer (Mwaanga 2011). In my case another limitation was the short-term period of staying in the field, the participating observation of social anthropologist can last for several months (Creswell / Miller 2000).

Participation in daily life of MYSA included the regular visits of the headquarter office and socialising with MYSA staff, attending of football matches on zonal level and of Mathare United FC, visits of decentralized MYSA offices and libraries in Eastleigh, Githurai and Kayole, participating in a guided tour through Mathare valley, presence at the elections of the Sports Council and Community Service Council and involvement in non-sporting programmes, e.g. the launch of a magazine by the Shootback project. Through these field work activities I engaged in informal conversations and communication via phone or email with at least 50 different MYSA members and stakeholders. Participation and interaction was facilitated by fact that I stayed most of the time in Komaroks, an area where some of the research participants resided and by the pro-active approach of MYSA to involve me and give free access to their operations and staff.

To report my observations regular field notes were written (Denscombe 2007). The field notes were usually recorded on a laptop every evening after returning from interview meetings or field visits. The daily field notes combined the description of observations including minor incidents with an ongoing personal journal. The regular writing-up of passing thoughts, open questions and emotions proved to be a valuable source for an ongoing reflexive practice (Denscombe 2007). This method triangulation through consulting additional primary data was beneficial for reflexivity on three aspects: thoughts about my relationship with research participants and how this influenced the findings, my prejudices
and emotions and the practical and methodological problems encountered in the field (Lindhof / Taylor 2011)

Furthermore, also secondary data which provide indispensable data for social research were collected and used (Denscombe 2007). Secondary data comprised reports, documents and organisational records of MYSA, letters, comics, press releases and media reports. These documents provided valuable insights in the perceptions of the North – South partnership relations and their ideological underpinnings. In the course of the withdrawal of Strømme Foundation an in an effort to demonstrate transparency and openness, MYSA published the letter exchange between MYSA and Strømme and other documents including the investigation report on their website www.mysakenya.org. This extensive written exchange between MYSA and Strømme Foundation constitute a useful body of secondary data for this study.

**Sampling**

Sampling is the technique to select a sub-set of the population under study. Sampling allows for a reduction the amount of data to be collected “by considering only data from a sub-group rather than all possible cases or elements” (Saunders et al. 2009: 210). This allows the researcher to manage scarce resources, i.e. time and money. In qualitative research the aim is gaining in-depth understanding of events and realities experienced by a deliberately selected group of people (Maykut / Morehouse 1994: 56). As a result, the focus of sampling is on increasing understanding and not necessarily on generalizability of the findings (Saunders et al. 2009).

This study has used a mix of cluster sampling and purposive sampling techniques to select the potential respondents for the investigation. Initially a cluster sampling strategy was selected, which is a proceeding in which the population is divided into distinct groups or clusters prior to sampling (Denscombe 2007; Saunders et al. 2009). The population in our case includes the totality of all MYSA stakeholders and partners who have a vested interest in the current partnership conflict. The following seven clusters have been created:

**Table 2:** Sampling Clusters of MYSA stakeholders with vested interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Criteria / Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not involved Northern Donors</td>
<td>Northern donors who provide funding for MYSA programme about do not get involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Involved Northern Donors &amp; MYSA Friends</td>
<td>involved in MYSA programmes and provide also non-monetary assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Northern Sport &amp; Development Academics and Experts</td>
<td>contributed to the construction of MYSA in the international SDP movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southern Practitioners and Experts</td>
<td>conversant with MYSA programmes and who are critical about the continuity of unequal North-South relationships in SDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indigenous Stakeholders in Kenya</td>
<td>representatives of local SDP and human rights NGOs, sport governing bodies and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MYSA Staff and Board members</td>
<td>present and former salaried staff at MYSA headquarters or staff in MYSA zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MYSA Volunteers and Coaches</td>
<td>focus on young MYSA members and leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In cluster sampling, according to Saunders et al. (2009), only a few clusters from the full list are selected randomly. In this study I selected all clusters with the intention to conduct in-depth interviews with an average of three individual cases out of each cluster.
For selecting the individual reach participants the purposive and snowballing sampling techniques were employed (Maykut / Morehouse 1994). Purposive sampling permits the researcher to use his or her judgement to select cases constituting the sample. This non-probability sampling procedure is useful for case studies when working with few, specifically informative individual cases (Saunders et al. 2009:236). Furthermore, after conducting interviews in Nairobi it seemed appropriate to resort also to snowball sampling to identify succeeding respondents by proposal of initial respondents (Denscombe 2010). A challenge was to identify indigenous MYSA stakeholders who were critical about the role played by the MYSA organisation in relation to the accusations about sexual abuse, age-cheating and misuse of funds. The ‘closeness’ and social relations I developed with MYSA during my stay in Nairobi constituted a barrier to identified critical interviewees outside the “MYSA family”. After identifying an indigenous stakeholder who was conversant with the allegations and was willing to express criticality about MYSAs conduct, I was referred to a sport administrator and a SDP NGO activist who were willing to share their views of events. While MYSA made no direct effort to “control” my research touching on sensitive issues, one of the Kenyan vested interests outside MYSA insisted that the meeting remain strictly confidential and that I do not mention the name to anyone within MYSA.

Challenges in the Data Collection Process

The initial research design has foreseen a stronger emphasis on the discourses and development notions of the Northern donors. This proved to be difficult, because individual donors and experts in the North declined to take part in the research project. One explanation of why Northern stakeholders did not take part in the study project was a reference to the sensitivity of entire MYSA case. For example, one major donor declared that it is his “responsibility to ensure that I do not breach confidentiality or trust” with any of their partners (email communication, 11 July 2013). As a result, only four participants representing Northern MYSA donors and partners were interviewed. To bring in additional perspectives on MYSA from Northern vested interests, secondary data including a radio interview, memoirs, photographs and online comments on the MYSA case are used. Moreover, as a consequence, the study shifted its focus towards the perspectives of Global Southern actors. To make a southern, grass-roots perspective heard is essential in three aspects. First, to assess the way partnerships are perceived, second, to find out how development is defined from an indigenous perspective and finally, how alternate North-South power relations can be developed. However, a critical, in-depth investigation of development and partnership notions held by Northern SDP actors remains a highly relevant task for future SDP research.

Data Analysis

Data analysis is the complex procedure of interpreting and making meaning of the data (Guba / Lincoln 1994). A sound data analysis process is essential to strengthen the quality and validity of the research findings. The perspective of analysing the generated qualitative data of this inquiry was principally inductive. From an inductive perspective, theory will develop as a result of the data analysis (Saunders et al. 2009).

The inductive approach underpinned by an interpretivist and social constructionist perspective adopted in this study focuses on gaining an understanding of the meanings that study participants attach to the events around the recent MYSA partnership conflict. The challenge is to understand the different perspectives or realities that are constructed by the different vested interests, put into context and to search and reveal thematic patterns in the data (Saunders et al. 2009).
The goal of inductive data analysis is to ensure that “the theories explain themes from the data” (Mwaanga 2011: 144). The inductive qualitative data analysis procedures employed by this study encompassed coding, generating of themes and constant comparative analysis. In addition, a deduction perspective played a role in the data analysis, since I was acquainted with pre-established sociological theories from the literature review. I did not attempt to make the data fit these theoretical concepts, but allowed concepts to emerge through the data (Saldana 2009, Mwaanga 2011).

Constant comparative analysis is a process whereby different pieces of data (e.g one interview transcripts or one theme) are constantly compared with all other pieces of data. Through this ongoing critical procedure meaning is identified, confirmed or even discounted which then gradually develops into a core of emerging abstract concepts (Glaser / Strauss 1967).

The qualitative process of data analysis of this research started with transcription of in-depth interviews, reading through and jotting of memos in the transcripts and the field notes. The digitally audio-recorded interviews have been transcribed by the researcher using a word processor programme (Tuner 2010). Transcription started in the field but due to the large amount of data, most of the work was completed back in Austria, which limited the possibility for cross-checking with the respondents.

This was followed by coding from the data, which was done manually and using the analytic software programme Nvivo 8. Coding is a fundamental analytic technique which “will uncover an emergent grounded theory form the field of inquiry” (Mills et al. 2006: 29). An open coding procedure was used, which basically divides the interview into text segments and allocates code labels, thereby accurately describing the meaning of the text segments (Saldana 2009, Mills et al. 2006). The initial list of 62 codes was then reduced to avoid redundancy and keep them manageable. Using constant comparative analysis the shortened list of codes was collapse into five themes, which express major ideas on a more general, higher-level of abstraction. Themes aim at capturing “the essence of why something happened or what something means” (Mwaanga 2011: 146). For labelling the themes categories and concepts were used which reflected what I have encountered in the data (Saldana 2009).

Based on the generated themes I have created a narrative description of the themes for the research report. The themes form the basis for grasping meaning and ideally translated into a set of theoretical propositions or constructs which should help to explain North-South partnerships issues in SDP (Saldana 2009, Glaser / Strauss 1967).

Ambivalence of the Role of the PAR Researcher

It has been argued that participation of those investigated constitutes the key factor for producing quality action research (Popplewell / Hayman 2012). As outlined above, a relationship of trust and rapport developed between myself and a group of (male) MYSA senior staff and coaches, including SDP activists which I knew from previous joint project work. From a research point of view, these rather intimate relationships were desirable in terms of finding gatekeepers to get access and being involved in the daily routines of those researched. As intended by PAR, such a setting is crucial to establish a common ground for knowledge development and collective action between those being observed and the researcher (Denscombe 2007). Nevertheless, the “closeness and intimacy of the researcher’s role vis-à-vis those being researched” posed two major problems (Denscombe 2007: 220). Firstly, through the participation of upward actors like head office and management staff of Southern NGO the research process is driven by top-down demands (Popplewell / Hayman 2012). Bottom-up demands from downward actors such as members of the community, volunteers or members of vulnerable groups (e.g. PLWHA, teenage mothers or young prison inmates) are
marginalized. Secondly, through my closeness to the MYSA organisation and the fact that MYSA had a genuine interest of to restore their damaged reputation after the allegations, I was drawn into an ambivalent, normative debate. An independent, “objective” academic research would be helpful for the organisation to restore their image and credibility, which must be considered a highly important symbolic capital for a SDP NGO dependent on foreign aid. In a personal communication a MYSA board member wrote to me:

“During the darkest period earlier last year, I kept reassuring the MYSA leaders and staff that the truth will eventually prevail. Thanks to MYSA’s many true friends in Norway ... and hopefully your study as well ... that is finally and fortunately happening” (email communication, 9 June 2013).

During the research process PAR researcher have to manage multiple often competing demands (Popplewell / Hayman 2012). For example, the perception of one Kenyan sport stakeholder was that not all “truth” about MYSA has been revealed so far. She said: “it is very difficult to speak against an organisation like MYSA. ... If you complain against them and you still live in the slum then there are chances that you are being harassed by the rest of the members” (Interview 11).

This antagonistic situation generated a role conflict and raises questions several questions. How can a PAR researcher remain “neutral” and objective in a non-positivistic sense? Who actually participates in the research project for which purposes? How to balance the competing demands of different groups of research participants (Baldwin 2012)? One strategy of this inquiry was to hear and capture pluralistic perspectives of different vested interests, including female activists (Creswell / Miller 2000).

From the initial stages of the research I made clear to MYSA that this study has no intention to evaluate the ‘truth’ content or verisimilitude of the allegations or to blame any of the conflict parties. The MYSA - Stremme Foundation conflict is rather embraced as an ‘arena’ as defined by Long (2010), namely a spatial and social location where different actors (e. g. ‘partners’, stakeholders, leaders) “confront each other, mobilize social relations and deploy discursive and other cultural means for the attainment of specific ends” (Long 2010: 59). Consequently, the recent conflict represents a particular situation of dispute and disagreement between NGO partners in the SDP field.

Ethical Considerations

Good ethical conduct for carrying out research encompasses two main dimensions. First, the researcher is responsible that the collection and analysis of data is done in way that accuracy, validity and integrity are ensured (Open University 2008 qtd in Briscoe / Jackson 2012). Second, a principal concern in any empirical study which involves human-beings is to conduct the research in an ethical and respectful manner (Denscombe 2007). Ethical practice involves communicating clearly to those being researched and the wider community the purpose of the investigation and how the data and findings will be used.

To ensure good ethical conduct, this study follows the ethics policy of Southampton Solent University (see Appendix F: Ethics Form). For the interviews an Informed Consent Form has been prepared specifying the nature, purpose, and the possible benefits associated with participating in the research study (see Appendix C: Informed Consent Form). Moreover, ensuring anonymity for the interviewees and confidentiality of the data was ensured. The usual procedure was to hand over a copy of the consent form before the start of the face to face interviews and to explain the content verbally in addition. Establishing an atmosphere of trust, where the interviewee felt secure and comfortable to talk about sensitive issues including sexual abuse and corruption, was crucial (Creswell / Miller...
Research participants in Kenya demonstrated openness to talk about the MYSA – SF conflict. One key representative of MYSA even asked for disclosing his identity, because “MYSA has nothing to hide”. In contrast, Global Northern vested interests were far less willing to share their experiences. There was a general mistrust of being blamed or that confidential information might be disclosed (Denscombe 2010). This perception might also relate to the fact that most interviews with Northern research participants were conducted via Skype and phone which inhibited building up rapport.

3.5. Conclusion

This chapter aimed and justifying the adoption of a Participatory Action Research (PAR) paradigm informed by an actor-oriented, social constructivist perspective as the main research strategy in responding to the research questions of this dissertation. PAR seems to be appropriate in addressing methodological problems within SDP research, namely that academic knowledge production on Global Southern actors is predominately produced by and for the Global North. Striving toward the ideal of participatory action research allows for a participation of marginalized research participants.

This chapter also presented procedures how to improve validity through triangulation and researcher reflexivity. The position and potential biases of the researcher impacts the interpretation and analysis of data and findings. To acknowledge this fact is in particular relevant for this study, which aims at gaining an understanding of the conflictual relations between Northern donors and Southern SDP NGOs. Therefore, I have elaborated on methods for generating in-depth qualitative data which are likely to bring local experiences, perspectives and discourses to the fore and are overall sensitive to relations of power relations (Kay 2009).

Following the explanation and critique of the methodology and the methods, the next chapter will draw on the data to address the study aims of this dissertation.
4.1. Introduction

This chapter draws on the collected data to answer and address the dissertation's research questions. It presents the study’s main findings by drawing on mainly qualitative narrative.

The sections are organised according to the central themes that emerged in data analysis, which are (1) competing social constructions of MYSA (before and after the conflict), (2) MYSA self-identity, (3) meanings of development, (4) negotiating and contesting partnerships, and (4) visions of reform.

Qualitative data is presented in sequences of narratives as thick description exploring these themes, followed by a more critical analysis. The principal findings are highlighted and compared with relevant current conceptualisations and previous studies. This helps to evaluate and assess the significance of the findings. Based on a comprehensive analysis of the primary and secondary data, qualified generalisations will be made.

The overall aim of this study is to gain a critical understanding of enduring post-colonial power relationships and discourses in the field of sport for development and peace. Therefore, I examined the partnership relation between the Southern SDG NGO MYSA and their main Northern funders. Specifically, I focused on the competing and changing views on MYSA of different stakeholders and vested interests after the current conflict. This study thus presents findings regarding how the research participants understand and experience partnership and development. Furthermore, this chapter discusses factors and conditions which hinder or lead to (dis-)empowering processes in the context of sport-for-development practice and partnership working.

I strongly focus on the narratives of the research participants, which negotiate, contradict or sustain dominant discourses on “MYSA”, development and partnership. To provide “space” to the perspectives of actors from the Global South is consistent with a social constructionist and PAR paradigm and reflects an “anthropological approach” to SDP research (Lindsey / Banda 2011: 92). According to Long (2001:3) social constructionism employs discourse analysis to better understand “processes of social interaction and negotiation, the constitution of power relations, and the co-production of knowledge” (Long 2001:3; Gergen / Gergen 2008). Thus, investigating the different meanings attached to MYSA and the current conflict by the different vested interests is based on a constructionist epistemological position. Furthermore, a perspective considering the views and narratives of the research participants as a main source for generating culturally relevant knowledge is a key ingredient for Participatory Action Research.

This following section provides a contextualisation of the current conflict and discusses contradicting views on the current conflict.

4.2. Contextualisation: The crisis’ impact

To put the case study's findings into perspective, I provide a brief descriptive account about recent allegations against MYSA and the subsequent partnership conflict with the Norwegian donor NGO (See Appendix A for a chronological narrative of the events of the conflict).

Following a whistle-blower report in September 2011 by a Norwegian police-man and his wife claiming age cheating, misappropriation of funds and sexual harassment of female players by male coaches, one of MYSAs most important international funding partners, Strømme foundation, put their long-standing partnership on hold. Toskin 2012 Strømme Foundation (SF) and MYSA agreed in December 2011 to commission an expert on women rights from the Norwegian Olympic Committee
(NIF) to conduct an investigation report. The findings of the drafted report seemed to confirm initial
allegations against MYSA including identity falsification (age cheating in connection with
international sports events), misappropriation of funds and other forms of corruption, and as well as
sexual harassment and abuse of girls and young women (Strømme 2012). Nevertheless, the report was
criticized by the renowned SDP academic Fred Coalter, for instance, for its poor methodology.

In March 2012 after SF unilaterally published the drafted investigation report, an open conflict
emerged between MYSA and the Norwegian NGO, reflected in accusations and defences between the
two organisations. The allegations were also broadly discussed in the public sphere ranging from
newspaper and TV reports in Kenya and Norway to a debate in the Kenyan parliament. Indigenous
stakeholders encompassing women and child right activists, other sport and development NGOs, local
politicians and football administrators, and members of community (parents, teachers, local leaders)
were all concerned about the incidents and engaged in explicit and informal discourses about the
trustworthiness and credibility of MYSA as a promoter of development.

In April 2012, the Strømme Foundation put an end to the 16-year partnership with MYSA. Other
Northern donors have either withdrawn or reduced their funding. While MYSA members admitted
that they dealt since 1991 with 34 cases in connection with sexual abuse, age cheating and corruption,
MYSA has fiercely dismissed the allegations as a “witch-hunt” (Toskin 2012).

The immediate effects of the withdrawal were massive: MYSA lost almost half of their funding. They
were not able to pay their staff’s salaries for months and eventually retrenched 14 out of 56 staff
members. A MYSA executive staff admitted “we couldn’t survive; the moment they pulled we
immediately went bankrupt… That is the tragedy of what happened, change of management in the
partners means death to MYSA [laughs]” (Interview 4)

According to one statistic, the number of registered teams in the 16 zones dropped from 1700 from
2012 to 789 in June 2013. This would constitute a decrease by 53,6 %. Girls particular withdrew from
their teams. The number of girl teams according this statistic dropped from 320 to 143 (55,3 %) in
2013. In the under-14 age group, 14, 75 % of the girls team withdrew.12

Perception of the crisis’ impact

During the fieldwork and in the interviews, the Northern donor's withdrawal was perceived as
“unfair” and having extremely adverse effects on the sport for development programmes, the
organisation and the community. Common references to Strome were that they “destroyed MYSA”
(Interview 9) or “closed the shop” and that “the moment they pulled out we almost, almost went
under” (Interview 4). Two main areas of concern emerged: One, the cutback of the football
programme including travel opportunities to Norway, and second, mistrust and losing credibility with
the community.

12 The statistics on team registration according to age group and zones were gathered in June 2013 and are
based on the figures as they were displayed publicly at the reception of the MYSA headquarter office. On 31
October MYSA provided me with up-dated figures regarding registration of teams which reflect a less dramatic
picture in terms of the decline in participation from 2012 to 2013. The total number of team dropped from
1700 (2012) to 1369 (minus 331 teams); the total number of MYSA members dropped from 24.020 to 19.940,
minus 4.080 members) . The explanation provided by MYSA was that the chart displayed on the notice board
at the office was not up to date at the time. Another explanation is that the number of teams which registered
went up between June and October 2013.
A **MYSA volunteer** (Community Services, male) voiced his concerns regarding the cutback of the sporting activities:

“last year we took three teams to the Norway Cup, now it becomes only one team in a difficult situation... but unfortunately we are taking only one team and it’s a female team, for me this is pinchy. These people have brought us in this situation now. Many partnerships are now quitting out from MYSA because of the allegations they took.

Likewise, a Kenyan **SDP NGO activist** (male) and former MYSA staff laments the adverse impact on the community and girls in particular:

“Yes, a lot of things have gone down. And the difference is huge because so many staff are losing their jobs, so many zones are not playing, so many girls have given up playing. So many girls and boys, their target was not only to play football [but] it was only Norway Cup ... when you hear people go to Norway Cup, they go to earn some money for their families and all that. But since this is not anymore there it’s a very big impact. For us, for the community it’s a very big loss”

In a less dramatic recount, the interviewed **MYSA senior staff** (female) confirmed the negative impact due to sudden exit of the Northern main donor:

“it hit the organisation a bit in terms of registration, because due to the lack of finances we could not start our activities on time and that led to some of our members going to other organisations. ...yes, scholarships were put on hold, other projects like Child at Risks were put on hold. Shootback was put on hold because of issues of funds. Because MYSA is an entirely donor dependent organisation and if we have not funds ...we cannot trust these people” (Interview 9).

For the volunteers, a main concern was the loss of credibility amongst parents and the community at large. A recent study on the Football for Hope centre at MYSA observed that a key factor for the success in engaging so many youth into their football activities is the solid reputation with the community. This symbolic capital is conceived to be under threat. A **MYSA volunteer** (Community Services, male) described the mistrust his organisation is facing:

“The children and the office is also suffering, and also the volunteers will suffer now, the 25,000 youth who are registered with MYSA are now in a messed situation because of their allegations, because it was gazetted all over Kenya and people say: ‘I don’t want my child to play in MYSA. Because they have been accused of is sexual harassment and misuse of funds, then we cannot trust these people’” (Interview 6).

A **MYSA volunteer** (20 years, female), member of the MYSA Executive Council echoed the ramifications of the Strømme Foundation (SF) exit from her zone:

“In every zone there is a labourer, [the MYSA worker in our zone] had to withdraw, ..it was very difficult, because you can’t convince children their isn’t money, they are just looking and say the elders they are the ones eating money, the management is the one using money, but they can’t understand there isn’t enough money, but when we had Stremme everything was going well. But without Strome everything starts going down. Like scholarship, these days pupils are not given scholarships. A lot of shortage came without Stromme ...even people now felt MYSA is going to end, but it can’t” (Interview 7).

The accounts suggest that due to the budgetary cuts, the on-going process of decentralising MYSA's structure came to a halt. The idea behind decentralising was to bring the football activities closer to the communities and “consolidate links with local stakeholders (e.g. parents)” (SAD 2009: 21).
These elaborated narratives demonstrate the perceived dependency of Southern SDP NGO such as MYSA from Northern funding and how this structural imbalance is collectively experienced by Southern SDP practitioner as impacting their daily practice. The withdrawal of the funding is felt to be unjustified and deliberate and has created feelings of being at the mercy of an external aid agent. From an empowerment point of view, research participants perceive that they cannot “exert control and influence over decisions that affects one’s life” (Zimmerman 2000:43). To sum up the overall perception of the crisis’ impact is a feeling of disempowerment.

The data signifies a state of passivity towards events which seem to be entirely induced from outside. However, the data also reveals that the MYSA volunteers and staff share a perception that they are capable of reacting pro-actively to the crisis and devise alternatives to cope with donor dependency. This aspect will be presented in the section “visions of reforms.”

4.3. External Constructions of MYSA: From “donor darling” to a “bunch of molesters”

Populist representations of MYSA as a model for SDP

In chapter two we examined the academic discourse on MYSA and how a celebratory SDP academia helped to construct MYSA into a paradigmatic flagship model for SDP. Examples for a thoroughly positive reference to MYSA in academic research include: “high profiled NGO” (Burnett 2013: 8), “major and longstanding sport-for-development organisation” (Coalter 2012: 307) and “largest youth soccer programme in Africa” (Coalter 2007:298). Also Brady and Khan (2002: 2) describe MYSA in a very positive light: “This dynamic grassroots organization, which seeks to link youth development, sports, and environmental activism, provides a fascinating example of the role of sports in development, as well as its potential to transform gender norms.”

Likewise, the interviewed MYSA board member recounts the organisations’ eminent and pioneering role in establishing the academic field of sport for development:

“By 2003, 2004 there were a few articles but nobody in academia was taking sport and development seriously even then. And this was only 6, 7 years ago. Yes, the UN would have a task force on Sport for Development and the MDGs and that sort of things but it was not taken very seriously in the academic world. And Fred [Coalter] was clearly one of the first to do so at Sterling University.

Referring to the pivotal role of individual Northern SDP scholars, the MYSA board member continued:

“So he [Coalter] has got this big contract form UNICEF to do a sort of analysis on Sport for Development. So he came here and he has pretty well done it ..... He said ... ‘I realize I have to rip the whole damn thing up and start all over again, because what I have written is nonsense, you guys are doing the real things here. So he wrote an evaluation manual ... And it still is one of the benchmarks in Sport for Development. ...He is a fan of MYSA but he is not wearing blinkers about MYSA”

(Interview 5)

The statement suggests that Northern academic activists, who have close relationship with the origination played a main role in establishing MYSA’s popularity and global recognition of MYSA as a sport for development model organisation. The interviewee also referred to the facilitating role of non-academic actors in establishing SDP, for example the UN. Outside the academic world, popular textual and visual representations of the “MYSA success story” were elementary in creating an iconic image of the organisation. A key agent in the construction of MYSA as a flagship project of the emerging SDP movement is the United Nations, who (re-) produces populist images of MYSA. The
UN system and in particular the UN Office for Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP) in Geneva and New York are key in institutionalising and informing the emerging SDP sector. The textual and visual representations of MYSA produced by the UN system are informed by individualized stories on how sport can “rescue” individuals out of the “slum”, while neglecting structural issues. In such a neo-liberal discourse the notion of “slum” usually represents abject poverty and hopelessness, which can only be overcome when individuals show virtues such as determination, discipline and leadership.

For example, when Wilfried Lemke spoke in a radio interview about his experiences as the United Nation’s Special Adviser on Sport for Development and Peace, he employed a narrative which constructed an image of Mathare valley as the locus of absolute poverty on the one hand, and on the other hand he presented himself as the “saviour” elevating young people out of misery.

"Even more beautiful for me is when I can change people and destinies and that is something I can do in my job. I can manage that an initiative is supported. I can fix it that we can bring young Africans, who are from the ultimate misery, here to Germany and invite them to an internship. ...Peter Ndolo, who works in a slum sport project, which is called MYSA in Kenya, whom I met 2 1/2 years ago in the slum project.

Then he said, as we sat in his small, dark shack "Were you ever in the slum," I said, "No, I've never been in my life in the slum," he said. "How do they feel about, what are you expecting, when you enter such a slum?". I was gobsmacked. Anyone can try to answer the question for himself, since we have all seen images of slums before” (Lemke 2010; translation from German original)

The statement of the UN under-secretary–general Lemke illustrates a paternalistic approach to “development”. Lemke portrays the MYSA volunteer as somebody who lives in “ultimate poverty” and who seems to sit in his “small, dark shack” waiting for someone to rescue him and to bring him to the Global North. Here Lemke assumes the role of a benevolent “saviour” who has the power to “fix” things for the poor MYSA activist. Lemke seems to be disconnected from social reality (“never been in my life in the slum”), but uses his superior status to help. In his memoirs, Lemke (2010:108f.) unfolds a similar narrative about his first visit of Mathare valley in 2008. To describe his impressions he uses emotional language (e.g. "dirt everywhere", "seething cauldron", "lethargy", "dirty little children", "chaos" and “stifling poverty”).13

While acknowledging the local work of MYSA, Lemke suggests that the impetus to overcome squalor in Africa has to come from external actors in the Global North. Lemke claims that “we must not let up, we must go to the slums and set something in motion” (Lemke 2010:110). Lemke admits that his “ulterior motive” for bringing the “slum youth” Peter Ndolo as an intern to a German radio station was to “train him as a real role model, how I personally imagined it” (Lemke 2010:113; emphasis in original).14

Here, the UN SDP representative seems to suggest that his own, Northern notion of development is superior to local conceptualisations. Furthermore, in the radio interview Lemke refers to the 25-year-old Peter Ndolo, who went to Bremen as an intern in 2009, as “my boy” (Lemke 2010a), which bear a resemblance to colonial discourse where the colonizers referred to the colonized as child-like

subjects, which were in need for the guidance and help of the “‘white men”. Paternalistic language is also to be found in fundraising campaigns of Northern charities and NGO, where representations of the passive, poor and innocent African child are employed (Dogra 2012).

A further key role in the popular construction of MYSA as a “slum fairy-tale story” have been played by sport celebrities, who visit MYSA and give a testimonial on behave of a Northern donor or partner. International and local media as well as the communication departments of the donors cover these short-term visits, which usually show the Northern athlete playing with MYSA kids in an impoverished slum environment. For example, Laureus foundation organized the MYSA visits of the French footballer Marcel Desailly and the US sprinter Michael Johnson (2006) and the tennis legend Martina Navratilova (2010) (Laureus 2006). As Black (2010) observed these celebrity “athlete ambassadors” are vital in channelling resources from the affluent North to the SDP projects. Furthermore, the MYSA story is also reified in popular publications, for example in Declan Hill’s bestseller “The Fix - Soccer and Organized Crime” the chapter on MYSA is called “The Salvation of Football” (Hill 2008).

Another example of MYSA's populist representation involved the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon at an IOC congress. In an effort to symbolize the importance of sport for children living in poverty Ki-Moon presented a *juala* ball, a football ball made of waste bags usually made by children of poor communities in Kenya, to the IOC president. Initially, the ball was personally made by Peter Ndolo of MYSA and presented to Lemke. Eventually, the ball was auctioned in Dubai and then returned to The Olympic Museum where it went on display (Korir 2010). IOC president Jacques Rogge said:

“This simple football symbolizes the cooperation between the IOC and the UN to bring the uplifting power of sport to those in need. It is a welcome addition to a museum that showcases and celebrates the Olympic values and athletic achievement” (Korir 2010).

Instead of interpreting the *juala* ball as object of poverty and deprivation, which is no longer widely used in the Nairobi slums, it has been manufactured into romanticized, decontextualized symbol in a Northern narrative about the “power of sport”. In the functionalist discourse of the UN System MYSA has become to represent a positive “slum fairy-tale” divorced from a social reality marked by exploitation, conflict and dominance. MYSA founder Bob Munro (2010:9) criticised SDP donors for only focusing on “the good, the true and the beautiful”, while neglecting the harsh reality of working in a slum area. Partners in the North should therefore highlight the “dark and often hidden side behind our laudable goals and glowing reports on our many achievements” (Munro 2010: 10).

To conclude, the manufacturing of decontextualized representations by UN system and other Northern agencies have contributed to the development of MYSA into an iconic and paradigmatic model SDP NGO. Such decontextualized representations by Northern actors have contributed to the development of MYSA into an iconic and paradigmatic model SDP NGO. Moreover, the data supports the research by Dogra (2012). She observed that international NGOs and donors work with prevailing dualisms which differentiates between a Global Northern “us” which is assumed to be the active “givers” and a Global Southern “them”, which are passive “receivers” (Dogra 2012: 22f.). Such dominant dualisms do also feature prominently in the discourse following the accusations.

**Northern blaming the African other**

After the allegations against MYSA became public, the image of the SDP “darling project” started to transform. A discourse evolved which turned the erstwhile iconic SDP model into its opposite. The
trusted, reliable and effective partner altered into an organisation “full of thieves, age cheats and sexual abusers”. In Norway a discourse evolved which constructed on the hand an image the “Self” of the Northern donor as ethically superior, democratic and high-toned in contrast to the African “Other”, imagined as morally “rotten”, corrupt and not sincere in protecting potential victims of sexual abuse. In a press release announcing the end of the partnership with MYSA the CEO of Strømme Foundation states:

“We deeply regret that we have come to this. There are girls and young people in Mathare who are the losers. We had hopes of reaching a common ground where we can work together with a renewed focus on the rights of young girls and boys in Mathare. We had a desire to do it with MYSA. Now we see, unfortunately, that we have a different understanding of reality in regards to this, and we regret that we are in a situation where MYSA does not appear as an organization we can continue to work with and just to focus on the abuse of power and practical [youth] rights work” (Press statement by SF CEO Øyvind Aadland, 27 April 2012).15

In this statement the Northern donor is constructed as the only guardian of human rights and true protector of the youth in the Mathare slums whose rights are continuously violated. The Southern partner in portrayed as unwilling to challenge “the abuse of power” and to work sincerely towards the adherence of youth rights. A Norwegian NGO activist who supports slum kids in Nairobi commented on the case:

“We have lived so long in Kenya that we actually thought this was common knowledge ... To perform tricks with age to those sent to Norway Cup is commonplace. The girls have to "earn" the place for the Norway Cup is also something that has been talked about for many years. ...Unfortunately its not only the question of MYSA and this is one of the tragedies of aid directed towards Africa. There is always someone who will 'eat' ..” (Jonny Mydland, Maisha Mema charity, 2 March 2012).16

Here, the NGO representative suggests that age falsification and sexual abuse is “commonplace” not only in a single organisation, but in Kenya and in Africa as whole. Furthermore, the precious aid provided by the European Self to “Africa” was and will always be embezzled. Discourse, according to Baaz (2005:101) can be grasped “as a partial closure of meanings”. In the context of development aid the mechanisms of the discourse of African otherness entails that events which in different context are attributed to individual or other differences are understood in terms of ‘African difference’. In the statement above through the reduction of possible other meanings age cheating, sexual abuse and corruption become something “typically” Kenyan or African.

Speaking about the rigour approach taken by Strømme Foundation, the NGO activist continued:

“It is good that this matter comes to light, but it undeniably feels quite strange to Strømme Foundation, who have supported MYSA for many years with a total of 41.5 million kroner (!). Now Stromme foundation has enough and also a realistic perception that one cannot avoid all messiness in the cooperation with the various organizations, but the report ..suggests that MYSA is "rotten to the core"[original English] .... Even if such a disclosure could adversely affect the public perception of

15 Strømme Foundation Press Release on 27 April 2012 announcing the end of the collaboration with MYSA, http://strommestiftelsen.no/avslutter-samarbeidet-med-mysa [accessed on 15 August 2013, translation from Norwegian]
In contrast to the perception that the Southern NGO is an organisation which is “rotten to the core”, MYSA executive staff rejects a stereotypical collective branding as “molesters” and child abusers:

“So the evaluators were treating everyone here as a molester. Its very a sad way of looking at people who you worked with for so long and branding everybody in the organization, branding everybody we are all cheats, we all abusers and who have we abusing? Our own brothers and sisters because it is our brother who are playing MYSA its our sisters who are playing MYSA because MYSA only hires people who are members. So its not like we have come from Europe to run MYSA and then we are abusing MYSA kids, [but] our own brother, our own sisters, our own neighbours. So that’s also one other unfortunate side, complete mistrust, based on perception that has been created” (Interview 3, MYSA executive staff).

The Northern branding of the Southern NGO as collective “molester” may also refer to a colonial imagination of a high level and uncontrolled “black” sexuality (Negri / Hardt 2011: 136). The Northern narratives which blame MYSA for misconduct are underpinned by a Western discourse on promoting human rights, democracy and equality. In this context, a Kenyan football administrator commented on the different significance attributed to the question of human rights in a European context:

“All organisations, even governments have scandals, they have problems but the whites are really particular on human rights issues, really particular, this was not a small talk. Initially it looked like something small, later we realized this thing has gone global” (Interview 11).

The perception that a gross difference in the interpretation of the events at MYSA existed depending on the cultural and geographic position and the position in the development aid chain is also expressed by a Norwegian NGO representative (male):

“I think they [Strømme] managed it as poorly as they possibly could there was a sort of unilateral decision making all along the road even though they are giving lip service to a bilateral decision making process. The reality was that they for instance were releasing their attitudes or their decisions prior to any discussion with MYSA in the media actually. MYSA would learn after the fact of various decisions. And the decisions were made very much on a basis of a Norwegian cultural acceptance or non-acceptance of the issues and not being a voice for the MYSA cultural context, I thought they managed it very, very poorly” (Interview 17).

Here it is suggested that the Northern donor was ignorant of the local context and discourse and followed rigidly its own principles, based on a Western notion of defending the rights of children and young people. As Baaz (2005) observed in her study on development aid in Tanzania the “image of a democratic Self.. reflects the Nordic or Scandinavian identity, where the Self is constructed as the perfection of democratic, humanist Western tradition” (see Dahl 2001). In their claim of acting as the true custodian of youth rights in Nairobi, SF adopts such a prefect humanist Scandinavian identity.

Résumé on External Constructions

In his narrative on MYSA Lemke contrasted the Mathare “slum” as place of “seething cauldron” and “chaos” inhabited by lethargic people with his mission to “help” selected individuals to transform into “real role models” based on his personal preferences. The underlying process of constructing a difference between the benevolent European and the passive African is similar to the Nordic discourse which blames MYSA for neglecting child rights from a position of Western, humanitarian superiority. The data supports the idea that Northern-led development discourse is informed by a
colonial dichotomy between the civilised European “Self” and the African “Other” devoid of the idea of human rights. As Baaz (2005:116) argued, this image “reflects long-standing and generally shared meanings attached to an enlightened Western Self. Representations of a democratic, humanist European Self constituted an integral part of the colonial project. It defined the white man’s burden – to spread the light of democracy and equality, to liberate the Other” (Baaz 2005: 116).

The findings support what Dogra has found in her study on representations of Global Poverty. Public messages by international NGOs are characterized by „a dual logic of ‘difference’ and ‘oneness’“ (Dogra 2012: 22). Viewed through a postcolonial lens, representations and discourses establish dominant dualisms between a Northern “us” and a Southern “them”, between “givers” and “receivers” and between “active” and “passive”. However, these differences are connected by Northern donors “though specific notions of humanism, cosmopolitanism and human rights” (Dogra 2012: 23). Northern Perceptions of the misconduct within MYSA is based on colonial, benevolent attitude.

4.4. Constructing of MYSA Self-Identity: Rebranding the slum and social bonding

Parallel to the creation of an iconic MYSA model by the Northern Other, particularly by the SDP development academics and donors, MYSA nurtured and constructed also an image of the Self (Baaz 2005). The discursive representations employed by MYSA and its organisational constituent for creating the self-image were neither randomly nor purposeless. The constructed organisational identity serves internal and external purposes and is underpinned by certain notions of development and ideologies.

The data points to the centrality of the assumption of individual and collective advancement from a pejorative and stigmatised identity as slum dwellers to a positive self-image of “We”. In the data the overriding belief in local role models emerged. Positive role models and leaders are conceived to have to capacity to “rebrand” the slum and overcome negative traits. Furthermore, the organisations’ identity and social relations in informed by the value of social bonding, which is contested in the course of the current conflict. Reiterating the aspect of rebranding the negative image of the “slum”, a MYSA board member stated:

“When we started out in 87 we purposely chose the name Mathare and one of our goals was to change the image of Mathare in Kenya. Because at that time the only time Mathare was ever in the news was mob justice killing people, police raids, thugs, brewing illegal liquor and people dying from it, prostitution, that was it” (Interview 5)

To the above, the interviewed MYSA executive staff (male) added:

“I would say the first big benefit was the benefit of feeling a little bit of a relief, finally the slum is no longer or Mathare is no longer just about bad news, also something good can come out our community. And when you see their own kind being celebrated across the country or going to meet the president of the country and all that, so I think the main boost for the community is the pride and that the community has some pride, we can produce.. or our kids can be something” (Interview 4)

The aspect that SDP activities can be a contributing factor for creating the collective pride and reduce prejudice towards the marginalized community is significant in terms of

A key instrument for the rebranding the stigmatized image of Mathare valley and neighbouring areas is the football club Mathare United FC, established by MYSA in 1994. The symbolic role of the professional football club for the stigmatized community is stressed by a MYSA board member:
“...we have changed the name if you go around the country and you mention the name Mathare the first thing they talk is ‘Mathare United football oh, they are good’ you know and so it helped to inspire poor kids around the country, ... because they are poor and they know our guys were just as poor as they were and know the play in the Kenyan Premier league and on the Kenya national team and if they can do it I can do it. So it had a national impact. It particularly changed the image of Mathare people .. before you never ever admitted to anybody you are from Mathare” (Interview 5)

A boost for linking the name Mathare with “success” and “achievement” was in in 2008, when Mathare United FC (MUFC) won the Kenyan Premier League. The local media commonly refer to Mathare United FC to as the “slum boys”. It can be read as a gendered reference to positive “street kids” mentality, characterized by a fighting spirit and resilience. MUFC is become also a national model of good practice, as the sport journalist expressed in the interview: “the fact that quite a number of Mathare United player played for the national team, which is a unifying symbol, it was very easy for MU to be seen” (Interview 10). Therefore, MUFC provides a source of pride for the communities in the Nairobi Eastlands.

Moreover, the data demonstrates that the MYSA self-identity sustained by the idea of a social connectedness and social bonding. In fact, many MYSA members refer to the NGO as their “family” (Wamucii 2012: 191). Deriving a sense of social connectedness and social bonding through being part of MYSA, was reiterated by several respondents. Putnam (2000) has introduced a concept of social capital, which is informed by functionalist theory. Civic engagement such as the involvement in voluntary-based sport clubs creates social capital in the sense of increased social contacts, trust and a feeling connectedness. Putnam (2000) differentiates between bridging social capital, which is connectedness across heterogeneous social groups and bonding social capital, which refers to the stronger integration of homogeneous groups.

The data points to the centrality of the notion of social bonding through being a member MYSA. The idea of uniting the community (bonding) through MYSA activities evolved is of paramount importance. The social bonding aspect is seen by MYSA members as one of the most important values of taking part in MYSA programmes. A community services volunteer expressed this connectedness in the following word: “For me being in MYSA, doing the activities I enjoy I am well placed, I enjoy, I feel happy and do everything. Its home” (Interview 6).

One Kenyan stakeholder believes that the certain notions of collective and solidarity are part of a Kenyan or even African world view. He mentions immaterial and collective resources which the South can offer:

“Acceptance is a big one. In Africa for example, maybe I restrict myself to Kenya. There is always the feeling that you can offer something, that is the warmth, that is the love that is coming especially from people here. That willingness to listen, to stick through a difficult situation. Because African countries are poor by a definition of poverty by using maybe financial standards, but even without money these guys are willing to work” (Interview 10).

This ethos of collectiveness and also the social “rooting” in the community has helped MYSA to cope with the current crisis. A MYSA senior staff (female) observed:

“our staff stayed for 5 month without salaries and no one left so everybody was here for the interest of the organisation. If you were here for the interest of money than by now MYSA would have been empty without staff, but we were all here, our volunteers were all here understood the problems we had, because everything, everything passes through the MYSA executive councils, the volunteers themselves ...even the parents could come and asked us ‘Oh, we saw this on TV, eehh’. And no parent questions, ... The good roots that we have put in our stakeholders really helped us to come out of this situation” (Interview 9).
The data reveals that the assumed self-identity of the MYSA organisation is strongly underpinned by notions of true, grass-roots democracy involving the youth, who are willing to volunteer. The narrative that young community members are the true decision makers and that everybody “came through” the same egalitarian system is essential for the organisation’s self-image.

Speaking about the democratic governance, a senior staff at the MYSA headquarter states: “You find the MYSA organisation is entirely for the young people, they make decisions, and they have their own committees to look at issues. That all empowers them and this is a tool that keeps them in the organisation” (Interview 9).

Here it is important to recognise that the interviewed elected council members often referred to MYSA as “they”, which suggests that the volunteers conceive the salaried staff and the MYSA headquarter office as the core of the organisation. A 13-year-old zonal chairlady echoes this division within the organisation: “MYSA should improve by involving more volunteers, because without them there is no MYSA. Today there is no MYSA staff here [at the football activities], but the volunteers run everything. So MYSA should care better for them” (Interview 8).

Moreover, the senior staff member speaks about the NGO system of staff recruitment from marginalized communities:

“The other thing I look at is the power of the youth. MYSA has invested a lot in the young people and MYSA is for the young people and everybody in the organisation came through the same system including the CEO once played for a team that went to the Norway cup including one of us. MYSA is unique in that, we don’t get staff who come from universities” (Interview 9).

At this point it should be noted that in the course of the conflict, the bonding dimension within MYSA was increasingly met with suspicion. My findings suggest that the discourse on sexual abuse and corruption the strong ethos of “bonding” and the collective “slum” identity was transformed into its opposite: From a resource for collective empowerment into a basis for collective illicit activities. For example the previously acclaimed system of recruiting leadership positions and employee solely from the “MYSA family” was contested. The drafted report (Huffman et al. 2012) states that “there were indications of inequity in employment based on tribalism, nepotism” implicating that the “social bonding” factor may promote favouritism. It was also implied that MYSA would take a defensive stance towards the prosecution of the perpetrators in a deliberate effort to protect “family members.”

Another disruption of the NGOs self-image is the fact that not all members fit into the concept of a close and trusted family-like social system. When referring to the MYSA “success story”, narrations about the failures of the social bonding model tend to be absent or are not remembered. This omission in image of Self is echoed by a Kenyan sport media stakeholder:

“we have seen some of them who are failed to fit into the system I know of two former players of Mathare Youth that were killed by the police because they were engaged in violent robberies ...one of them was killed at Githurai; he was shot dead at bright daylight. He stopped playing for Mathare youth for whatever reason” (Interview 10).

Nevertheless, such tragic incidences reiterated the need for social bonding to keep faith with the collective ethos within the organisation, based on “positive” role models and peer leadership.

Indigenous Images of the North: Mzungu as the saviour

17 It should be noted that only 2% of all respondents named “tribalism” or “nepotism” as problem of MYSA (Huffman et al. 2012).
The findings suggest that MYSA is perceived as being “owned and run” by local youth, that the responsibility lays with the democratically elected voluntary youth leaders and all staff originate from deprived local communities. However this self-image as a genuine indigenous initiative is contradicted by narratives about the eminent role of the Canadian founder of the organisation, Bob Munro. Members referred to Munro as the “the eldest youth in MYSA”, “our friend” or simply as MYSA’s “father” (Hognestad / Sauvik 2011:8). Despite keeping a low profile Munro is still a powerful player in the organisation and played a crucial role in the conflict.

A Kenyan MYSA stakeholder stated: “And the beauty about it was that Bob Munro the founder of MYSA did not take a lead role. …. So the sport light was not on Bob Munro, but the leadership of these upcoming kids,...” (Interview 10). However, Munro is omnipresent in the narratives of MYSA members. For instance a 21-year-old volunteer recounts a sort founding “myth” of the organisation: “when our friend Bob come with that initiative that we need to do something and he came with a polythene ball, a nylon ball, ..the local name is juala. When he came with that idea he said “I need to do something for these people”. And slowly by slowly he achieved what he wanted achieve” (Interview 6).

The data indicates that Munro is portrayed as the active “giver” from the Global North that had a clear idea of how to help the poor in the Mathare slum. This is also evident in the produced imagery which portrays him as a “saviour” of the youth. For example, the MYSA library in Eastleigh is decorated with a big painting which shows Munro in a suit while handing over a branded t-shirt to a girl and a boy who look up to Munro. This image, showing a “white” person in a benevolent gesture towards African children conveys a subliminal paternalistic message often used in the fundraising campaigns of Northern development NGOs (Manzo 2008).

It must be emphasised that outside MYSA, Munro is considered to be controversial figure. In 2006 after Munro, acting as chairman of Mathare United FC, criticised corruption within the Kenya Football Federation, the minister of sport threatened to deport him (Thesbjerg 2007). Previously, volunteers had reported about allegations from “political elements” outside the community that “the white man is using” them (Wamucii 2012: 191).

Baaz (2005: 67) indicates that many studies on European images of Africa exist, but hardly on images of Europe in Africa. Post-independence images had its origin in colonial history and material prosperity and wealth were associated with mzungu (sing.) the word of white person in Swahili (Baaz 2005:68). In the East Africa context Baaz (2005: 68) observes that the image of the European is that of a “superior problem solver” and that respect would arise from his alleged economic endowment.

Speaking of the secret of the MYSA “success story”, a Kenyan football administrator said:

“I think it was proper marketing, Bob Munro the person behind it is Muzungu. Muzungu is white. We have a problem with Africans. And white people, they are more trusted, other organisations will trust when they see a white man in the funding, than a black person in the first instance. I know that, because they know our culture” (Interview 11).

Here the interviewee suggests that within a contemporary, racial discourse Africans are still viewed as less capable and less trustworthy compared to people of European decent. Moreover, due to the “whiteness” of the founder of the NGO, he was more successful to raise Northern donor funding. The respondent also proposes that the colonial stereotype of the ingrained inferiority of the indigenous is shared to a degree by her fellow Africans.
Likewise, the findings exposed the thought that MYSA’s “father” went too far in trusting the indigenous “slum” youth and that there is a need for him to take again firmer control. A SDP NGO activist and former MYSA staff said: “not in a bad way I blame Bob somehow entrusted his staff very much. Bob became too busy with Mathare United. So people got a chance to spend money the way they want” (Interview 13). In similar terms a sport journalist stated points to the assumed pervasive role of the Canadian founder:

“the model practiced by Munro, one by not getting directly involved has got its advantages. ... The disadvantage of that is if he detaches himself from the direct management of that organisation some of these kids because we know they are street kids and we know about their poor up-bringing. There is a likelihood that these kids can slide back into the bad habits, because they know no one is watching over them, now they become sex pests, they become molesters. That’s the downside” (Interview 10).

This comment discloses a perception that “street kids” despite all efforts of changing their individual behaviour essentially remain unreliable and deviant “street kids” and that there is need for constantly disciplining them. A former MYSA staff member expressed the fear that without an active role of Munro the whole NGO would collapse:

“Bob will not stay here in Kenya forever, maybe one day he wants to go back to his own place in Canada. What will happen to MYSA? ...If today Bob leaves MYSA what next are we going to leave it to our own people who are misusing money? Somebody has to take over the organisation and has to bring his own ideas.” (Interview 13).

The data above demonstrate that the discourse on explaining giving meaning to current crisis are underpinned by colonial representations and images of the “white man” imagined as “superior problem solver” (Baaz 2005). I found a few cases supporting the contrary, namely that Munro was criticised for his conduct towards Strømme Foundation. The former MYSA staff member stated: “Bob should not stand there [in Norway] and start accusing donors. Bob should sit down there and look at ourselves, how we are running the organization.” (Interview 13).

However, the investigation is consistent with findings of Baaz (2005) in Tanzania regarding the ascribed, superior role of the mzungu in a development aid context. While MYSA is a truly indigenous, “Made in Africa Sport for Development Project” (Interview 14), as one NGO activist put it, dominant development discourse infused with conceptions of African inferiority and European superiority continue to exert influence.

Conclusion

Overall, the findings demonstrate that sport and sport participation can act as powerful resources for a process generating social capital or enhance community capacity (Putnam 2000). Moreover, the success in establishing a positive image of Mathare valley as an icon of hope for its inhabitants and also other slum areas SSU may also facilitate a process of collective empowerment. The theoretical concept of empowerment on a collective level can be compared to social capital (Putnam 2000), but here the emphasis is on the transformation of relations of power between institutions, communities and individuals (Wallerstein 1992, Mwaanga 2011).

The nurturing a transformed Mathare slum identity and MYSA self-identity based on ethics, values and discipline is a resource for collective empowerment and can assist to change the course of life of Mathare communities, i.e. getting rid of stigma and creating social capital. The fight for a removal
and transformation of collective stigma by marginalized urban communities is also a fight on power relations.

In the context of the current crisis the social capital of MYSA facilitates to cope with the recuperations of the SF-MYSA conflict (Putnam 2000). Furthermore, using SDP programmes for social bonding seem to in particular effective in an impoverished context of urban poverty, aggravated by the effects of neo-liberal ideology (‘hollowing out of state’). The MYSA social system seems to provide goods and services including education, income and security, which are not provided by the public sector or other institutions. The downside of this closed “MYSA family” model is a lack of social bridging. Also in the international development aid arena the MYSA model was attractive. The story of the “slum boys” which started with small project linking garbage collection with football grew into a Global showcase for the power of sport to attain development was useful in channelling development aid to the organisation.

The data also suggests that MYSA is managed entirely indigenous staff recruited from the communities and is one of the few larger SDP NGOs in SSU. Nevertheless, the influence of the Global Northern father figure is significant in terms of the underpinning ideologies and discourses and a colonial mind-set seem to persist on part of several MYSA members. Finally, the allegations that members of the MYSA sexually abused other members particularly challenges the constructed self-image of a trusted “family”.

4.5. Meanings of Development

The usefulness of a discourse perspective on MYSA

Previous SDP studies have employed a Foucauldian discourse approach for the analysis of power relations within the sport for development field (Darnell 2010, Darnell 2007; Nicholls et al. 2010). A Foucauldian perspective development through sport constitutes a specific discourse “which does not reflect but actually constructs reality” (Baaz 2005: 178). This discursively constructed reality requires “a partial, temporary closure of meaning, a reduction and exclusion of other possible meanings” (Baaz 2005:11). As Mwaanga (2011: 24) contends discourse on sport and sport for development practice “privileges a particular form of rationality that reflects and legitimizes relations of power whereby the Northern development paradigms dominate SDP policy and practice.” Nevertheless, the following question should be raised: which conceptualisations and meanings are currently excluded in SDP and which are dominant?

For instance, the Kick AIDS Out approach which was designed by an indigenous SDP NGO in Zambia as an holistic HIV/AIDS educational tool based on wide range of discourses, later became “internationalised (Westernised)” with an emphasis on behavioural change, a discourse largely influenced by a Global Northern notion of development (Mwaanga 2011: 24). The Kicking AIDS Out (KAO) approach is also employed by MYSA when working with young people in various zones in Eastlands. It concentrates on educating on the ABC of HIV/AIDS prevention, which stands for Abstinence, Be faithful and Condomise. According to Mwaanga KAO education is founded on the assumption that “what young people need to prevent infection is basic knowledge and information, irrespective of contextual factors” (Mwaanga 2012: 330). Against this background, SDP practice in the Global South, such as the Kick AIDS Out programmes, do not present a counter-discourse to a dominant notion of development, but rather (re)produce a hegemonic discourse (Mwaanga 2011).

Accordingly, this section explores if MYSA as an organisation reproduces the Northern-led hegemonic development discourse through, for instance, a focus on notions of individual behaviour
change. Or is it rather that MYSA creates ‘room for manoeuvre’ and therefore succeeds to engage in forms of resistance and counter-discourses? In other words, does the MYSA development model constitute an alternative to the traditional Western model or is it rather a (re-)production of the dominant paradigm? Such questions refer to wider discussions within the development studies, namely the intersections between local agency and globalized structure.

Personal Development: Removing the “slum” mind-set

Questions in the interview guide aimed at exploring different understandings of development held by the research participants. It became evident from the expressed views both by Southern and Northern interviewees, that a strong connection was made between sport participation or being a volunteer in a SDP NGO and notions of personal development and individual behaviour change.

When speaking about sport and what it can contribute to the process of development, senior staff A of Strømme Foundation (SF) stated: “sports too has a lot into individual development, self-esteem, identity of the youth, leadership skills, you can learn from it but it has also a lot of this community benefits in too, like team spirit” (Interview 15).

Likewise, SF senior staff B added: “most important it [sport] should be a way to develop individual growth of the youth, holistically, not passion. And I think to a great extent MYSA has come a long way into a number of these areas” (Interview 16). Furthermore, for senior staff B “sport [for development]...has to be centred on empowering individuals and not creating on any kind of dependency syndrome”.

Hognestad and Tollisen (2004: 224) argue that the “Christian Lutheran ideology” of the MYSA’s main funder Strømme Foundation, which is based on impeccable individual conduct, had an influence on MYSA. In fact, the narratives of the Kenyan research participants revealed a normative, individualist notion of development. Sport is conceived as an ideal instrument for developing personal skills and competencies and it is seen as avenue to uplift individual from problems which tend to be associated with the “slum” (Willis 1999). A 20-year-old member of the Executive Council (female) gave testimony, about the perceived individual changes due to her involvement in MYSA:

“With me they [MYSA] have changed a lot! Because maybe if they never brought those games .I could have done bad things, even I could not be here on the place I am, maybe I could be a mother there ... It has helped a lot maybe I could not even finish high school and have going to college. But through MYSA it has helped me a lot” (Interview 7).

In the interviews with MYSA staff and volunteers the prevailing notion evolved that through sport for development programmes individual are imparted with discipline and personal leadership skills. Through these virtues individual are elevated from poverty and the “social immorals” prevalent in the “slum” context. In this model, sport for development is not only a forum for keeping the environment clean, but also keeping the youth morally clean. A MYSA executive staff (male) noted:

“...all the youth sitting idle, drinking alcohol and drugs they are part of doing something daily, to organized themselves, .... if you can get the youth busy, get them organized, get them operate in a structured way across the country. I think we can solve huge problems that we are having of drugs, of thuggery, which is brought by idleness and also its not only about kids playing football, it’s about giving them responsibility to organize the leagues themselves and to run it themselves” (Interview 3)

Moreover, the MYSA executive staff believed that “sport can keep the youth clean for 5 years and they never get tired of playing”. (Interview 3)
The “slum” in the MYSA development discourse is more than the deprived and impoverished urban area; it is a mind-set that could be overcome with individual behaviour change, as the MYSA executive staff states:

“One scholar asked me: if you guys are doing development, why is the slum still there? [laughing] then I said we never set out to remove the slum in the first place, its basically removing the slum from the people, not the physic slum but get the mind-set out the people and we have done that I think, nowadays.. when we started Mathare was name which nobody want to associate with” (Interview 3) 

The MYSA model of changing dysfunctional mind-sets through sport and other self-disciplining efforts (e.g. education) rests grossly on the notion of producing local role models and leaders.

A MYSA board member highlighted the significance of role models from within:

“...the most important thing MYSA did in the development process and that its nothing more important than that is to produce new heroes and role models for the kids. That’s MYSAs biggest achievement by far. I honestly believe there is nothing more important in development that providing new heroes and role models, in the communities in which the people are living. If he can do it I can do it, if he did it I want to do it ...a huge transformation within 10 years in the thinking of Mathare youth, then among the girls [occurred]” (Interview 5).

In addition, the MYSA executive staff member confirms:

“MYSA is all about developing leaders, you know, new role models and leaders for the community, so that the community does not look at guys who are doing the wrong thing, who are selling drugs to be the role-model, thieves to be the role-model, but role-models that are positive. And it’s all about developing individuals to be leaders for the country and for Africa” (Interview 3).

The findings also demonstrate that MYSA members perceive football as an individual avenue to escape poverty. The underpinning narrative employs the metaphor of football as “hope” to make the individual dream of attaining a better life and move up the social ladder come true. In this context, a Kenyan stakeholder stated:

“It is a fantastic idea, a brilliant idea. In my time as a journalist here I have seen so many football players both women and men, that is girls and boys. They have been able to relief themselves from poverty because of the MYSA programme...we have seen the progression of players through the ranks all the way to the national” (Interview 10).

Speaking about other alternative possibilities for social advancement, the Kenyan journalist adds: “Those who could not fit in in football, quite a number of them, went into leadership courses, I know two or three guys who are now in the United States because of that MYSA project, they were just street kids” (Interview 10).

Football as a social up-lifter

The findings suggest that MYSA adhere to an ethos that everyone is capable of moving socially upward and achieve success, dependent on the individual efforts. A MYSA board member stated “it’s that breaking of ceiling, breaking the lack of self-esteem, the lack of self-confidence, the lack of self-belief. You know the Mathare youth today is the sort of ‘I can be whoever I want to be’” (Interview 5).

This “American Dream”-like belief obviously ignores structural barriers, which hinder social mobility and social change. Nevertheless, the findings show that the MYSA focus is very much on football,
which is also perceived as a way of achieving direct material benefits. A MYSA senior staff member (male) acknowledged the salience of preparing members for professional football careers:

“Our target is not to produce the next Messi and the next Ronaldo, but then out of the sport and development programmes we organise, 3 or 4 or 5 players might become the top players in the country and might go out to play professional football. It’s not our goal but we end up having this” (Interview 4)

A 21-year-old MYSA footballer (qtd. in Hognestad / Sauvik 2011: 10) gave testimonial about the vision of football as a “social up-lifter”:

“When we were young the only thing that was on our mind was just to travel to Norway. Our family would forget the problem that was facing them and make a big party to celebrate when we travel and coming back. After coming back we are seen as big players. Then one has to focus and set a good example to the rest. Going to Norway was a starting point in making my dreams come true. I knew with a little more effort I can make it and also help my family out of poverty. If you make it, as players of Mathare, also the community share the joy” (Hognestad / Sauvik 2011: 10).

At this point it should be noted that MYSA and their stakeholders in SSU overtly employ instrumentalist notions of the ability of sport to “save” participants from poverty. For instance, Willis (2000) has quoted headlines form Kenyan newspapers including "Miracle in the Mathare Slums" (Hutchison 1994 in Willis 2000: 845) or "Soccer as Saviour" (Maser 1995 in Willis 2000: 845). Moreover, the common reference to Mathare United FC in the media is “slum boys” which seem in line with the clubs’ marketing strategy.

The aspect of gaining direct material benefits from participation in sport and development should not be underestimated (Wamucii 2012). Volunteers referred occasionally to fact that their involvement in MYSA contributed to make a living. Referring to transport expenses, a MYSA executive member said:

“[MYSA] normally pay the volunteers that is small, even if it is small it helps the volunteers, maybe you can build your house or rent. You can eat and cloth yourself. In education if you don’t have parents if they give you the scholarship you can be able to learn through MYSA” (Interview 7).

Similar comments suggest that gaining tangible benefits through SDP involvement seem to work as a motivating factor in an economically impoverished environment. Conversely, the fact that MYSA was not able to provide balls to the teams for two years and had to put 500 scholarships on hold due to the lack of funding led to a decrease in participation.

Individualised notions of development

The thick description presented above overwhelmingly supports the idea of youth sport as a tool for changing mind-sets and behaviours perceived as being dysfunctional and deviant. Sport is understood as an effective way of instilling discipline and moral into the young people. When asked about what development meant for her, a 13-year-old volunteer said: “to be mentored by someone or getting instructions and doing things which are right [for example] being obedient and avoiding peer pressure” (Interview 8). The reiterating of normative, individual behaviour seems to underpin the development model of MYSA.

The interviewed Northern SDP academic expressed his concerns towards a neo-liberal definition of development, which “put emphasis on individuals which also points towards getting people trained towards self-directing, self-government in terms of being in a position to take advantage of market
opportunities...Some projects focus is for example on measures of self-worth and self-esteem. This all very well but we need also need to look at the societal aspect which is key”.

A concept of individualised “heroes” and success stories lays emphasis on individual behaviour change and becoming a less “deviant”, more functional member of society, without challenging structures which produce poverty (Giulianotti 2004). A strategy of wiping out an ascribed slum identity and overcoming poverty through personal discipline, hard work and a rigid ethical behaviour is also informed by a (post-)colonial and neo-liberal discourse (Manzo 2007).

As Coalter has pointed out, sport has constantly been considered as an instrument for character building “not only developing personal and social skills, but also moral personality traits such as discipline, honesty, integrity, generosity and trustworthiness” (Coalter 2010: 296). Assertions based on crude functionalist notions about the transformative and socializing properties made sport also welcomed instrument for colonialism (Coalter 2010, Mangan 1986, Mangan 1988).

For instance, most sport and development NGOs in sub-Sahara Africa, including MYSA in Kenya, use football with the intention of changing individual behaviour of marginalized youth. This approach seems to constitute a continuity of the colonial team sport model, when football was introduced to “effect personality change and instil Western moral values” (Manzo 2007: 2). As outlined in chapter three, colonial pedagogy saw Western sports as a remedy to educate and shape personal character. The colonial “sport & development” model was to impart Western moral values and induce personality change among young males (Manzo 2007).

With regard to MYSA’s approach of transforming “bad” attitudes and behaviours of young people through football it cannot be interpreted as a simple continuity of colonial culture. However, when examining the abundant studies on MYSA it is striking to observe how little attention is paid to the historical context of football and “pedagogic imperialism” (Mangan 1986: 43). Nevertheless, it must be noted that influential dissertation on MYSA by the Canadian Owen Willis (1999) and the subsequent widely received article (Willis 2000) dwelled on the colonial history of football in Africa.

This gap is even more astonishing when looking at the intimate connection between colonial (and post-colonial) football culture and the underpinned masculine values. Colonialism in SSA was in no way neutral with respect to gender, but aimed to instil virtues such as “manliness” (Mangan 1986). With MYSA’s introduction of girls football in 1992, the challenging of male dominance and assigned gender roles has emerged into a backbone of the organisation.

It emerged from the findings that notions of development are also informed by neo-liberal discourse on sport and development. The focus on individual and personal development is a key aspect of neo-liberal development thinking (Coakley 2011). Coakley (2011) has argued that youth sports are often underpinned by neo-liberal ideological assumptions. The claim is that individuals participating in sport, would automatically turn youth into healthy, productive and deviance-free people. The neo-liberal claims of Western Sport Evangelism regarding youth sport fall into three categories: “personal character development, reforming ‘at-risk’ populations, and fostering social capital leading to future occupational success and civic engagement” (Coakley 2011:307f.). The narratives are overwhelmingly congruent with the first two categories.

The research revealed that the MYSA development model does not necessarily constitute an alternative to the traditional Western model, in some aspects it actually (re-)produces the dominant development paradigm. Nevertheless to conclude that MYSA youth programmes would actually produce “neoliberal subjects” consistent with predominant Global Northern ideologies (Giulianotti
2011:51) is insufficient. The articulated development notions do actually borrow from a neo-liberal, individualised discourse, nevertheless the development of personal skills and positive perceptions among marginalised youth through sport is informed by a concept of individual level empowerment (Mwaanga 2011).

4.6. Negotiating and Contesting Partnerships: Mutual trust vs. hypocrisy

MYSA’s International Partnerships

As the data reveals, MYSA is considered to be a key player in an increasingly transnational and globalized SDP movement and entertains a multitude of partnerships, networks and cooperation. A strong motivation for SDP NGOs from the Global South to work within Western-led international development networks is to get ‘access, leverage, and information (and often money) that they could not expect to have on their own’ (Keck and Sikkink 1999: 13 qtd. in Hayhurst et al 2010: 324). For example MYSA is firmly embedded within various Northern-led sport for development networks such as the FIFA Football for Hope movement, the streetfootballworld network and works closely with the UN system through the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSD). The list of MYSA partners and donors reads like the Who-is-who of the international Sport and Development mainstream: including UN agencies, development aid agencies, public sport bodies, football governing bodies, corporate sponsors and a range of foundations and NGOs (MYSA 2012).

All of these Northern organisations and institutions are engaged in a “partnership” with MYSA and they have played a role the construction of MYSA as a paradigmatic model of SDP. In terms of partnering with Global Northern agencies entails an integration and embedment into an international development aid chain (Harrison 2007). Such an aid chain can also be identified in the SDP sector. A table of a typical Sport and Development aid chain and the position taken by different MYSA partners is presented in Appendix F. Relations within “multilateral chain of international aid delivery” (Akindes / Kirwin 2009: 223) are infused with power and struggles over resources and meaning and different actors engage in discursive strategies negotiating and contesting SDP partnerships (Long 2011).

In reference to Kaldor (2003) Gulianotti (2011: 211) situates SDP organisations like MYSA into the field of “global civil society”, which should be assumed to be “a complex field featuring struggles, partnerships and interdependencies between interested individuals, groups and institutions which are seeking to define ad shape its constitution, identity and practices.” In line with this action-oriented perspective North-South partnerships have been analysed as an arena of struggles over meaning and resources, which need to be understood as dynamic relationship embracing different tensions and conflicts, rather than as inherently “natural” given of development practice (Baaz 2005). In this section the findings on the struggles over the meaning of “true” partnership are presented.

The Ideal Partnership Relation

Black (2010:125) noted that within SDP the key buzzwords “partnership” has “become profoundly ambitious in their meanings and implications”. However, the data shows that the research participants, both in the North and in the South had a clear perception what partnership should be. When describing the characteristics of good partnership working collective reference was made to the attributes such as “mutual benefits”, “respect”, “understanding” and most important “trust”. A MYSA executive staff noted:
“a very good example of partnership [is] where we share a lot of mutual respect, there is listening to each other and a lot of openness, frankness. And a lot of flexibility, I thought there was a lot of flexibility there, to me this is one of the best examples I can give [laughs] before whatever happened. Before the fall-out [with Strømme Foundation] I think it was excellent and that’s why we were able to grow as fast and as big as we did. We grew very fast. It was a dream kind of partnership I think it is not possible to get that anymore [laughs]” (Interview 3).

Speaking about the ideal division of roles between the North and the South, the MYSA executive staff added:

“The South partner is the one basically understands the problems on the ground, because the live it every day. But of course the North partner also has their responsibility to be.. to understand what is it you are targeting, what change you are trying to make, so I would say it should be a relationship where the South is able to clearly define what their goal is as an organisation and the should basically seek to listen more. If you don’t listen too keenly you may miss” (Interview 3).

In the same way, a MYSA senior staff stresses the need for Northern donors to get acquainted with the cultural and social context in which the Southern partner operates:

“..the Northern partner should also understand the dynamics involved. And if possible should also understand how this Southern partner operates. The culture, the environment, so many things, even the social setting of the Southern partner. It’s important to both of the partners” (Interview 4).

To summarise, the research has found that study participants adhere to normative ideas of an ideal North – South partnership relationship based on mutual trust, respect and shared responsibility. Such assumptions are also characteristic for the mainstream discourse in development cooperation, where conceptions of ‘partner’, ‘partnership’ and ‘empowerment’ have become key aspects of development policy (Baaz 2005). The expressed views on partnership seem also to be compatible with cultural ideas of African commonality.

Perceptions about Northern dominance and dependency

Against the backdrop of an image of an ideal partnership relation based on mutuality, respect and reciprocal relations, research participants overwhelmingly described their experience with the SF-MYSA partnership in negative terminology. Research respondents expressed feelings of being abandoned or “let-down” by a powerful Northern donor, which is perceived as acting arbitrarily in relation to the beneficiaries in the South. The findings demonstrate overwhelmingly a perception of Northern dominance and Southern dependency in partnership relations. The articulated criticism encompassed forms of confirming dominant partnership discourse approaches but also elements of discursive resistance. A MYSA volunteer, who was elected into the executive council stated:

“Strømme have published already things that MYSA is not good, they are corrupt... [They] poured out everything, without me knowing, so it’s like I am a fool. I thought I am coming here to talk to these people to make things in order, but unfortunately you find the things all over. Then people from that place look or view us in a bad image, so it’s like a pinching and a headache. ..We then took it in a professional way, slowly by slowly, to know the root cause .. we need [to do] 1, 2, 3 to make these things, but they rush. Strømme could have said they are quitting from MYSA partnership in a good faith rather than using these things to fight MYSA which was not good. We didn’t want to lose Strømme, but ... if somebody does not agree with you and wants to create a mess you say enough is enough, be aside” (Interview 6).

In this statement the SDP volunteer criticises the Northern donor for blaming the Southern partner, before analysing the issue without prejudice. The interviewee expresses the need for the Southern partner to preserve’s the organisations dignity by putting an active end to the uneven partnership.
Pointing to the sudden shift in the partnership approach on part of the Norwegian partner, a MYSA board member complained:

“Let’s look at the big picture. Here we have an example of an Northern NGO who doesn’t bother to see what a particular organisations doing, takes a single whistle blowers letter after working for 15 years, ... instead of saying like his predecessors ‘we have a problem how can we help’ he turns it around in a way to promote himself and make himself look good as the archangel fighting sexual abuse and age-cheating in the South. .. And he repeatedly went behind the backs of Mathare youth to the media in Norway. Does a partner act like that? Is that partnership, in any stretch of the imagination?”

Likewise, a female senior staff member disapproves the top-down, Eurocentric approach to partnership which lacks of understanding for the grass-roots: “My other question is do we sit in very high offices and discriminate other African organisations or do you go down to the organisation themselves and try to see what these organisations are doing better or areas whereby these organisations can improve?” (Interview 9)

A recurring theme in the narratives was a perception about a disproportional reaction of the Northern partner based on ignorance about the local context and unwillingness to listen to the Southern partner. The Norwegian NGO activist uttered concerns about the authoritarian conduct of the donor:

"the immediate freezing of all funding, immediate sort of putting very strong conditions to any resumption of funding, relinquish from [the] board, this is something of unheard in any partner relationship, when can you go in to define for a partner organisation that you have to change your board? It is a very strange, heavy-handed, very paternalistic reaction and with that kind of thinking and of course” (Interview 17).

The haphazard and paternalistic conduct from position of power is also uttered by the representative of the international SDP NGO in Ghana:

“The problem emanating from this incident is not what Strømme accused MYSA of but rather what it said, what it did and the judgment it passed, the way it went about it. For me this is the crux of the problem - A well to do foundation in the Global North funding an organization in the Global South and thus perceives to have the right to do with the organisation what it feels fit and can arbitrarily act and expects to be obeyed and followed, if you like” (Interview 14)

Moreover, the interviews responses clearly reveal that MYSA’s main donor is perceived to lack commitment to address the problems which arose. According to Nicholls et al. (2010: 258) a committed partnership in SDP “involves a long-term commitment to create forums to share successes and challenges such that admitting to failure does not jeopardize a Southern partners’ funding”. In contrast, a MYSA executive staff identified a lack of an “error culture” and a willingness to admit failure:

"you may be seated up in the North but if you are working, supporting us than you can’t say you are not part of the problem, I think to me this is my biggest disappointment. Saying you guys are doing [bad] and ...pointing fingers at something. We are one, that’s not partnership. Partnership is owning up to your part of the responsibility, because MYSA has the problem then Strømme has a problem, it’s not just MYSA having a problem. Just because they don’t sit here it does not mean they don’t own. They own our successes and they also own our failures” (Interview 3)

This Southern assumption about the Northern partner lack of ownership for failures relates to an idealised construction of the SDP “flagship” project MYSA. Northern donors, including the UN and FIFA, seek and make use the imagery of football playing “slum” children to illustrate the “power” of sport, but are hesitant to be associated with aspects of the harsh realities of underdevelopment (Manzo
Northern donors such as SF depended overwhelmingly on private donations and the retention of a seamless public image is a key objective. Any association with issues such as corruption or human rights violation is strictly avoided.

Form a Northern donor perspective the reference to the termination of the cooperation with MYSA is framed in bureaucratic language: SF senior staff A stated: “MYSA was a partner just like all other partner but it was in a way a special partner” (Interview 15). Likewise, SF senior staff B stated “we have finished this aspect [the MYSA crisis] we are into other projects, this is history” (Interview 16).

In contrast of such an austere view, the interpretation of the conflictual events on part of the MYSA interviews is characterized by deep-seated irritation. An emerging theme in the interviews was the questioning of the moral integrity of the Christian-based Strømme Foundation and to reproach double moral standards. A male MYSA executive staff said:

“And if they really, really were genuine they would have probably have helped us in advance. And this happened and they knew they didn’t really helped us in that area, to me the moral thing was to stay with us, say let us work together to see that it is not happen again and how to stop such situations in the future. But there’s was to cut, cut completely, [to say] we are rotten” (Interview 3).

In addition, a MYSA board member assumed double standards between Scandinavia and East Africa:

“They punished 25.000 innocent youth for the unproven allegations of a few and that’s where the hypocrisy comes in, For example in Norway there all kinds of incidences of coaches in football clubs and that abusing girls and in other sports, do you ban the football club in Norway, never! You go after the perpetrators, you don’t blame the whole organisation unless you have a mind-set that ‘they are all like that’, you know, so frankly is blatantly racist, it’s a racist view on the world” (Interview 5)

To allege the Northern partner of racism is a robust indicator that the partnership relation is not conceived as being equal and reciprocal but to have the Northern funder in a position of power, which allows him to impose his reality and meaning on the aid relationship.

A consequence of dependence on external funding and subsequent patronage is mission drift (Zaidi 1999). Southern NGOs and CBOs do not serve the needs of their target groups, but deliver services for the donor (Desai 2008). A MYSA senior staff member stated:

“Northern partners also need to understand the programmes well, before they support. And then they should not be like dictators. Because I have seen cases where Northern partners say Ok, you need this? OK I’ll give you this, but you have to do this, while your target was to do this. ... You come to realise that they are pulling strings, pulling shorts, you do not work towards achieving your objectives as an organisation, but you work towards achieving objectives of somebody else” (Interview 4)

The narrative addresses the issue of mission drift due to autocratic conduct of the Northern donor. Furthermore, the Northern partner was blamed lacking any understanding for the Sport for Development approach. An MYSA executive staff commented:

“We were funded by an organisation, by a Christian organisation that..., yes they appreciated our work, but they never appreciated the theory, the sports for development approach. For Stromme they don’t know what sports for development is. That is stories for them” (Interview 3).

Beyond a “North – South” conflict
At this point it must be emphasised the MYSA respondents were nuanced in their interpretation regarding their relations with Northern agencies. Contradicting evidence emerged regarding the interpretation of the crisis as a conflict between the Global North and the Global South. While Størmmme Foundation was portrayed as the antipode of genuine partnership, other donors were viewed with appreciation. A male executive staff member said:

“we have partners who believed in MYSA and in the partnership, like Laureus even in the face of all of all this bad media and everything stood firm with MYSA. That’s for me one example of partnership. They didn’t run away and say ‘now we can’t be associated with this guys otherwise they taint our name” (Interview 3)

Comparable statements suggested that the issues, which emerged with SF, were not consistently attributed to uneven power relations but partly considered as the “bad” behaviour of one Norwegian actor or even one particular individual within that organisation.

Moreover, the findings show that the tensions were not solely perceived as a North-South conflict but a battle between individual male leaders. A Norwegian NGO representative observed:

“It developed more a sort of trench wall between MYSA and Størmmme, basically on a leader level, because you have these two elephants at the top, Bob Munro and Øyvind Aadland who transformed this very much to a personal prestige thing with very, very negative attacks on each other and where you lost the focus of the causes of this conflict and it became more of a prestige thing. ...There is this saying, I think in Zimbabwe: When the Elephants fight then it is the grass which suffers and ...basic core activity of MYSA and the basic approach of using sport as a development tool suffered” (Interview 17)

The narrative of the Northern SDP practitioner suggests that the conflict was aggravated due to a personally clash and that not only local SDP programmes were negatively impacted but also the entire SDP approach. Explanations why the conflict escalated Strong focused also on the behaviour of a single person, the CEO of Størmmme Foundation. A MYSA board member said about the CEO: “he.. went to the media to tell them what a good guy he is because he was acting on these things that were happening in MYSA. ... I am only doing this to protect the youth and protect the offence of the rights of the youth, that’s hypocrisy, its self-righteous hypocrisy” (Interview 5)

The findings suggest that a discourse evolved among MYSA members which on side made a clear distinction between the “good” current and the “bad“ past Northern donors. Moreover, such a normative perspective together with the personalised explanation of the partnership conflict leave little room for a more structural reflexion on power disparities between North and South relations or the impact of postcolonialism. While the narratives are highly critical about one donor there is only partial challenging of the overall “rules of the game”.

Conclusion

Issues of donor-recipient relationships and the danger of promoting new patterns of dependency are a concern within SDP (Coalter 2013, 2010). Coalter rejects the assertion that the quick growth in influence of SDP NGOs would represent “new forces of neo-colonialism, with their main leadership and strategies being formulated in the West” (Coalter 2010: 17). Based on the empirical example of MYSA Coalter argues that, contrary to the internationalist stand within SDP, dependency would not constitute the “predominant relationship” between Northern donors and Southern NGOs (Coalter 2013: 17, Coalter 2010). Coalter contends that MYSA was “strong enough to negotiate funding on the basis of its own definition of its needs and approach” (Coalter 2013: 17).
This study's findings clearly demonstrate the opposite. Despite its privileged position within the development aid chain and its access to transnational networks MYSA is highly dependent on the transfer of resources from the North. Besides, their negotiating power vis-a-vis Northern agencies to define their own “needs and approach” is alarmingly vulnerable, as revealed in the current partnership conflict. Looking through a postcolonial lens Nicholls et al. (2010) argue that the dominant development discourse would have a disempowering effect on Southern actors:

“Partnerships between the North and South, funding donors and recipients, ..., are fundamentally shaped by the pervasive discourse of development. The discourse positions the North as the benevolent, educated development worker and the South (specifically the African continent) as the poverty stricken and disease-ridden child in need of salvation (Nicholls et al. 2010: 250).

Stated differently, donors tend to act from a position of knowledge and power, while the recipients may define what their problems is, the role of the donors is to fix the problem.

The findings demonstrate that the discourse on the allegations and the partnership conflict were informed by ideological and normative assumptions about “development” on part of the different vested interests. On the one hand MYSA’s criticism of the Norwegian donor employed representations of a stereotypical European “colonial master” – paternalistic, dictatorial and racist. On the other hand, Strømme Foundation’s critique of MYSA appears to be sustained by conceptualisations of modernization theory, which blames indigenous culture for the failure to “develop” and to become “democratic”, while neglecting structural disparities of power (McKay 2008). For example MYSA produced cartoons (see below), which used images combining representations of a paternalistic, colonial missionary with images of an autocratic development aid donor of the 1960s.

Source: www.mysakenya.org

These cartoons constitute a form of visual resistance since they engage in forms of counter-discourse regarding the perceived dominant and paternalistic conduct of a powerful development aid agent.

Furthermore, the data overwhelmingly indicates that the Southern research participants conceived the partnership conflict with SF as a disempowering experience and a contradiction of their notions of true “partnership” and “development”. The partnership relation with the main donor is perceived to be dominated by a paternalistic, authoritarian colonial attitude. As “exogenous” factors for the failure of the partnership on part of the Northern donor the interviewees highlighted ignorance and dishonesty, change in management and the intention to end the partnership, prejudiced personalities and the fear of damaging the own image. A recurrent theme raised by the Southern participants was also the emphasis on relations based on trust, integrity and personal bonds, while the Northern perceptive stressed bureaucratic and policy factors (e.g. salience of rights approach).

4.7. Visions of Reform: Local autonomy vs. International embeddedness

Academic studies and SDP evaluation literature - predominantly produced by actors in the Global North - have constructed a certain uniform image of MYSA. When looking at the main research work on MYSA, including Willis (2000), Hognestad and Tollisen, (2004) and Brady and Khan (2002) a critical analysis about the structural dependency of MYSA as a result of their reliance on foreign aid is lacking. This and similar structural conflicts which are a common feature of North-South
partnerships in the sport and development sphere have yet not been the concern of a systematic academic inquiry.

Notwithstanding, this study's findings clearly demonstrate that Mathare Youth Sports Association is integrated into Northern-dominated, international development aid chain which entails a variety of dependencies and vulnerabilities. The view of a structural dependency of Southern NGOs and CBOs is also evidenced by several development studies (Reith 2010). For example Hearn (2007:1107 f. qtd. in Manzo 2007: 555) argues that all FIFA Football for Hope project partners are reliant and that “these NGOs thus form part of a social group that is reliant on external resources and patronage.” It is suggested that MYSA’s destiny continues to lie to a large degree in the hand of the North.

However, a recurring vision of becoming less vulnerable and dependent and to increase local autonomy and sustainability emerged amongst the southern interviewees. This section presents the expressed visions and strategies how to reform the organisation after the rupture and put the narratives into context of increased local competition. It will explore factors which can contribute challenging hegemonic discourse and dominant social structures. In other words to what degree does the organisation facilitate or resist international development agendas.

Resistance to Hegemonic Discourse and Southern Agency

According to Foucault (1998) discourses can be both: a site of power and a site of resistance, with the possibility to “evade, subvert or contest strategies of power” (Gaventa 2003: 3). For Foucault resistance can be an effect of discourses, which means that power is never solely repressive but can eventually be productive. Therefore, when working with the Foucauldian concept of discourse it must be reiterated that discourses are never hermetic and total. This is in the first place because multiple discourses exist at the same time may conflict with each other and, second, discourse can also be influenced by agency. “Truth” is never an objective quality, but it is produced through a social struggle over meaning. This implies that even the most subjugated actors who appear to be completely powerless own the capacity for undermining and altering dominant discourses. Or as Gledhill (1996: 185) put it, even the most “hegemonic discourses provoke strategies of resistance” and for that reason counter-discourses are a reality.

For instance, the dominant development discourses in SDP are challenged and contested by local NGOs and ‘beneficiaries’ in the South through a ‘multiplicity of strategies and forms of negotiation or resistance in order to carry out their own ‘projects in the Project’” (Rossi 2004: 4). Consequently, marginalized discourses within SDP are capable to resist and challenge dominant discourses and thus initiate change (Mwaanga 2014). In such an understanding resistance is the instrument of those whose voices are subjugated and excluded but who are capable for contesting the “multiple axes of power” (Mwaanga 2011: 25).

Rossi (2004: 26) contends that the ‘room for manoeuvre’ for actors in international development is growing with the “distance” from the sources of development rationality. This describes also dilemma of Southern NGOs and Community-based organisations (CBOs): the remoter they are situated from the Northern-led dominant development discourse, the bigger is the potential space for organisations autonomy and indigenous knowledge production. At the same time a lack of integration in the international aid system, bears the danger of being unable to survive economically.

For example in the case of MYSA Coalter (2013:33) argues that in the first five years no single donor or other development institution was interested in the organisation. This initial ‘splendid isolation’ and the absence of aid would have allowed MYSA to establish locally defined aims and objectives
based on indigenous needs (Coalter (2013). This observation reflects the lack of international interest in sport and development until the late 1990s. However, it seems also to be an idealisation of MYSA’s pioneering years and tends to overlook the firm positioning of MYSA in a system of international development. The current findings demonstrated the international interdependence of the NGO and the problems it entails. A MYSA executive staff stated: “we are more vulnerable, because while you are up there and somebody cuts you, you are doing so much to go back to this level of hundreds of millions, it’s so hard, you know, it takes so many years to build that” (Interview 4)

Reducing dependency and increase self-sustainability

The data reflect the need for more independence from Northern funding via the creation and utilisation of local resources emerged an imperative. Speaking about the imperative to learn and draw the right lessons from the crisis, a male MYSA senior staff stated:

“Number one, we need to reduce as much as we can donor dependency. Because unless we do that if the remaining donors pull out then definitely we have to follow them, say good-by and go back home. So we need to reduce donor dependency and try as much as we can resource mobilisation. We need to do fundraising. Then we need to come up with sustainable programmes, in terms of programmes that can generate income.” (Interview 4)

Likewise a female MYSA staff member concluded:

“we are entirely dependent on the donors, but after happened we realised hey, it was a wake-up call for us as an organisation, and we really need to be self-sustainable, it really helps. So for us we are really working on fund-raising and income generating activities that is going to sustain the organisation. …it really dragged us behind and interfered so much with our strategic plan. But again it was an eye-opener that we should do something to sustain the organisation, because tomorrow when the donors are not there what happens to the organisation? We have to serve the community even of the donor are not there” (Interview 9)

Both interviewees call for the establishment of local income generating activities to make the organisation more sustainable and independent. In narratives a strong focus was laid on emancipation from Northern influence in terms of funding. Aspects of non-material dependence for example on the level of ideologies regarding cultural values were not explicitly mentioned.

Contrary to the MYSA model, most of the indigenous SDP initiatives in Kenya work with which local resources funding. This is mainly due to the lack of access to transnational networks through which they could channel funding. However, there are indigenous NGOs that deliberately follow a local development model and generate their own income. For example the Stadium Homeless Youth Rehab Project (SHY), which involves street kids around the Nairobi City stadium through football and other leisure activities engages in small scale income generating activities to raise funds (e.g. running of a public toilet and clean-up activities in a slum business area selling of drinks in the stadium). The founder of the SHY project, a former goal keeper of Mathare United FC and their current goal keeper trainer said they do not need external because the “boys earn their food through work”. However, through the international contacts of the founder the project receives second-hand football gear from Scandinavia. An example for a local, community-based response to the cutbacks of MYSA programmes in the sixteen zones is Kayole Football club. MYSA had to close their library in the Kayole zone mainly because the donations of the Swedish Bjorn Borg foundation came to a scheduled end. Nevertheless, the community decided to up-hold half of the office space for Kayole FC including a library which is paid solely by contributions from the community.
However, to create adequate local income generation opportunities or raise substantial local funding to run large-scale programmes is an extremely difficult task. This is mainly due to the economic deprivation of the communities in which SDP NGOs operate. According to Munro (2010:8) the reduction of “donor dependence and move toward financial self-sustainability” has constituted a constant, yet unresolved challenge for MYSA.

In contrast to strategy of making use of indigenous material and immaterial resources, a few Kenyan respondents were also advocating of a stronger integration into the globalized development system. A female football administrator asked:

“…you have seen some of our playgrounds? You can’t even play, you get hurt, they are full of mud, the grounds are not conducive for soccer, but we still play. They say “this is Africa!”, you look at the standard of the balls we have or the shoes, we have the capability but the know-how is needed - someone needs to come help push on, we are localized, we need to make it more international in terms of thinking- from a local to a global thinking” (Interview 9).

The notion that external know-how is lacking and that development must be “pushed” by an actor who comes to help from outside is consistent with modernization theory: Without the intervention from the “developed” countries the South cannot “take-off” (Briggs 2008).

**Continuity vs. reinvention of MYSA model**

The findings brought a dichotomy between continuity and radical change of the MYSA model to light. For example MYSA volunteers advocated for mere replacement of the “bad” old donor by a new “good” donor. The priority here is to obtain material gadgets to continue the sport programmes. Asked about his expectations towards a Northern partner, a male volunteer said: “that we have balls in each and every zone, maybe the supplement they are giving us to come to office and then they purchase uniforms and balls and make nets, you see. The facilities, the equipment, balls, cons for all the 16 zones” (Interview 6).

Here the interviewee called for a continuity of the organisation and its programmes. Conversely, the findings suggested that as a result of the conflict research participants questioned the MYSA model and suggested a radical change of the organisation. A former MYSA staff member and current NGO activist stated:

“So it’s a very huge gap Strømme has left but first of all before were are even talk about the Strømme it’s about us, our house. How do you arrange our house? [We] should ..look at ourselves, how we are running the organisation? We have grown so fast, we have grown too big. And the bigger you grow the more demand. You are not able to sustain everyone. We expanded too much and that too much has brought this entire crisis” (Interview 13).

The conflict did not only trigger criticism of the conduct of the Northern donor but of the MYSA model itself. The NGO activist above suggests that the responsibility for the current crisis lies not outside in an office in Norway, but within the organisation and the way it is managed. The former MYSA worker believes that the NGO grown too fast and has lost its focus on community work:

“you find the [donor] money which is used for the development of the community, it’s a quarter, but three quarters are taken by salaries. It’s not bad to become paid but you become too much greedy, then it’s another danger. Because the community will not develop, the community will not move” (Interview 13).
The professionalization of Southern NGOs and the subsequent emergence of a group of salaried staff is a typical outcome of North–South partnerships (Desai 2008). This process leads to a social difference between the employees, which have a legitimate interest to retain their employment and continue to support their families, and the target community. Moreover, based on perceptions that MYSA did not handle the conflict very well and that their credibility is damaged MYSA stakeholders proposed a “reset” of the organisation. A national sport journalist said:

“And it’s not all lost even look for new partners from elsewhere… they need a rebranding. Rebranding their ideology. And let them come out and say we are going to prosecute whoever did this to this girls. On that accountability and just rebrand and say we are open” (Interview 11)

Furthermore, MYSA respondents perceive the crisis to be new start and a future reference point for the entire SDP movement. A MYSA staff member stated:

“We are starting afresh, so the movement of sports and development I think can take this as a huge lesson to the whole field, to me it’s not a bad thing but a good thing for the industry, but know the others can lean and avoid the mistakes, if any [laughs] mistakes the lesson mistakes by our partners and mistakes by MYSA, so to me it’s a learning moment for the industry, and it also comes at the right time 25 years of MYSA existence. (Interview 4)

A general perception that the crisis yielded positive outcomes in terms of strengthening the child and youth rights agenda within the sport and development sector emerged from the data. Talking about the positive sides of the public debate, a football federation staff said: “Yes, definitively, it did [help uncovering weak points] … it was something like an eye opener. Maybe this time it is MYSA but this needs to be checked across all federations” (Interview 11).

New local competition

From a structural point of view it has been argued that MYSA is filling the gap that was created by neoliberal policies. According to Alegi (2010: 124) MYSAs growth is owed to their ability to fill a gap:

“The rollback of government assistance in sport in the 1990s paved the way for nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) .., to step in as providers of basic needs and services, including sport and physical education. One of the most prominent NGOs active in sport and development project is the Mathare Youth Sports Associations (MYSA)”

According to this perspective the “success” of the MYSA development model in particular the rapid expansion of the league system and the increase in membership is directly linked to the absence of a sporting system targeting urban slums. Neither the ministry of sport nor the national football associations provide sport programmes for urban youth. The delivery of youth sport “services” is left overwhelmingly to NGOs such as MYSA and increasingly to Corporate Social Responsibility initiatives run by transnational companies. More recently, mainly private agents established sport programmes which are a direct competition for the MYSA league. A local NGO activist described this new competition for MYSA:

“most of the kids go to academies, rather than paying in the MYSA leagues. ..There is now a lot more competition and so many European organisations have come here and do sports. You find there is Airtel, you see Manchester with Vodaphone, you find Liverpool with Standard Chartered, and so they are trying to come up with sport activities. They have their own tournaments for two month so MYSA activities will be dented .. so you find that during the whole year MYSA activities are going down. ..MYSA is suffering due to their own development”.
Here it has to be reiterated that the research respondents interpreted the fall-out with SF as the major cause of the crisis within MYSA, while there are contradicting perceptions that unresolved issues within the organisations and the context of an increased structural competition through other sport programmes had a negative impact on the sport participation.

4.8. Methodological Limitations and Conclusion

MYSA is engaged in a variety of partnerships with international / Northern donors and agencies (see Table 2). Nevertheless this study focusses on the relationship with Stromme Foundation, partly due to its disproportional current impact on MYSA. Equally, no other case examples of SDP NGOs in Kenya or other parts of the world were examined. This lacking comparative perspective ultimately affects the generalizability and utility of the findings. Nevertheless, during the fieldwork in Nairobi I visited three other football for development grass-roots initiatives, who were all inspired by the MYSA model, to explore how football is used as a development tool.

Further limitations of the study's findings include the following: First, no claims are made that the results of the MYSA case study are simply generalizable to other SDP NGOs in the Global South. This would ignore the very methodology upon which this case study is based (Lindsey / Grattan 2011). Secondly, I do not propose that the findings presented in this dissertation can be taken as a comprehensive account of MYSA or the current relationships with other stakeholders. Within the scope of this research, it was not possible to capture the perspectives of the full range of stakeholders with a vested interest in MYSA such as teachers, parents or local donors. Finally, a major limitation stems from the fact that the study was conducted in a cultural setting alien to that of the researcher. This implies uncertainties and difficulties in understanding and decoding cultural meanings and symbols (Carspecken 1996).

Even though acknowledging these limitations, this case study hopes to demonstrate that it can contribute to an understanding of wider aspects of sport and development.
Chapter 5: Conclusion & Recommendations

5.1. Introduction

This study explored issues of North-South partnership, Southern notions of development and post-colonial power dynamics in Sport and Development by looking at the case study of the Mathare Youth Sport Association (MYSA) and their current partnership crisis with Northern donors.

This concluding chapter aims at providing a summary of the key findings and an evaluation of the studies contributions for the sport for development movement. Based on the findings and limitations of the study recommendations are made concerning the theoretical implications of the study and future research. It is believed that the gained understanding and insights are not only relevant for Mathare Youth Sport Association (MYSA) and its partners but for the wider sport and development movement. This section will also present way of how to improve future North-South partnership in SDP relations on the level of practice and policy;

The aim of this case study was twofold. First, to engage in a critical theoretical reflection of dominant neo-colonial discourses and practices in the SDP field, which are still infused by subtle notions of Northern dominance and Southern inferiority. Such a reflection is imperative for “decolonising methodology and knowledge” (Kay 2009: 1188). Second, to produce knowledge in collaborative process with the research participants which can inform/devise future action in the SDP movement, i.e. challenging power relations within partnership between Global Northern donor and Global Southern NGOs.

This critical analysis of the conflict between a Northern donor and the highly decorated global pioneer of SDP bears relevance for the entire SDP movement in various ways. Regarding theoretical implications of the study and future research the following recommendations are made:

5.2. An actor-oriented Southern perspective on SDP

Consistent with an actor-oriented approach North-South partnerships were analysed as an arena of battles over resources and meanings. These struggles in the partnership arena were grasped as a dynamic relationship which is underpinned by conflicts and tensions. Partnerships can therefore not be understood as a “natural” given of development practice (Baaz 2005).

It has been argued that the “politics of partnerships” in SDP would still follow a long-established top-down approach where Northern actors transfer funds, infrastructure and knowledge to the Global South, above all to Sub-Sahara Africa, a key “object” for Northern SDP interventions and funding (Nicholls et al 2010:8). And that actors in this “partnership” are on the one hand Southern NGOs and CBOs which are constructed as the “inadequate, passive, unreliable ‘partner’” in dire need for Western support and know-how (Baaz 2005: i; Darnell 2007). On the other hand, the Northern partner is constructed as the efficient superior and reliable ‘donor’ (Baaz 2005: i).

This study did not just assert that North-South partnerships are framed by unequal power relations; it provided in-depth empirical findings which supports a reflective understanding North-South power issues in the field of sport and development. The findings of this empirical research established that neo-colonial North-South relations based on discourse constructed around images of “Self” and “Other” are still a phenomenon of contemporary SDP partnerships. In the context of the MYSA – SF conflict the Southern partner was constructed as the passive, corrupt, human rights violating African “Other” not willing to protect the own youth from abuse, while Strømme Foundations was
constructed as the active, democratic, righteous European “Self” which is the true custodian of child and girls rights in the slums. It should be here noted, that it is not assumed that the “Othering” of the Southern actors is an intentional tactic (Baaz 2005), instead “it reflects a colonial legacy that continues to inform relations between donors/recipient, policy makers/practitioners, and North/South” (Nicholls et al. 2010: 261).

However, the Southern actors might be perceived as “passive”, but they are not. As it emerged from the findings MYSA members partially reproduce dominant Northern development discourse but they are also engaged in counter-discourse and contest dominant representations. SDP models are not simply transposed from the Global North to the Global South but they are resisted, appropriated or redefined. For example, in the case of MYSA the Western cultural form football, which was used by the colonialists as an instrument of power, is now adopted as a tool to construct an empowering collective identity which contests stigmatization. In respect thereof the empirical findings of this study is a contribution to “localizing Global Sport for Development” by emphasising local narratives and making local voices heard (Banda et al. 2014:1).

The research revealed that the MYSA development model does not necessarily constitute an alternative to the traditional Western model, in some aspects it actually (re-)produces the dominant development paradigm. Nevertheless to conclude that MYSA youth programmes would actually produce “neoliberal subjects” consistent with predominant Global Northern ideologies (Giulianotti 2011:51) is insufficient. The articulated development notions do actually borrow from a neo-liberal, individualised discourse, nevertheless the development of personal skills and positive perceptions among marginalised youth through sport is informed by a concept of individual level empowerment (Mwaanga 2011).

5.3. An elaborated concept of power in SDP

This empirical research on the MYSA case aimed at making a contribution to the analysis of pervasive neo-colonial power relationships within SDP (Kay 2009). Banda et al. (2008:15) argued that “the power of international donors resides primarily in the funding that they make available.” This is consistent with the findings of this study, but with working of power within SDP partnerships is more complex than a simple direct “power over” relationship. As demonstrated, power can take more refined forms or such as exerting power through representations of the “beneficiary” community or organisation and manufacturing an image the “rotten” and “unreliable” partner. Southern partner tend to be excluded from such discourses, for example when they take place in Western media with limited access for the Southern partner, as in the case of the MYSA – SF conflict.

Moreover, from a Foucauldian perspective the relationship between ‘dominant’ Northern donors and ‘subjugated’ Southern NGOs cannot simply be interpreted as a repressive and hierarchical relationship whereby the former controls and oppresses the latter. In fact, power dynamics in North-South development relations must be viewed as far more subtle, cooperative and underpinned by normative rationalities, which are perceived by both actors as ‘true’ and legitimate. In other words, power is not a given but a site of struggle (Cole et al. 2004: 230). Against this backdrop, future SDP studies on North-South relations need to elaborate more sophisticated concept of power.

5.4. A postcolonial perspective on SDP partnerships

The dominant narrative within SDP is that sport is a universal applicable tool for tackling problems associated with underdevelopment and marginalization. This belief is shared by most scholars and practitioner. Evidence for this sport-for-development common-sense is partly derived from the
uncritical perspective on emblematic projects such as MYSA. Once these paradigmatic models are deconstructed it will also have an impact on the wider discourse on sport and development. For SDP to progress as an academic field and remain relevant as innovative development approach criticality is indispensable. Notably taken-for-granted assumptions and core concepts such as “development”, “partnership” and “empowerment” need to be challenged.

While issues of improving efficiency and effectiveness of SDP programmes remain valid and relevant for SDP research, there is still a lack of theoretically informed and empirically-based analysis of the contested meanings of development. Therefore this study has not taken “development” for granted. Questions about dominant and alternative meanings of “development” have been explored. It attempted to look into potential contradictions, tensions and ambiguities of SDP practice and the underpinning notions of “development” and “partnership”.

Moreover, in the SDP sector there is a necessity for a critical reflection on partnership working. SDP practice is full of contradictions, tensions and ambiguities and “development” and “sport” underpinned by ideologies. If partnerships fail to address the constant reproduction of the unequal distributions of power, partnerships will remain unequal and “will cater to the dominant member’s political agenda” (Nicholls et al. 2010: 257). A critical analysis of the various perceptions of “development” and “partnership” on part of different vested interest groups and their changing views on MYSA is likely to contribute to a theory-based reflection and understanding of current partnership issues between MYSA and its (Northern) partners. For this research, critical theories of power and postcolonial theory have been employed. Mwaanga (2012: 329) suggests that postcolonialism treats one of the fundamental issues within development “the concept of power and how it shapes developmental thinking and policy.” A postcolonial theoretical framework with its complex notion of power and knowledge is not only a useful tool for understanding current relations of dominance, but might also assist in exploring alternative development models within SDP (Rossi 2004, Mwaanga 2011). A better understanding of partnership issues including the management of power issues, the role of personalities, local ownership versus Northern dominance, local empowerment vs. disempowerment or trust versus control will help to improve future partnership practices.

From an perspective of empowerment the issue here is that contemporary partnership relations in Sport for Development need to radically challenge (post-)colonial, paternalistic and to-down forms of collaboration. Not donors and sport governing bodies in the North need to fundamentally “decolonize” their approaches to partnership from Eurocentric mentalities of the past, but Global Southern partners needs to liberate themselves form the continuity of colonial ideologies. Furthermore, SDP partnership that does not allow for local ownership, local building of knowledge and control of resources will lead to processes of disempowerment, which is the contrary what SDP aims to achieve.

5.5. Human Rights on the SDP agenda

This study has to contribute to generated insights on the relation between SDP and human-rights which go beyond the particular case. So far issues of sexual abuse, corruption and human rights violations were usually treated as development problems associated solely with the deprived target groups, but never with SDP NGOs. These issues are considered to be outside the SDP movement and external to the SDP ethos. The MYSA case suggests that sport and development organisations and practitioners themselves can act as perpetrators. It has become apparent that sport is not a priori a force for the social good (Coakley 2011), but also SDP practice is not a priori furthering development. This cognition leads to a whole host of related questions about human-rights, ethics and democracy in
SDP. It is hoped that this study will spark-off further important considerations, but a systematic discussion goes beyond the scope of this work.

5.6. Alternative, non-colonial SDP models

It was argued that “Sport for development is not immune to pervasive post-colonial power relations.” (Nicholls et al. 2010:257). This research aimed at making a contribution to the development of an alternative, postcolonial model relevant for the wider SDP sector, a sector still partly infused by colonial notions of Northern dominance and Southern inferiority. This is more likely to be achieved through a critical reflection on the “postcolonial condition” of sport and development.

Developing alternate, non-colonial frameworks of North-South partnership will enlarge the sustainability of SDP programmes and improve the legitimacy of the SDP approach. Nicholls et al. (2010: 257) has called on the SDP movement to involve “the privileging of formerly subjugated knowledge”. Therefore, the study aimed and bringing forward actors and vested interests which have a different perspective on MYSA, those who have a different notion of development and partnership. Now with a public debate which questions the sustainability of the MYSA these other voices and narratives got space to come to forefront and make them heard. The MYSA incident may cause a rupture which shifts hegemonies ideologies.

It is hoped that the research will advance future sport for development practice by creating an alternative paradigm of North-South partnership thus avoiding unreflected and neo-colonial ideas of development in sport and development. In this sense the study aims to contribute overcoming dominant discourses and practices in the sport for development field, which are still infused by colonial notions of Northern dominance and Southern inferiority. Or to borrow a paraphrase from the inspirational World Social Forum movement: Another sport for development is possible!

Regarding MYSA and other SDP NGOs, there seem to a challenge to advance to the next step in “decolonisation” process. Against the backdrop of the paternalistic and disempowering experiences with SF the emphasis must on issues such as local autonomy, local and regional partnerships and the advancement of South-South exchange.
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Interview Questions

Title of Study:
Revisiting North-South partnerships in sport for development: The case of Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA)

Researcher:
Kurt Wachter, MA researcher, Southampton Solent University

Organisation of and Use of the Interview Guide
This interview guide is separated into five broad categories of issues for discussion.

A. Personal Background
B. Perspectives on Development and Partnership
C. Understanding of MYSA and Interpretation of Incident
D. The future of MYSA
E. Lessons for the Sport for Development and Peace Community

Confidentiality
The results of the research study will be published but the name or identity of the interviewees will not be revealed. In order to maintain confidentiality alias will be used. See also “Informed Consent Form”.

A. Personal Background

1. Name: .................................................................
2. Institution / Organisation: ........................................
3. Position / role: .....................................................

4. Tell me, how did you get involved in field of sport and development?

..........................................................................................
..........................................................................................

B. Perspectives on Development and Partnership

5. In your own words, what is your understanding of development? (How would you define development?)

..........................................................................................
..........................................................................................

6. In your opinion, what makes the difference between a good and a bad sport for development project? (Give examples of good and bad practice)

..........................................................................................
..........................................................................................
7. What is your understanding of partnership in sport & development?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

C. Understanding of MYSA and Interpretation of Incident

Perspective on MYSA before the incident

8. In your view, what is MYSA’s development philosophy?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

9. What are the main reasons why MYSA became such a successful organisation?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

10. What constitutes the basis of your partnership or involvement with MYSA?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

Understanding of the actual incident

11. In 2012 Stromme Foundation has exposed a number of allegations against MYSA including corruption, sexual harassment and abuse of girls and young women. What is your general view of how Stromme managed the situation?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

12. Have you been aware of any problems or shortcomings within MYSA before the report was published?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

13. What is your general view of how MYSA handled the situation?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

14. MYSA admitted that a few cases of sexual harassment in the past. From your perspective, what went wrong that these incidences have occurred?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………

15. Have these allegations influenced and not influenced your perception of MYSA?
16. Have the recent allegations influenced and not influenced your partnership with MYSA?


D. Future of MYSA

17. Do you think that the Stromme report was helpful to uncover weak points within MYSA?

18. MYSA is known for advancing gender equality and the girls empowerment through sport. Will the credibility of MYSA programmes suffer from the reported allegations?

19. Critiques have argued that sport "diverts attention from more serious social and political problems". Wouldn’t it be more effective for the poor in Mathare to tackle inequalities in the Kenyan society instead of organising sport programmes?

20. How do you see the future of MYSA as a whole? What lessons need to be learned?

E. Lessons for the SDP community

21. On a global scale MYSA has been as a shining example for the power of sports to attain development goals. Do you think the Sport and Development approach as a whole will lose credibility as a result of such incidences - or the failure to address them?

22. In the past, well intended development aid projects have sometimes contributed to the increase inequality. Do you think also sport and development projects can sustain inequality?

23. Do you think your work or projects in sport and development have ever contributed to the increase of marginalization and inequality?
24. How do you view the future of the Sport, Development and peace (SDP) movement as a whole? What are the main challenges?

25. Is there anything else you want to share?

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

Mr Kurt Wachter, who is a MA researcher at Southampton Solent University, has requested my participation in this research study. The title of the research is: Revisiting North-South partnerships in sport for development: The case of Mathare Youth Sports Association in Kenya

I have been informed that the purpose of the research is twofold. Firstly, it aims to gain an in-depth, critical understanding of partnerships between donors in the North and their sport and development partners in the South. Secondly, the study aims to improve the sustainability of future North-South partnerships and make recommendations relevant for the entire sport and development movement.

I understand that there are no foreseeable risks or discomforts if I agree to participate in the study.

My participation involves one-to-one interviews. The one to one interview is scheduled to last for 35-40 minutes.

I understand that the possible benefits of my participation will include a better understanding of how sport can be utilized for achieving development goals and reducing inequalities between the Global North and the Global South.

I understand that the results of the research study may be published but my name or identity will not be revealed. In order to maintain confidentiality of my records, Mr. Wachter will use alias.
I have been informed that I will not be compensated for my participation (yes / no).

I have been informed that any questions I have concerning the research study or my participation in it, before or after my consent, will be answered by the investigator Mr Kurt Wachter on the following contact details:

Phone: ++43 699 10754988 (in Austria)
Email: wachter@vidc.org
Postal Address: FairPlay-VIDC, Moellwaldplatz 5/3, A-1040 Vienna, Austria

(Yes / no)

I have read the above information. The nature, demands and possible benefits of the project have been explained to me. I understand what is expected of me and what I expect of the researcher.

I also understand that I may withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time. In signing this consent form, I am not waiving any legal claims, rights, or remedies. A copy of this consent form will be given to me (yes / no)

Participant’s Signature……………………………………..Date………………

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature, purpose, and the possible benefits associated with participating in this research study. I have also answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature (yes / no).

I have provided the participant a copy of the signed consent document (yes / no)

Signature of investigator…………………………………….Date………………
## Appendix D: List of Events of MYSA – Strømme Foundation Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details / Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Strømme Foundation (SF) and MYSA enter a formal collaboration.</td>
<td>SF becomes the first major development partner / funder of MYSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Appointment of Øyvind Aadland as new Secretary General of the SF.</td>
<td>Online Article[^18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2011</td>
<td>SF reduces MYSA funding by more than 30 %.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2011</td>
<td>A Norwegian couple meet with Bob Munro and report about age cheating, abuse of under-aged girls by one coach and stealing of scholarship monies within MYSA.</td>
<td>Both organisations receive a letter by the Whistle blower reporting about the allegations. Norwegian Couple letter to Strømme[^19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct / Nov 2011</td>
<td>After an internal investigation MYSA sends two reports to SF detailing their findings and the actions taken.</td>
<td>MYSA Second report to Strømme on findings and actions taken[^20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
<td>SF announced to put MYSA funding on hold and demands that MYSA should not attend the next Norway Cup.</td>
<td>Norad scrutinize Strømme Foundation [^21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2011</td>
<td>At a joint meeting in Nairobi SF and MYSA decide to appoint an investigation team.</td>
<td>Interview with former SF CEO[^21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 March 2012</td>
<td>A drafted summary report was presented during a SF board meeting.</td>
<td>“What came out is terrible”, commented Aadland[^22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 March 2012</td>
<td>The meeting the summary report is sent to MYSA.</td>
<td>The report states “70 percent of respondents said that they have a clear perception that sexual harassment takes place in the organization” (2 March in bistandsaktuelt.no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 March 2012</td>
<td>SF goes public with accusations (press release)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/23 March 2012</td>
<td>At a meeting between SF and MYSA in Nairobi MYSA rejects the report as methodological unreliable and unjustified.</td>
<td>MYSA’s concern about the draft report was based on two external reviews, conducted by SDP expert Prof. Fred Coalter and Ipsos Synovate, a market research company. MYSA agreed to prepare an action plan addressing “governance structure, leadership and management, Norway Cup and gender balance at all levels” (SF/MYSA 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 April 2012</td>
<td>SF issues a press release reporting about that continuation of the cooperation.</td>
<td>The release states that MYSA will develop an action plan addressing the “challenges” (access via web links on MYSA 2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 April 2012</td>
<td>In a letter to Bob Munro SF informs that they terminate the agreement. SF says the action plan draft would not meet the requirements, in particular on “Board and Management structure”.</td>
<td>SF also “questions about the commitment of MYSA” (access via web links on MYSA 2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 April 2012</td>
<td>In a letter to SF MYSA rejects the new conditions set by SF and announced not to sign a new partnership agreement</td>
<td>MYSA (2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 April 2012</td>
<td>SF publishes statement on ending the cooperation with MYSA</td>
<td>The Norwegian newspaper Dagbladet report that SF terminates the partnership with MYSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May 2012</td>
<td>The popular Standard newspaper in Kenya reports about the accusations.</td>
<td>The newspaper refers to a list of incidences where MYSA admits 33 cases of age cheating, sexual abuse etc between 1987 and 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May 2012</td>
<td>MYSA letter to NORAD requesting for an independent investigation on the “Stromme Foundation conduct”</td>
<td>MYSA (2012b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>TV stations in Kenya and Norway report about allegations; a debate in Kenyan parliament</td>
<td>Youtube - <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VO0OsNsXvql">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VO0OsNsXvql</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mathare Youth Sports Association (MYSA) admits some of the allegations of sexual harassment and financial impropriety levelled against them by Strømme Foundation are true, but branded the Norwegian organisation as insincere.

MYSA chairman, Bob Munro, insists Strømme Foundation has turned a blind eye to several actions they have taken. Instead they went to the media with ulterior motives. Records availed by MYSA show 34 people have since 1991 been summarily dismissed, expelled or forced to resign from the association in connection with sexual abuse, age-cheating, misuse of funds and misuse of their positions.

Strømme Foundation has since put on hold their partnership with MYSA insisting that: “What has happened in MYSA strikes at the heart of that which Strømme Foundation wants to do something about – protecting the rights of the weakest.”

“The survey shows, unfortunately, that there is enough content in the charges. Yes, there is corruption in MYSA. Yes, there is identity fraud, yes, there is sexual harassment and assault,” Secretary General of the Foundation, Øyvind Aadland, told another Norwegian newspaper Bistandsaktuelt at the beginning of March.

But, Munro contends that Strømme has not respected the rights of the Mathare Youth. “Over the last six months the SF has repeatedly ignored and violated the rights of the Mathare youth to a fair hearing and due process by ignoring MYSA’s long zero-tolerance record and actions on any misconduct and focusing on the allegations of one whistle-blower based on anonymous sources,” said Munro.

Munro also rubbished Strømme’s report, saying that the respondents were led towards answers. “After belatedly receiving the draft evaluation report at mid-March and as MYSA has never feared the truth, MYSA sent it for independent review by Ipsos Synovate and to Professor Fred Coalter, one of the world’s most respected authorities on analysing and evaluating sport-for-development projects,” Munro said in a statement.

But even as the two organisations are fighting for their images, the real sufferers remain the underprivileged and underage boys and girls in one of Africa’s biggest slums. It is a sad story that could, in the end, spoil a noble idea that has won MYSA praise over the years, culminating in its nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize in early 2000s, among many other awards.

Besides, several athletes of international repute have come through the MYSA programmes such as Harambee Stars captain Dennis Oliech, Titus Mulama and Doreen Nabwire, who went on to play for German women’s team, Werder Bremen.

Due to its clean image in the eyes of the world of sports, world football ruling body, Fifa, built one of its centres in Africa at MYSA.

Appendix F: Table on Typical Sport and Development aid chain & MYSA actors
(adapted from Harrison 2007: 390)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal typical actors in SDP</th>
<th>Key actors in MYSA aid chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Institutional Donors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Agencies (intergovernmental)</td>
<td>UNOSDP, ILO, WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National aid agencies (governmental)</td>
<td>Norad, USAID, Czech Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sport bodies (governmental)</td>
<td>UK Sport, Australian Sports Commission,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport governing bodies (private)</td>
<td>FIFA, KNVB, Commonwealth Games Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporates sponsor (private)</td>
<td>Nike, Bjorn Borg, Sara Lee, Samsung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations in the North (private)</td>
<td>Laureus, Comic Relief, Pathfinders, Prince Claus Fund, Jacobs Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern SDP NGOs</td>
<td>streetfootballworld, Play able, Norway Cup, Tackle Africa, SAD, INEX-SDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks (North &amp; South)</td>
<td>East Africa Cup, Kicking AIDS Out!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local NGOs and local sport bodies</td>
<td>MYSA (Headquarter office, Sports and Community Leadership Academy, libraries and decentralized offices), Mathare United FC,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based organisations, voluntary associations, local sport clubs</td>
<td>MYSA volunteers, local sport partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Marginalized Youth and Communities in the 16 MYSA zones in Nairobi’s Eastlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 The listed Northern actors are a selection of the 44 foreign partners which MYSA have published on their “My partners” section of the website organisations (MYSA 2013). It should be noted that some partnerships have ended due to the completion of projects. The MYSA partner list is by far not comprehensive, relevant international actors (e.g. Czech partners) or local funders (e.g. Safaricom) are not listed. Some donors (e.g Norad, the German GIZ or FIFA) fund projects or programmes where MYSA is a partner among others, such as the Kicking AIDS Out! and East Africa Cup networks, Youth Development Through Football (YDF) or Football for Hope. The table does not feature a range smaller groups (e.g. local supporters in Norway or the Netherlands).

22 Individual MYSA projects such the building of the “Mathare Football for Hope Centre” involved a multitude of addition funders and supporters including the FIFA sponsors Adidas, Coca Cola, Emirates, Hyundai, Sony and VISA as well as three national ministries. Some of the key partners of MYSA have close links to the corporate, for example Laureus is funded by Mercedes Benz, IWC, and Vodaphone.
Appendix G: Ethics Form

ETHICS RELEASE CHECKLIST FOR RESEARCH AND ENTERPRISE PROJECTS

Project Name: Reviving North-South Partnerships in Sport for Development: The case of MYSA in Kenya
Course: DISSERTATION AND PROFESSIONAL REFLECTION (MAN112)
Principal Investigator: Kurt Wachter
Other Investigators: 
Level: Postgraduate
Supervisor name: Dr. Oscar Mwanga
Faculty: FdSE

Question
Q1. Will the project involve human participants other than the investigator(s)?
   Yes No
   ( )
Q1a. Will the project involve vulnerable participants such as children, young people, disabled people, the elderly, people with declared mental health issues, prisoners, people in health or social care settings, addicts, or those with learning difficulties or cognitive impairment either contacted directly or via a gatekeeper (for example a professional who runs an organisation through which participants are accessed; a service provider; a care-giver; a relative or a guardian)?
   Yes No
   ( )
Q1b. Will the project involve the use of control groups or the use of deception?
   Yes No
   ( )
Q1c. Will the project involve any risk to the participants’ health (e.g. intrusive intervention such as the administration of drugs or other substances, or vigorous physical exercise), or involve psychological stress, anxiety, humiliation, physical pain or discomfort to the investigator(s) and/or the participants?
   Yes No
   ( )
Q1d. Will the project involve financial inducement offered to participants other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time?
   Yes No
   ( )
Q1e. Will the project be carried out by individuals unconnected with the University but who wish to use staff and/or students of the University as participants?
   Yes No
   ( )
Q2. Will the project involve sensitive materials or topics that might be considered offensive, distressing, politically or socially sensitive, deeply personal or in breach of the law (for example criminal activities, sexual behaviour, ethnic status, personal appearance, experience of violence, addiction, religion, or financial circumstances)?
   Yes No
   ( )
Q3. Will the project have detrimental impact on the environment, habitat or species?
   Yes No
   ( )
Q4. Will the project involve living animal subjects?
   Yes No
   ( )
Q5. Will the project involve the development for export of 'controlled' goods regulated by the Export Control Organisation (ECO)?
   Yes No
   ( )
   (This specifically means military goods, so called dual-use goods (which are civilian goods but with a potential military use or application), products used for torture and repression, radioactive sources.)
For further information: http://www.beer.gov.uk/watseco/europeantrade estratégic-export-control/redex.html

Scenario: An Ethics Release applies to the project.
I/we, the investigator(s), confirm that:

- The information contained in this checklist is correct.
- I/we have assessed the ethical considerations in relation to the project in line with the University Ethics Policy.
- I/we understand that the ethical considerations of the project will need to be re-assessed if there are any changes to it.
- I/we will endeavour to preserve the reputation of the University and protect the health and safety of all those involved when conducting this research/enterprise project.

If personal data is to be collected as part of my project, I confirm that my project and I, as Principal investigator, will adhere to the Data Protection Act (DPA) 1998. I also confirm that I will seek advice on the DPA, as necessary, by referring to the Information Commissioner's Office further guidance on DPA: http://www.ico.gov.uk/news/current_topics/what_is_data_DPA_purposes.asp and/or by contacting freedom.information@port.ac.uk. By personal data, I understand any data that I will collect as part of my project that can identify an individual, whether in personal or family life, business or profession.

Signed by (ALL) the investigator(s): [Signature]
Date: 26/05/2013

If the principal investigator is a student:
I confirm that, as supervisor:

- I have discussed the ethical considerations in relation to the project with the investigator(s) involved.
- I have read and agreed the information in this checklist.
- I will monitor progress of the project.

Signed: [Signature]
Print Name: [Name]
Date: 26.05.2013

http://portal.solent.ac.uk/portal-apps/ethics/form.aspx?id=4975
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