Investigating the Role of Intergroup Contact within an Inner-City Youth Sport-for-Development

Program: A Case Study

by

Jessica Brake

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Masters of Arts

in

Recreation and Leisure Studies

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2018

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis including any required final versions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

Abstract

Sport is often viewed as having a positive impact on shaping both individual and community development. Sport, used for such developmental purposes, is commonly referred to as sport-for-development (SFD). A common goal of many SFD programs is to build relationships amongst divided societies and groups experiencing conflict. One of the ways that this can be done is through intergroup contact. By promoting positive contact between conflicting groups, it is believed that groups will learn about each other and as a result will change their thoughts and attitudes towards one another. Positive contact is said to not only change intergroup attitudes, but it also has the potential to promote positive relationship development. However, it has been well noted in the literature that there are many factors that may influence contact. The current study explores a youth soccer program that was developed as a means to facilitate positive contact and promote relationship development between youth and police within a community that was dealing with issues of youth deviance. By drawing on both SFD literature, and contact theory, this study investigates factors that facilitate contact within an inner-city youth SFD program. Further, the study investigates the impact that contact has on program stakeholders. Findings of the study reveal that understanding target-groups, developing partnerships, and having champions of youth development all play a role in facilitating contact within an inner-city youth sport for development program. In the current study, such factors were critical when it came to effectively promoting intergroup contact. On the whole, intergroup contact had many positive impacts on program stakeholders. Indeed, many positive relationships were developed, intergroup attitudes were shifted, and there was a positive change in youth behaviour. Overall, the study reveals some important findings and discusses their practice based implications. It also suggests future areas of research.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Misener for her endless support throughout my Master's journey. Your feedback and ongoing guidance was critical to my success thus far. You helped me to think critically and to grow as a researcher.

I am thankful to all of those who participated in my research and openly shared their experiences with me. Without you this would not have been possible.

I would like to thank the Graduate Student Association for taking a chance on me and allowing me to be their Vice-President for one year during my graduate studies. Although it was challenging at times, filling this role gave me an abundance of experiences that I am very appreciative of. Thanks to you, upon completion, I will have much more than just a Master's degree.

Lastly, I would like to thank my one true love, running. Without you I would not have made it to the end. You have taught me how to persevere and be patient with progress - one step, one breath, one moment at a time. I will forever be grateful for you.

<p style="text-align:center;">*Table of Contents*</p>

3. METHODS

4. FINDINGS

5. DISCUSSION

1. Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Background

Sport, which can be defined in a board sense to encompass all forms of physical activity that positively contribute to an individual's physical fitness, mental well-being, and social interactions (United Nations, 2003), is a powerful vehicle that can offer benefits to both individuals and communities. By bringing individuals and communities together, sport can act as an international language that can build bridges between people, overcome cultural and ethnic differences and create an atmosphere of tolerance (Beutler, 2008). Such intentional uses of sport for the purpose of strengthening individuals and communities is referred to as Sport-for-Development (SFD), which has been broadly defined by many as:

> "the use of sport to exert a positive influence on public health, the socialization of children, youths and adults, the social inclusion of the disadvantaged, the economic development of regions and states, and on fostering intercultural exchange and conflict resolution" (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011, p. 311).

Overall, SFD is a growing area of interest in the field of sport management. In fact, in recent years, as the use of sport for the purposes of development has become increasingly popular, there has been a large amount of research done on SFD projects (MacIntosh, Arellano & Fomeris, 2016). This has been seen over the past decade with the SFD field receiving a great deal of attention from the government, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), academics, and sport practitioners all across the world (Schulenkorf, Sherry & Rowe, 2016). This growing interest and attention in SFD likely stems from the fact that research on SFD has shown that are many benefits to using sport as a tool for development such as: disease prevention, cohesive and sustainable community development, tackling anti-social behaviours and fear of crime,

individual empowerment, raising educational standards, social integration, development of social capital, and contributing to lasting peace (Beutler, 2008). Because of the many benefits that sport can provide, sport is commonly used as a strategy, or form of social intervention in disadvantaged communities around the world (Kidd, 2011). Indeed, many SFD programs often target at-risk populations (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011). Additionally, many of the programs are focused on improving the lives of those in economically disadvantaged, marginalized, and conflict-affected communities (Black, 2010). With this in mind, inner-city communities, which is a term that commonly refers to communities who are facing a variety of social and economic problems, provide an appropriate context for SFD programs to take place. Within an inner-city context, SFD programs can help to re-engage individuals into society as it can provide them with a supportive environment that can encourage social development and integration, therefore minimizing social exclusion and its harmful effects (Welty Peachy & Sherry, 2016).

One of the theoretical foundations of SFD is intergroup contact theory (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2016). The use of intergroup contact theory in SFD stems from the work of Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis. Allport (1954) proposes that contact between diverse groups can act as an effective remedy against issues such as racism, prejudice, and discrimination. Allport's (1954) hypothesis has been used within the sport context. For instance, a study by Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011) explores the that role that sport can play in promoting positive social change it. Specifically, Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011) suggest that within the sport setting "intergroup contact between in-group and out-group members can promote positive intergroup relations, when sufficient conditions are in place" (p. 313). Indeed, sport provides an appropriate context to promote positive contact, as sport can be used to break down barriers between groups and potentially promote broader social change outside of the sport setting (Lyras & Welty

Peachy, 2011). It is important to note however, that interactions with dissimilar others alone does not in and of itself facilitate the breaking down of stereotypes and prejudice (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011). Rather, there must be certain conditions in place in order for optimal intergroup contact to occur (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998). Therefore, by drawing upon Allport's (1954) conditions of positive contact, as well as Pettigrew's (1998) advancement of conditions of positive contact, this study will seek to explore the conditions that facilitate positive contact within a sport-based youth development program. Further, it will investigate the impact that positive contact has on program stakeholders.

1.2 Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to explore the role of inter-group contact within a multi-stakeholder sport-based youth development program. By identifying the conditions for positive contact in an inner-city youth SFD program, and the effects of contact on program stakeholders, this study will investigate how inner-city youth sport programs can be managed to promote positive contact among diverse stakeholders.

1.3 Research Questions

In order to fulfill the purpose of the study, the following research questions will be used:

1. What are the conditions which facilitate contact within a sport-based youth development program?

2. How does contact influence stakeholders involved in a sport-based youth development program?

1.4 Significance of Research

As Canadian societies are becoming more and more socially and economically diverse, both governmental and non-governmental organizations must find innovative ways to bring

communities together and create strong social ties among citizens. Creating such ties is important for the development of strong and healthy communities and individuals, both of which are essential to Canadian society. Moreover, in order to reduce conflict in communities, relationships need to be built among diverse groups of people. Sport has often been thought of as an appropriate context for bringing individuals together and promoting positive social change. In fact, "new and innovative thinking comprises sport as an integral part of a holistic approach to development and peace and, as such, is increasingly gaining importance on local, national and international agendas" (Beutler, 2008, pp. 359-360). Such intentional uses of sport-based programs to build relationships, however could be a stronger force and have more powerful and sustainable effects on communities and individuals if we knew more about what key elements promote positive contact within the sport setting. In particular, understanding the role that intergroup contact plays within an inner-city youth SFD program may help us to better understand the mechanisms and process that foster positive outcomes from sport programs. This, in turn, can help program providers develop, implement, and manage inner-city youth SFD programs that promote positive contact amongst participants.

2. Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.1 Intergroup Contact Theory

Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis has been very influential within the field of social psychology (Vezzali & Stathi, 2017). Accordingly, the intergroup contact hypothesis is a well-supported theory in social psychology with hundreds of studies showing that intergroup contact can yield positive effects across a variety of different situations, settings and samples" (Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014, p. 11). Therefore, this section of the paper will provide an overview of the evolution of contact theory. It will then review contact theory and its relevancy to sport, and in particular, youth sport.

2.1.1 Introduction to contact theory

In 1954, Gordon W. Allport published his book titled *The Nature of Prejudice.* In his book, Allport (1954) explores the roots and nature of prejudice and provides suggestions on how prejudice and discrimination may be reduced. In his book, Allport (1954) defines prejudice as, "thinking ill of others without sufficient warrant" (p. 6). Allport (1954) suggests that the key ingredient in this definition is the *without sufficient warrant* component. Here, Allport (1954) suggests that prejudice is essentially a pre-judgement of others based on opinions and beliefs and not on fact. With this in mind, prejudices can be either positive or negative. For instance, an individual may form either a negative, or a positive pre-judgement about a group of people. Although prejudgements may be positive, most research on contact theory focuses on how to reduce negative prejudices and promote positive intergroup attitudes. With this in mind, it is also important to note that prejudice is different than discrimination. While prejudice, simply stated, is a pre-judgment of others without sufficient warrant, discrimination is when individuals or groups of people are denied equality of treatment (Allport, 1954). Discrimination in this sense is

the behavioural component of prejudice as it entails acting on one's prejudices and treating others differently (Aboud et. a., 2012), rather than just thinking ill of others.

Allport (1954) suggests that prejudices may be reduced by promoting positive contact between conflicting groups. Indeed, the basic premise behind Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis, which is also referred to as intergroup contact theory, is that contact between individuals belonging to different social groups can reduce prejudices that groups hold towards one another. Not only is contact thought to reduce prejudices, but it is also suggested that contact can promote more positive intergroup attitudes. Indeed, by learning new information about the out-group, it is thought that intergroup attitudes and perspectives will begin to shift in a positive way.

Overall, Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis was the start of a large body of research using intergroup contact as a central phenomenon to understanding how interactions among dissimilar groups of people enabled groups to learn about each other, which could in turn reduce prejudices that those groups may hold towards one another (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Contact theory is an important and relevant area of research as both prejudices and conflict are intractable characteristics of society despite attempts of policy makers and politicians to implement social change (Vezzali and Stathi, 2017). This is problematic as prejudice and negative intergroup attitudes can cause many social problems in societies throughout the world (Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014). According to Beelmann and Heinemann (2014), "even in their mildest form, the consequences for human beings may include social exclusion and segregation, health and behavioural problems, poorer chances on the labour market, [and a] negative quality of life" (p. 10). This is concerning given rapid globalization and the resulting need for strong cooperation between groups of people (Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014). This is particularly relevant within

the Canadian context as it is well known that Canada is a racially and ethnically diverse country. In fact, according to Statistics Canada (2016), "in 2011, Canada had a foreign-born population of about 6,775,800 people which represented 20.6% of the total population, making up the highest proportion among the G8 countries". Of the foreign-born population, a large portion are recent immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2016). Overall, "recent immigrants made up 17.2% of the foreign-born population and 3.5% of the total population in Canada" (Statistics Canada, 2016). It is not surprising then that a large body of social research has focused on how to develop positive interethnic relations and how to reduce negative stereotypes and prejudices related to race and ethnicity (Kim, 2012, p. 72). Indeed, "contact and its effectiveness at improving out-group attitudes has been an appealing and enduring research topic for social scientists" (Vezzali and Stathi, 2017, p. 1). This may be because it is believed that interactions between different ethnicities may lead to a reduction in prejudices, and may also promote cross-group friendships (Kim, 2012). The evolution of this concept will be discussed in the following sections.

2.1.2 Allport's Contact Hypothesis

Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis is one of the most common and influential frameworks that guide initiatives addressing issues of racism, prejudice, and discrimination through contact amongst groups experiencing conflict (Jones et. al., 2016). Indeed, Allport (1954) was one of the first social scientists to provide a theoretical framework for intergroup contact. In his book, Allport (1954) suggests that within the contact situation there is an in-group and an out-group. Allport (1954) broadly defines an in-group "as any cluster of people who can use the term 'we' with the same significance" (p. 37). In-groups are often characterized by codes, norms, beliefs, standards and "enemies" (Allport, 1954). Furthermore, in-groups are often tied to one's identity. For example, many people identify with and feel a sense of belonging to their own

families and ethnic groups (Allport, 1954). In-group memberships can reflect either *achieved* status or *ascribed* status (Allport, 1954). For instance, some group memberships are earned (achieved status), such as becoming a member of a club, whereas other memberships are automatically gained (ascribed) such as through birth and family tradition (Allport, 1954). Individuals can belong to more than one group, and group membership to any one group is not permanently fixed (Allport, 1954).

Given the social nature of groups, if there are individuals that belong to a group, then there must be individuals who don't belong to the group. Accordingly, Allport (1954) states that "every line, fence, or boundary marks off an inside from an outside. Therefore, in strict logic, an in-group always implies the existence of some corresponding out-group" (p. 41). In-groups may hold prejudices against their corresponding out-group, thus contributing to tension and conflict between the two groups of people. Interestingly, Allport (1954) suggests that hostility towards an out-group can actually help strengthen one's sense of belonging to their in-group, however it is not necessary. Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis provides a framework for how conflict and prejudices amongst in-groups and out-groups may be reduced through intergroup contact.

The premise behind Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis is that intergroup contact between diverse groups is an effective remedy against prejudice and discrimination. Further, Allport (1954) suggests that not only can contact reduce prejudices and discrimination, but it can also promote positive intergroup attitudes and reduce intergroup anxiety. Allport (1954) however discusses how it is not enough to just bring people of different races, religions, colour, and origin together. This in and of itself will not assist in reducing intergroup stereotypes and developing positive intergroup attitudes (Allport, 1954). Rather, Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis indicates that in order for positive intergroup contact to occur the following four conditions must

be present: equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and institutional support. The first condition, equal status suggests that there needs to be equal status among the groups involved in the contact situation. In other words, any one group should not hold any power or have advantages over the other group. The second condition, common goals, holds that the groups should be actively in pursuit of some sort of common goal. The third condition, intergroup cooperation, indicates that achieving a common goal should be a group effort that is not marked by intergroup competition. The fourth condition, institutional support, is concerned with social supports from authorities, law, or customs. In other words, the contact situation should be socially supported by external sources. Allport (1954) suggested that these four conditions are critical for promoting positive intergroup contact.

Over the past few decades, many studies have provided support for Allport's (1954) optimal conditions for contact. For example, in their meta-analysis of intergroup contact theory, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) found that samples that experienced structured contact situations that were designed to meet Allport's conditions had higher effects on reducing prejudice when compared to control groups that did not meet these conditions. However, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) also found that Allport's conditions were not essential to intergroup contact achieving positive outcomes. Indeed, they found that samples with no claim of the key conditions still showed a significant relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice reduction (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). With this in mind, although Allport's (1954) conditions for positive contact improve the outcomes of the contact situation, they are not necessary for contact situations to still yield positive results (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew, 1998).

In addition to the four conditions for optimal contact, Allport (1954) suggests that there are other factors that must be considered within the contact situation as they may impact the

outcomes. First of all, Allport (1954) identifies that quantitative factors such as the frequency

and duration of contact, the number of people involved in the contact situation, and the variety of

contact may all influence the contact situation. Second, the social atmosphere should also be

considered. Factors such as whether or not the contact is voluntary, whether the contact is

important to participants, or viewed as being trivial, or if it is regarded as typical or exceptional

all play a role (Allport, 1954). Third, personality of the individuals involved in the contact

situation may also play a role in the contact situation. Personality of individuals takes into

account things like the individual's initial level of prejudice, and the nature of their prejudice,

such as whether or not it is deeply rooted in their character. Further, previous experiences with

the out-group, and the strength of their stereotypes towards the out-group can influence contact.

Moreover, factors such as age, education level, and personality factors may also have an impact

on contact (Allport, 1954). The last factor that Allport (1954) highlights is areas of contact. The

areas of contact factor is concerned with where the contact situation is actually occurring. Some

of these areas might include a casual setting, a residential setting, an occupational setting, a

recreational setting, a religious setting and so on (Allport, 1954). Such settings may have

different impacts on contact, and thus different outcomes. In sum, even if Allport's (1954)

conditions for positive contact are satisfied, there are still various other factors that may shape

and influence the contact situation and its outcomes. Similarly, Pettigrew (1998) suggests that

there are many factors that can shape intergroup contact effects, such as individual differences

and societal norms. For instance, someone who is deeply prejudiced may avoid contact, and even

if faced with a contact situation they may resist the positive effects of it (Pettigrew, 1998).

Likewise, societies that are suffering from intergroup conflict may actually restrict intergroup

contact (Pettigrew, 1998). On the whole, Allport (1954) provides us with some examples of

influencing factors, however Allport's list of conditions is not meant to be exhaustive. Rather, Allport's (1954) contribution highlights the complexity of group interactions as it shows that there are a multitude of factors that need to be considered.

2.1.3 Evolution of the contact hypothesis

When it comes to the contact hypothesis, the work of Thomas Pettigrew (1998) has also been highly influential. Pettigrew (1998) reviews Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis and the four conditions of optimal contact – equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and support from institutions. Pettigrew (1998) then goes on to highlight the importance of a fifth condition, indicating that the contact situation must also have friendship potential. Indeed, Pettigrew (1998) states that "the power of cross-group friendship to reduce prejudice and generalize to other outgroups demands a fifth condition for the contact hypothesis: *The contact situation must provide the participants with the opportunity to become friends*" (p. 76). In other words, by providing participants with the opportunity to develop friendships with one another, the bonds between the groups may be strengthened, and individuals may develop more positive outlooks towards the out-group as a whole as a result of their friendship development. This has been supported by other research as many other studies have consistently found that cross-group friendship development is an effective form of contact amongst various populations and social contexts (Cameron & Turner, 2017).

In addition to proposing a fifth condition for optimal contact, Pettigrew (1998) highlights some key problems with Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis. Indeed, Pettigrew (1998) suggests that within Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis, too much focus is given to the factors that *facilitate* contact, and not enough attention is given to the factors that are *essential* for positive contact. Additionally, Pettigrew (1998) believes that the hypothesis does not address the

processes involved in contact. In light of these considerations, Pettigrew (1998) provides a reformulation of the Allport's (1954) intergroup contact hypothesis. In his reformulation, Pettigrew (1998) highlights the importance of process and the importance of distinguishing between essential and facilitating factors. Pettigrew (1998) also introduces a time dimension with different outcomes predicted at different stages of intergroup contact. Pettigrew's (1998) reformulation of contact theory stipulates that Allport's (1954) four conditions for contact, plus Pettigrew's fifth condition (friendship potential) are essential factors for positive intergroup outcomes (i.e. a reduction in stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination). In addition to the essential factors, Pettigrew (1998) proposes that there are multiple additional factors that may act as facilitating factors for the effects of contact. For example, equivalent group status outside of the actual contact situation, may impact or facilitate the outcomes of the contact situation (Pettigrew, 1998). Here Pettigrew (1998) is proposing that not only does status play a role in the contact situation itself, but it can also have an impact if statuses are different outside of the contact situation. Overall, Pettigrew (1998) helps us to think critically about Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis by highlighting important factors that need to be considered as they may have an impact on the contact situation itself, as well as the outcomes of the contact situation. Pettigrew (1998) suggests that such factors may act differently at different stages of intergroup contact.

2.1.4 Examination of the contact hypothesis

As contact theory has evolved, there still remains the question of whether or not intergroup contact is effective in reducing prejudices and promoting positive intergroup relations. In light of this, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) provide us with a meta-analysis of contact theory. In their analysis, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) analyze 515 studies with a total of 713 independent

samples. The findings of their study help to answer a long-standing debate in the contact

literature of whether or not contact reduces prejudice, and what role Allport's conditions play in

promoting positive outcomes (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Overall, the results of the study suggest

that intergroup contact does typically reduce intergroup prejudices (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Additionally, they find that intergroup contact may be useful for reducing prejudices across a

variety of situations, contexts, geographical areas, and target groups (Pettigrew & Tropp 2006).

According to Pettigrew & Tropp (2006), "these results support the recent extension of intergroup

contact theory to a variety of intergroup contexts, beyond its original focus on racial and ethnic

groups" (p. 766). In addition to this, results from their study show that contact effects often

generalize beyond the initial contact situation. To this end, they found that not only did attitudes

towards the immediate participants become more positive, but so did attitudes towards out-group

members not involved in the contact situation, and in different situations (Pettigrew & Tropp,

2006). In sum, the work of Pettigrew & Tropp (2006) provide support for intergroup contact

being effective in improving intergroup relations, and reducing prejudices across a variety of

groups and contexts.

In another study by Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) the issue of process, that is, how contact

actually diminishes prejudice is explored. In their study, Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) do a meta-

analysis of the following three mediators that contact is said to reduce prejudice by: (1)

enhancing knowledge about the out-group, (2) reducing anxiety about intergroup contact, and (3)

increasing empathy and perspective taking. In their study, Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) found that

all three mediators had an effect on reducing prejudices. However, both anxiety reduction and

empathy were stronger mediators in reducing prejudice than enhancing knowledge about the out-

group was (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). However, they note that "there may be a causal sequence

operating whereby initial anxiety must first be reduced with intergroup contact before increased

empathy, perspective taking, and knowledge of the outgroup can effectively contribute to

prejudice reduction" (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008, p. 929). In light of this, Pettigrew and Tropp

(2008) suggest that processes be tested longitudinally and experimentally in future work in order

to develop deeper understandings.

2.1.5 Contemporary contact theory

Overall, there is a wide theoretical basis supporting contact theory (Jones et. al., 2016).

Many studies have shown support for intergroup contact in reducing prejudices and improving

intergroup relations (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew et. al., 2011). Current research

indicates that contact in and of itself is not a remedy for prejudice, however it can act as a useful

tool that contributes to improving intergroup relations (Vezzali & Stathi, 2017). Indeed, we now

understand that achieving the positive effects that contact is not as simple as bringing groups

experiencing conflict together under Allport's (1954) four conditions. To this end, there are

many other factors and processes that may influence the outcomes of the contact situation. For

example, individual level factors such as the participants attitudes and experiences may influence

the effects of contact (Pettigrew, 1998). Further, certain processes like empathy and learning

about the out-group may have an effect on the outcome of the contact situation (Pettigrew &

Tropp, 2008). It is not surprising then that over the past few decades research on intergroup

contact theory has primarily been focused on understanding variables that explain why and how

contact improves intergroup attitudes (Vezzali & Stathi, 2017).

2.1.6 Contact theory and sport

Based on the interactive nature of many sport environments, sport may provide an

appropriate context for contact interventions. To this end, sport has commonly been advocated as

a mechanism to improve social cohesion (Nathan et. al., 2010). Indeed, "at the community level, sport has been advocated as a mechanism to promote a socially cohesive society, encourage strong community bonds, reduce crime rates, and offer access to positive mentors" (Nathan et. al., 2010, p. 2). Moreover, sport may provide opportunities to build relationships across religious, ethnic, and economic backgrounds (Nathan et. al., 2010). Such relationship development and the positive impacts that may result are particularly important for communities with high numbers of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds (Nathan et. al., 2010).

The association between sport participation and positive intergroup contact has been supported by many studies. For instance, sport has been proven as an effective remedy in promoting positive contact across cultural (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011), class (Skinner et. al., 2008), and ethnic (Nathan et. al., 2010) divides. This may be because sport acts as a common goal or interest amongst groups, as per Allport's (1954) conditions for optimal contact (Kim, 2012). For example, individuals typically engage in recreation activities based primarily on their own goals, choices, and interest (Kim, 2012). Such goals and interests may develop into shared goals and interests with other participants (Kim, 2012), thus forming one of the conditions of optimal contact. Additionally, in order to engage in recreation activities such as sport, participation often requires cooperation with others who may be different than oneself (Kim, 2012), which once again is one of Allport's (1954) conditions of optimal contact. Lastly, recreation settings are often socially supported or sanctioned (Kim, 2012). This is in line with Allport's conditions of positive contact. Specifically, one of Allport's (1954) conditions of positive contact is support from intuitions. Here it is believed that support from institutions, societies and figures of authority can promote positive contact. Therefore, in sum, sport settings provide an appropriate context for promoting positive contact.

2.1.7 Contact theory and youth sport

The use of sport to promote positive contact may be particularly useful amongst youth populations. Given that children and youth are often already exposed to a variety of contact situations through school and extracurricular activities (Cameron & Turner, 2017), sport settings that are structured to promote positive contact may be beneficial in reducing prejudice and negative intergroup attitudes amongst youth populations. Indeed, research has indicated that children begin to favour their own social group during early childhood (Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014). With this in mind, sport may be a useful tool for connecting youth together across various social groups. Therefore, the following section will explore contact theory and its relevancy to youth. In particular, the following section of the paper will review the use of sport as a tool for promoting positive contact for youth populations.

2.1.8 Contact theory and youth

Indeed, prejudice develops at a very young age in children. In fact, in many parts of the world prejudice can be seen in children as young as 4- to 5-years old (Aboud et. a., 2012). With this in mind, intergroup contact may help to reduce such prejudices that children and youth hold. Children and youth are often exposed to a variety of contact situations. This is because youth spend a large majority of time in educational settings where there are diverse groups of people and varying social groups (Cameron & Turner, 2017). Indeed, "as communities and schools become more socially inclusive, children are being provided with increased opportunities to befriend those from different ethnic backgrounds" (Aboud et. a., 2012, p. 308). Much of the research to date has identified that intergroup contact does indeed have a positive impact on youth's intergroup attitudes (Cameron & Turner, 2017).

Beelmann and Heinemann (2014) reviewed the effects of standardized intervention

programs for children and adolescents that were designed to prevent and reduce prejudice and

improve intergroup attitudes. In their study, they conducted a meta-analysis of 81 research

reports that contained a total of 122 contact intervention programs structured to promote positive

intergroup attitudes in children and adolescents (Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014). Overall, the

outcomes of the intervention programs that were analyzed proved to be generally effective

(Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014). However, their "analysis revealed that direct contact and

training in empathy and perspective taking are the most promising *program content components*"

(Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014, p. 18). Indeed, they found that direct contact leads to better

results than other forms of contact, such as vicarious or indirect contact (Beelmann &

Heinemann, 2014). Interestingly, they identified that the success of direct contact depends on

whether or not the program is successful in initiating personal relationships and friendships

amongst members of different ethnic groups (Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014). Given that

friendship development is difficult to promote through indirect forms of contact, this particular

finding indicates that friendship development is a key component of contact situations. In

addition to direct contact, Beelmann and Heinemann (2014) also found that training in empathy

and perspective taking were key in promoting positive intergroup attitudes. Further, it was found

that interventions that involved a trainer who was actively involved in program administration

had higher results (Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014). It is not surprising that the effects of the

interventions varied according to the participant's social status. For instance, studies that

addressed minority group attitudes towards majority groups were less effective than

interventions that addressed majority groups prejudices towards minority groups (Beelmann &

Heinemann, 2014). Overall, Beelmann and Heinemann's (2014) meta-analysis revealed that

contact intervention programs should include at least some form of direct contact amongst groups, promote the development of friendship, and should include training in empathy and perspective taking. Programs should also be mindful of individual factors, such as the social status of participants.

Overall, there has been a significant amount of research on intergroup contact and youth. In particular, developmental and social psychologists have begun to explore contact based interventions for youth (Cameron & Turner, 2017). Contact theory may be of particular relevance to minority youth as it has been identified that "experiences of racial exclusion such as discrimination and prejudice are quite common for urban ethnic minority youth across educational, institutional and peer settings" (Ruck et. al., 2011, p. 633). Moreover, adolescents associate low status occupation with minority status and greater affluence and opportunities with majority status (Ruck et al., 2011). Such feelings are problematic for a number of reasons and should be addressed. Addressing minority youths' feelings of exclusion and discrimination may contribute to an understanding of how to better support minority youth avoid negative outcomes (Ruck et al., 2011).

Promoting contact amongst minority youth populations in sport settings may be difficult as minority youth are often overrepresented in some sports and underrepresented in others (Jones et. al., 2016). Additionally, many minority youth lack opportunities and resources to participate in sports, which may lead to imbalances amongst their majority peers, and potentially influence the contact situation (Jones et al., 2016). Moreover, refugee families face many difficulties "including the need to learn new languages, negotiating differing cultural and societal values, emotional trauma, loss or separation from family and torture or life-threatening events preceding arrival" (Nathan et. al., 2010). With this in mind, there is a strong need to better understand how

sport may be used as a tool for promoting positive contact for minority youth populations. An appropriate context for this might be sport-for-development programs. Therefore, the next section of the paper will review sport-for-development, its relationship to contact theory, and in particular how it may be used as a tool for promoting positive contact for youth populations.

<div align="center">

2.2 Sport-for-Development

</div>

Sport-For-Development (SFD) programs may be an appropriate avenue for promoting positive intergroup contact among youth populations. Indeed, within recent years there has been a growing social movement of using sport as a vehicle for social change (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). Sport, in this regard, has often been used as an instrument to strengthen social networks, promote peace, solidarity, non-violence, social integration, acceptance/tolerance, justice, and equality (United Nations, 2011). Sport, used for such purposes falls within the scope of SFD. Thus, this section of the paper will contain an overview of SFD and its relationship to intergroup contact. Specifically the next sections of the literature review will provide an overview of the following: (1) the history of SFD, (2) SFD theory, (3) management and evaluation of SFD programs, (4) critical perspectives on SFD, and (5) how SFD relates to intergroup contact theory.

2.2.1 Sport-for-development: An Overview

Generally speaking, "SFD focuses on the role that sport can play in contributing to specific social outcomes and overall community well-being" (Schulenkorf et al., 2016, p. 6). Such SFD initiatives have greatly increased in recent years, with many programs dedicated to creating personal and social change through sport (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). Many SFD programs often focus on strengthening basic education, public health, community safety and social cohesion (Kidd, 2008). Many SFD programs target disadvantaged communities, or

<div align="center">

</div>

populations that are deemed to be "at risk" (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). Through SFD

programs, sport has the potential to act as a safe space as it can reduce conflict, social exclusion

and other injustices (Kidd, 2008). Moreover, sport can help empower individuals and potentially

reverse the negative effects of social exclusion (Welty Peachy & Sherry, 2016).

It is important to note that SFD is different from sport development. Essentially, sport

development is about athlete development and promoting opportunities for sport participation

and the benefits that come with it. Sport development can often be broad in scope in that it

happens at different levels and in different social contexts; it can span from young children in

schools and sport clubs, to professional athletes trying to win medals and world championships

(Schulenkorf et al., 2016). Rather than focusing on athletics, SFD is centered on using sport as a

tool for promoting positive social benefits among individuals and communities (Shilbury et al.,

2008). Moreover, SFD is about providing opportunities for both individuals and communities to

participate, grow and develop through different types of physical activity (Shilbury, Sotiriadou,

& Green, 2008).

2.2.2 The History of Sport-for-Development

The use of sport for purposes of development has a long history (Kidd, 2008). Indeed, the

roots and underlying tenets that have lead SFD to where it is today can be traced back to the

nineteenth century and the reforms that took place in elite English schools (Schulenkorf et al.,

2016). During these times, schoolboys where often undisciplined and displayed violent

behaviour, which was inconsistent with the schools' hopes of producing future leaders

(Schulenkorf et al., 2016). In order to deal with these issues, the reformers would use sport to

provide lessons for life such as aiming for victory and accepting defeats (Schulenkorf et al.,

2016). Sport, in this sense was much more than a game; sport was used as a tool help build

character, a sense of community, and loyalty to their schools (Schulenkorf et al., 2016).

Following this, in the early twentieth century there became an emphasis on participation

in sport for its own sake, as well as an emphasis on values such as selflessness and community

spirit (Schulenkorf et al., 2016). It was during this time that "sport was understood as a *common*

good that provided people of varying ages and backgrounds with valuable social experiences"

(Schulenkorf et al., 2016, p. 4). Here we can see the shift in sport as being used as merely a tool,

and rather being thought of as a valuable experience in and of itself. Regardless of the different

origins that SFD can be traced back to, the premise that it is built upon has remained relatively

constant. The underlying premise has often been that well-designed, sport-based initiatives that

incorporate appropriate values can become powerful tools to achieve developmental goals and

peace objectives (Schulenkorf, et al., 2016).

2.2.3 Theories of Sport-for-Development

In order to better understand SFD and how its objectives are achieved, it is important to

understand the theoretical assumptions upon which SFD rests. Understanding theories relative to

SFD is important because, the ability to explain any phenomena (such as SFD), is based in

theory (Doherty, 2012). Theory not only describes occurrences, but it explains them (Doherty,

2012). In this sense, "theory, quite simply, explains how things work and why" (Doherty, 2012,

p. 2). When it comes to theory in sport management, researchers should borrow, adapt and

extend existing theoretical frameworks, as well as generate new theory (Doherty, 2012).

In the field of SFD, theories and theoretical frameworks that surround SFD seek to

explain how we develop individuals and communities (Bowers & Green, 2016). Such theories

and theoretical frameworks are often concerned with the various ways in which sport may create

change in individuals, groups, communities, nations, and society (Bowers & Green, 2016). In other words, SFD theories and theoretical frameworks attempt to understand and optimize the ways in which sport can be used for the purposes of developing individuals, groups, communities, and society (Bowers & Green, 2016). Therefore, the next section of the paper will explore the theoretical components of SFD by reviewing the history of SFD theory, the building blocks of SFD theory, SFD theory, and SFD theoretical frameworks. Lastly, it will provide a critical analysis on SFD theories and theoretical frameworks.

2.2.4 Sport-for-Development Theory

Although many SFD programs claim to have significant impacts on society, many of the programs are poorly planned and lack scientific evidence about their effectiveness (Welty Peachey & Lyras, 2011). Likewise, there is little research on the specific conditions and processes that are needed to achieve positive outcomes within SFD settings (Welty Peachey & Lyras, 2011). In light of this, Lyras (2003, 2007) used grounded theory to develop what is now referred to as sport-for-development theory (SFDT). In her research, Lyras (2003, 2007) designed and assessed multiple Applied Olympian Initiatives, which were known as the Doves Olympic Movement model (DOM) (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2016). This was done in order to provide "an interdisciplinary approach to better understand the conditions under which sport, education and cultural enrichment (Olympism) can promote personal and social change and development as a vehicle for peacebuilding and reconciliation" (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2016, pp. 134-135). The DOM model's program components and theoretical foundations became the conceptual framework for developing SFDT (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2016). Before reviewing SFDT, however it is first important to understand the assumptions upon which SFDT rests.

The theoretical foundations and assumptions of SFDT are thought to come from inter-group contact theory (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2016). Indeed, Lyras' "first propositions where built on the assumptions that the foundation of successful sport and social change initiatives should cultivate human development frameworks and inter-group contact theory conditions before, during and after implementing the [programs]" (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2016, p. 134). The use of intergroup contact theory in SFDT stems from the work of Allport (1954). As previously reviewed, intergroup contact theory proposes that contact between diverse groups can act as an effective remedy against things like racism, prejudice, and discrimination (Allport, 1954). In this sense, through interactions in the sport setting with dissimilar others, barriers can be broken down with the potential for broader societal changes to take place (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011).

Lyras (2007) suggests that sport can facilitate personal development and social change through an interdisciplinary framework that integrates sport with cultural and educational activities. "This framework and associated outcomes, termed the SFDT, consists of five components: (a) impacts assessment (b) organizational change, (c) sport and physical activity, (d) educational, and (e) cultural enrichment" (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011, p. 313). The first component, impacts assessment, is concerned with monitoring and evaluating the impact of sport programs aimed at promoting positive social change. It is suggested that when it comes to assessing the impact of sport programs that the macro, meso and micro levels of change should be considered (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). The macro level refers to changes that are related to infrastructure, resources, socio-economic factors, policies, and systems. The meso level includes changes in social networks, inter-group relationships, group cohesion, social integration, values, norms, equal treatment and access to resources. Lastly, the micro level comprises

psychological impacts such as self-esteem, stereotypes, and empowerment, as well as resources and opportunities that are provided at the individual level (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). When assessing program impacts, it is recommended that data should be collected from multiple sources using mixed methods in order to measure the impact(s) that the program may have (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). It is proposed that assessments of long term impacts and transferability can be used to enhance further understanding SFD program impacts and sustainability (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011).

The organizational change component is concerned with how organizational change must occur in order to more effectively design both programs and evaluation strategies (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011). Here, organizational change refers to things like promoting changes within the sport itself, as well as improving systemic functions and governing practices of organizations (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011). In addition to organizational change, this factor is also concerned, more broadly, with organizational factors. Such organizational factors include, engaging stakeholders, building capacity of stakeholders, fostering an inclusive and collaborative environment, development of innovative programs, transformational leadership, and an overall innovative organizational culture (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011).

The third building block of the SFDT framework, the sport component, focuses on the actual role that sport plays within SFD. At this level, it is commonly noted that sport can have both positive and negative outcomes. As an example, at an individual level, sport can act as a means for positively developing social and psychological skills, however it could also negatively affect psychological processes for some individuals as it may increase aggression (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011). It is important to understand such negative outcomes that may be associated with participation in SFD as SFD aims to foster the positive outcomes rather than

negative. When it comes to achieving some of the more positive outcomes, it is suggested that personal and moral development of the participants depend on the structure, conditions, context, and methods of the sport initiative (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011). For instance, sport programs should be based on moral values and principles, provide a variety of activities to attract a diverse group, aim to bring diverse groups together and create inclusive teams, and have coaches that act as positive role models (Lyras & Welty Peachy, 2011).

The educational component of the SFDT framework focuses on using sport as an educational tool. For instance, the sport program should provide positive learning experiences; incorporate reward systems to reinforce positive behaviours and attitudes; provide conditions for optimal engagement, and empowering of individuals; and promote empathy, care and creative thoughts (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). Welty Peachey (2011) further suggest that in SFD settings, instructors can act as mentors and create a new culture of inter-ethnic understanding, friendship and collaboration. When sport is used within such an educational framework it can become a great method of achieving educational objectives, as well as promoting moral and proactive citizens (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011).

The last building block of the SFDT framework, the cultural enrichment component, suggests that sport should include both cultural and educational activities (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). For instance, sport interventions can be enriched with cultural activities such as art, music, dance, etc. (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). Additionally, there should be a focus on global and local issues and associations should be made between sport and real-life issues such as human rights (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). There should also be an embracing of the local culture and promotion of global peace (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). Overall, the cultural

enrichment component is intended to enable important practices of peace building, international

cooperation, and an enhanced global awareness (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011).

Overall, SFDT proposes that SFD initiatives should design their programming around the

five building blocks that are outlined in Lyras and Welty Peachey's (2011) SFD theoretical

framework. Indeed, the components that make up SFDT "describe and explain the conditions

under which sport researchers and practitioners can more effectively design and assess sport for

social change initiatives" (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011, p. 313). This framework is applicable

in international, national and community-based interventions (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011).

However, Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011) caution that this is not a checklist, or a one size fits

all approach, and it is important to understand that the SFDT may only be applicable in certain

contexts. In other words, "SFDT should not be considered a prescriptive framework, but rather, it

should be adapted to local conditions and needs" (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011, p. 324). In this

sense, SFDT can give a guiding framework for what should be considered, but it must be adapted

to fit the context in which the SFD program is being implemented. Marshall and Barry (2015)

suggest that the SFDT model could be valuable for educational sport interventions with similar

components and objectives and could help build an evidence base for SFD" (p. 119).

2.2.5 A Critical Evaluation of Sport-for Development Theory

Overall, the field of SFD has received considerable attention over the past decade

(Shulenkorf & Spaaij, 2016). In particular, there has been an influx of theoretical and empirical

SFD studies within the SFD field (Schulenkorf, Sherry & Rowe, 2016). Although SFD and

theories surrounding SFD are a growing area of interest in sport research, there is still a lack of

evidence when it comes to the effectiveness of some of the core claims of SFD (Coalter, 2010).

Indeed, there are many statements of desired outcomes of sport, such as discipline, confidence,

tolerance and respect; however, evidence for such clams is limited (Coalter, 2010). According to Coalter (2010), even the term SFD itself is vague and open for interpretation. Moreover, the attention that SFD receives is often highly positive and even romanticized. Often, SFD is looked at in a positive light that highlights the power of sport as a force for positive social change (Shulenkorf & Spaaij, 2016). Additionally, there is often a positive link made between sport and development outcomes. Indeed, many SFD programs claim to have significant impact on society, however, in many cases the sport programs are poorly planned and do not provide scientific evidence about their effectiveness (Welty Peachey & Lyras, 2011, p. 311). Likewise, there is little research on the conditions and processes that are needed to achieve positive outcomes in specific settings (Welty Peachey & Lyras, 2011).

The disconnect between the positive claims made about SFD and the outcomes achieved, may be due in part to a lack of strong theory to guide the field (Shulenkorf & Spaaij, 2016). Indeed, Schulenkorf and Spaaji (2016) suggest that SFD projects need to have a strong theory underlying it as this will provide a comprehensive description of how desired outcomes can be achieved within a particular context. Although it might not be possible to prove a clear link between sport and social change, it has been suggested that researchers should examine different SFD programs to help identify some common features and conditions for success in order to help identify the ways in which sport can effect change (Welty Peachey & Lyras, 2011). However, given the breadth of SFD, it is somewhat idealistic to expect that one theory could encompass all relevant and significant aspects of the field (Shulenkorf & Spaaij, 2016). Rather, Schulenkofr and Spaaji (2016) propose that there is a lot that can and should be learned from parent disciplines and relevant fields. For instance, using theory from other and related disciplines may lead to a more comprehensive theoretical understanding of how SFD functions and how desired

outcomes are achieved (Shulenkorf & Spaaij, 2016). With this in mind, intergroup contact theory may be useful when it comes to understanding the facilitating conditions of positive contact within SFD settings. Overall, using theories from related fields would allow for new knowledge to be included in both SFD theory and program development (Shulenkorf & Spaaij, 2016).

2.2.6 Sport-for-Development Program Outcomes

SFD programs are often thought to provide many positive benefits for its participants, both at the individual level and the community level. In fact, there is often an inherent assumption that participation in SFD programs will lead to positive personal development, which will result in broader positive societal impacts (Coalter 2007, 2010). Many of these desired outcomes of SFD, and statements made in light of such positive outcomes are often derived from traditional and widespread ideologies of sport (Coalter, 2010). Such ideologies are often built upon the premise that sport can develop discipline, confidence, and tolerance within its participants (Coalter, 2010). However, robust evidence for such claims is often limited (Coalter, 2010). Indeed, there is often a lack of evidence to support the effectiveness of some of the core claims of SFD (Coalter, 2010). However, it is important to note that although there may not be strong empirical evidence to provide the support for the outcomes that sport can provide, it does not mean that sport and SFD programs do not have positive impacts on its participants and its community. In particular, youth are often thought to benefit positively as a result of their participation in SFD. Indeed, Fraser-Thomas, Côté and Deakin (2005) suggest that youth experience many positive developmental outcomes through participation in sport. For instance, sport provides youth with opportunities for physical activity, which is essential for facilitating normal growth and development in both children and adolescents (Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005). Additionally, SFD experiences can foster citizenship, social success, positive relationships with

peers and leadership skills (Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005). Overall, sport and in particular, SFD can provide many individual level outcomes and contribute to youths' overall wellbeing.

Not only can SFD programs provide positive benefits to its participants, but SFD also has the potential to bring people together and develop a sense of community. In particular, SFD programs are often used as a way of creating positive social change within a community by promoting intercultural exchange, conflict resolution, and peace building (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). This may stem out of the belief that sport can create communities with high levels of social capital (Skinner et al, 2008). On the whole, "there is a large amount of anecdotal evidence suggesting that sport can combine disparate people, communities and nations" (Schulenkorf, 2012, p. 2). However, there tends to be a lack of empirical evidence to support claims of sport contributing to intergroup togetherness and overall community development (Schulenkorf, 2012). Overall, it is thought that many positive community networks and relationships can be developed through sport (Skinner et al., 2008). Such levels of engagement within a community can create opportunities that foster social inclusion, community development and high levels of social capital (Skinner et al., 2008), all of which can have a positive impact on the overall community.

2.2.7 Management and Evaluation of Sport-for-Development Programs

Like any sport program, when it comes to SFD it is important that it is effectively managed and evaluated in order to help the program achieve its intended outcomes. In fact, according to Sherry, Schulenkorf and Phillips (2016), in order "to ensure that sport programs achieve their intended outcomes, monitoring and evaluation are crucial activities" (p. 161). As such, it is important to understand and analyze the success or failure of a program in its ability to achieve the outcomes it set out to so that lessons can be learned and applied when facilitating

future programs (Sherry et al., 2016). With that being said, not only is it important to analyze and evaluate the program, but it is equally important to have effective ways of managing programs. This is not only important for the initial management of the program, but it is also important to manage programs effectively after they have been evaluated so that lessons can effectively be applied to future programs.

Indeed, effective management of SFD programs is crucial when it comes to the overall success of a SFD program. On the whole, management of SFD programs is important for both current and future planning of SFD initiatives, as well as the sustainable development and evaluation of the program (Schulenkorf, 2016). For instance, SFD programs are typically designed with specific intentions, goals, and overall objectives in mind (Schulenkorf, 2016). Consequently, the SFD program must be managed appropriately in order to achieve such intended outcomes. This is likely why "academics are now analyzing the specific management and organizational aspects of SFD projects, including the specific tactics, strategies and implications of sport-related development work which underpin many contemporary projects" (Schulenkorf, 2016, p. 3). Analyzing such management practices is important as programs can be strategically used to have immediate impacts which can then turn into sustained outcomes (Schulenkorf, 2016). Likewise, it is important to strategically plan for long term, sustainable outcomes of SFD programs (Schulenkorf, 2016). Not only is strategic planning required, but also effective management as it is one thing to plan for long term outcomes, and another to achieve them. On the whole, effective management of SFD programs is a key component of successfully achieving and sustaining desired program outcomes.

There is currently a lack of key performance indicators (KPIs) to help measure the success of sport programs (Schulenkorf, 2012). Indeed, the need for evaluation of SFD programs

has been well documented by many (Levermore, 2011). This is a concern, as clearly identified KPIs would allow for a "more rigourous evaluation of impacts, outcomes, strengths and weaknesses of sport projects" (Schulenkorf, 2012, p. 9). Likewise, it would allow for us to begin to test the impact that such programs actually have on communities (Levermore, 2011). Additionally, it would allow for consistency in evaluating programs over time, or comparing different SFD programs. All in all, it is important to have a clear way of measuring the effectiveness of such programs in order to help identify how SFD outcomes can be leveraged and sustained (Schulenkorf, 2012).

Although there may be a lack of KPIs for evaluating SFD programs, monitoring and evaluation of SFD programs can achieved, in part, by measuring the outcomes of the program (Sherry et al., 2016). However, evaluation should not only occur at the level of outcomes, but rather evaluation should also occur at the planning and design levels (Sherry et al., 2016). In fact, according to Sherry et al. (2016), monitoring and evaluation of SFD programs should not just be something that occurs once the program is over, but rather it should be embedded in the design of the program and considered through the entire process as it can be influential in making designs along the way. Accordingly, "evaluation, then, is both a *formative* part of the initial planning stages of programming and also serving to shape and improve programming through amendment" (Sherry et al., 2016, p. 167). This is because the outcomes of the program should be thought out and planned for during the planning stage (Sherry et al., 2016). Managers must consider the intended outcomes and strategically design the program to achieve them right from the conception of the program in order to ensure the effectiveness of the SFD program in achieving its intended outcomes.

2.2.8 Critical perspectives on sport-for-development

Sport, when positioned within a development context is often looked at as having positive effects on its participants, such as teamwork, respect for others, cooperation, and positive personal development. It is important to note however, that such claims often lack robust evidence to support them (Coalter, 2007). Even though there may be a lack of evidence to support such claims, the link between sport participation and positive development is often left unquestioned, as there is an assumption that sport is fundamentally positive (Coakley, 2011). Indeed, it seems that "in recent times the notion of the 'power of sport' to do social good has increasingly come to prominence on both social policy agendas and sport management and marketing strategies (Crabbe, 2008). Indeed, social considerations of sport tend to have a functionalist view in that sport is often emphasized for what it can do to people and for society (Crabbe, 2008). This positive view and contextualization of sport however often disregards the negative impacts that sport can have at both the individual and societal level. There are implications for this type of uncritical thinking as it often leads to decision makers investing resources into sport and sport programs (Coakley, 2011), even though there may be a lack of evidence to support the positive outcomes that are actually gained as a result. Not only does this romanticism of sport influence social and economic supports that are given to sport, but it also influences parental, peer and personal decisions about sport participation (Coakley, 2011). Indeed, even within the context of development we cannot forget that "sport can also have negative side effects such as violence, corruption, discrimination, hooliganism, nationalism, doping and fraud" (United Nations, 2011). Negative impacts can be seen within youth sports as well. Specially, youth sports have been linked to negative outcomes such as sports related injuries, eating disorders, negative emotional and psychological outcomes as a result of increased

competiveness and pressures, and violence and aggression (Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005).

Additionally, it is important to recognize that not everyone has equal opportunities to participate

in sport, as they may lack resources or have limited access to sport and recreation opportunities.

Even when individuals are given an opportunity to participate in sport through a SFD program

for instance, they may still face certain barriers, such as access to the equipment needed to

participate in the sport.

On the whole, there are many factors to consider when it comes to both the positive and

negative impacts of sport. Some of these factors that should be considered include program

design, parental influences, and coach influences (Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005). Being aware of

such factors is important so that programs can be managed in a way that reduces the potential for

negative outcomes to occur and instead works towards achieving and sustaining the positive

outcomes. Overall, SFD programs do not foster positive outcomes automatically. Rather, they

require strategic and socially responsible interventions that are tailored to the unique needs

within a particular social and cultural context (United Nations, 2011). In this sense, it is

important for SFD managers, practitioners and researchers alike to consider the context in which

the SFD initiative will be taking place in order for the program to be successful, while also being

aware of the negative outcomes that sport can have.

2.2.9 Intergroup contact and sport-for-development programs

It is without a doubt that there is a clear connection between intergroup contact theory

and SFD. In fact, many scholars refer to the use of contact within sport for development

programs (see Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011; Welty Peachey, 2011; Schulenkorf, 2011, Sugden,

2006). Further, Lyras & Welty Peachey's (2011) suggest that intergroup contact is a building

block of SFD, and in particular SFD theory. A study by Sugden (2006) explores a SFD program

designed to reduce conflict and promote co-existence in Israel. In the article, Sudgen (2006) reviews the SFD program and identifies some key issues that were faced. In particular, Sudgen (2006) looks at Football for Peace, which is a sport-based co-existence project aimed at reducing conflict and promoting positive relationships amongst Jewish and Arab children. The goals of the program were to "provide opportunities for social contact across community boundaries; promote mutual understanding; engender in participants a desire for and commitment to peaceful co-existence; and enhance soccer skills and technical knowledge" (Sugden, 2006, p. 226). In order to achieve these objectives, there were several processes used to promote positive contact amongst groups. The first involved encouraging awareness of the other (Sugden, 2006). For instance, children were given the opportunity to see what conditions were like in the other children's neighbourhoods and were able to learn more about the other children's history and background. One of the ways that this was done was by alternating which town the practices took place in (Sugden, 2006). In doing so, the children learned a lot about each other's history and thus developed a different outlook towards each other (Sugden, 2006). The children in the program were also given many opportunities to interact with one another and have dialogue and as a result, many children developed friendships (Sugden, 2006). One of the ways that this was done was by dividing the children up into four groups that were comprised of individuals with various backgrounds, identities and skill levels. This was done to promote intergroup contact amongst the children (Sudgen, 2006). Additionally, the football club itself was not ethnically exclusive, and had good facilities and coaches which all promoted positive contact amongst participants (Sudgen, 2006).

The Football for Peace program, although a successful and important initiative, faced a number of problems. For instance, there were some issues with language and translation as the

coaching was conducted in English and there were variations in the children's fluency in English (Sudgen, 2006). Another issue that was faced was that some of the coaches were too competitive, which took away from the underlying rationale of the project (Sudgen, 2006). Lastly, a number of issues were faced as a result of the Israel's complex political and social environment. For instance, many individuals in the communities are socially and economically deprived and live in communities experiencing high levels of conflict, which had an impact on program participation (Sudgen, 2006). Overall, Sudgen (2006) highlights a number of key issues that emerge when implementing a sport-based social intervention in a complex and divided society. Such issues remind us that there are a number of factors that must be considered when designing and implementing a SFD program intended to promote positive contact amongst groups experiencing conflict. Indeed, when bringing groups experiencing conflict together, one must be mindful of the potential issues that may arise within the given context (Sugden, 2006; Schulenkorf, 2010).

2.3 Conclusion/gaps in our knowledge

Overall, there is a clear link between intergroup contact and SFD. Indeed, given that a common goal of many SFD programs is often to bring people together and help to build bridges among divided communities, intergroup contact is almost a necessary condition for these goals to occur. However, little is known about what specific conditions facilitate contact within a SFD setting. This is an important area to consider as interpersonal relationships represent a central component of many SFD programs. Furthermore, although sport can promote friendship development, such effects need to be understood within the social and structural features of the context of the sport program (Jones et. al., 2016). Thus, it is important not only to understand the role of contact in SFD programs, but it is also important to understand the role of contact within specific SFD contexts.

Such gaps in our understanding are problematic for a number of reasons. For example, there is a gap when it comes to understanding the ways in which outcomes of SFD programs are actually attained, which means that there is no real way of managing SFD programs so that they can ensure delivery of positive outcomes. For instance, Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011) provide us with a SFDT that outlines a framework of multiple aspects that should be incorporated in a SFD program in order to achieve the intended outcomes. However, what seems to be missing from this theoretical framework is the role of contact in promoting intended relationship development outcomes of SFD programs. Therefore, this research intends to fill such gaps by exploring the relationship between intergroup contact and SFD. In particular, this study will explore both the factors that influence contact and the outcomes of contact within an inner-city youth SFD program. This will help us to better understand the processes and mechanisms that allow for such programs to effectively facilitate positive contact. It will also provide a basis for understanding what some of the potential impacts of contact are on stakeholders involved in an inner-city youth SFD program.

3. Chapter Three: Methods

This section will provide an overview of the methods that were used for the study. In particular, it will provide an overview of the research context, the participants, the study design, data collection data analysis, and the methods for ensuring credibility.

3.1 Research Context

Within Canada, the government is organized into three and sometimes four different levels. These levels are divided as follows: Federal, Provincial/Territorial, and Municipal (which can be further divided into regional and local). Each level of government has different responsibilities and jurisdictions. For instance, the Federal Government deals with matters such as criminal law, citizenship, and national defense. The Provincial and Territorial Government, on the other hand oversee matters related to health, education, and civil rights. Lastly, municipal governments are responsible for things like water, public transportation, and emergency services. In addition to these areas of responsibility, municipalities also provide recreation programming for its citizens. In fact, many municipalities have community centres, public pools, and libraries where they hold various recreation programs for members of the community.

Since municipalities are a key deliverer of recreation and sport programming, and they also have a vested interest in improving/enhancing the lives of communities they provide a strong context in which to perform this research study. As such, the context of this research is a local municipality within Ontario. In particular, the study focuses on a local municipality that implemented an inner-city youth SFD program that was part of an overall initiative to build relationships within a community who was experiencing high levels of conflict within and between groups. The study takes place in a densely populated low-income neighbourhood that has a high proportion of new Canadian youth. Over the past few years the community has

experienced high levels of conflict. In particular, the community has been having issues with youth who are disconnected from their community. In addition to being disconnected from their community, the youth also had a poor relationship with the local police. Therefore, in attempts to promote positive relationship development between the youth and the police, the municipality implemented a SFD program.

The SFD program used soccer as a tool to bring the youth and police together in a positive way. Soccer was chosen as the tool to promote contact as it was identified that soccer was the youths' favourite sport/leisure activity. Indeed, both the police and staff from the community centre identified that the youth in the community spent most of their free time either playing, or talking about soccer. However, many of the youth lacked the resources necessary to play soccer on an organized team. As such, the community centre staff and the police decided to develop a soccer team for the youth in the community. In addition to providing the youth with an opportunity to play soccer, the police were chosen to be the coaches for the soccer team so that they could begin to build a relationship with the youth.

The soccer program has been running for three consecutive years. The program itself runs from May to August. The typical structure of the program is one practice and one soccer game a week. During the soccer practices and games, the police interact with the youth and provide mentorship to them. For instance, the police talk to the youth about issues they are having both on and off the field, and provide support to them. In addition to the soccer practices and games, the police also try to organize a couple of events for the youth each season. For example, towards the end of each soccer the police organize what is called a badges game where the youth play soccer against the local police and fire department. Likewise, the police try to organize the youth to participate in an out of town soccer tournament each season.

Overall, the program has received a lot of positive feedback from the program stakeholders, the youth, and the overall community. Through the program, the police were able to develop a positive relationship with the youth. Moreover, the program helped to shift the youths' behaviours and develop stronger connections to their community. Since the program was able to successfully promote contact amongst two very diverse groups, which led to many positive outcomes, the program provides an appropriate context to fulfill the purpose of the study and answer the research questions.

3.2 Participants

The participants of this study included leaders from the municipality, community stakeholders, and youth program participants. The study included four leaders from the municipality, one community stakeholder, and eight youth program participants. The leaders from the municipality included city staff who oversaw, or were a part of the development and implementation of the soccer program. Community stakeholders included those who worked with the city to develop and implement the program. Lastly, the youth involved in the study were participants of the soccer program. All youth who participated in the study were between the ages of 16 and 18. The length of time that the youth participated in the soccer program varied from one to three years, however, all had been part of the program for at least one season. The soccer season is approximately four months long.

In order to gain contact with the study participants, I worked with two gatekeepers. The primary gatekeeper for the study was Karen, who is the district facilitator for three of the City of Riverdale community centres. Karen is responsible for supervising the three community centres, and managing the activities that take place within them. As part of her role, Karen works with the broader community to build and maintain relationships with community partners. Karen has

worked with the City of Riverdale for a number of years and has an in-depth understanding of

the needs of the communities in which she works. Since 2015, Karen has been working with the

Rosewood community centre to try and address youth deviance. In order to address youth

deviance in the community Karen worked with the city of Riverdale, the staff of the Rosewood

community centre, the local police and fire departments, and the Riverdale Soccer Association to

create a youth soccer team. The soccer team was developed in order to promote positive contact

between the Rosewood youth and the local police with the goal of improving the relationship

between the youth and the police. For the purposes of this study, Karen helped to identify and

gain contact with key informants. Following approval from ethics, Karen provided me with

contact information for individuals who would be able to provide information useful to the study.

Upon receiving contact information from Karen, an information letter was distributed to

potential adult participants via email. These potential participants included staff of the Rosewood

community centre, leaders from the City of Riverdale, the local police department, the local fire

department, and the Riverdale Soccer Association. In addition to acting as a gatekeeper for the

study, Karen was also a participant in the study.

Karen connected me with the secondary gatekeeper for the study, Hakeem who is the

Facilitator of the Rosewood community centre. Hakeem works directly with the community

members of Rosewood and oversees the community centre programs and services. He is

responsible for supervising the programs and staff in the community centre. Hakeem works with

the members of the community to ensure that the programs and services that the community

centre offers are relevant to the needs of the community. Hakeem worked with Karen to develop

meaningful programming for the youth of Rosewood in hopes of building relationships amongst

the Rosewood youth and the local police. Hakeem served as the secondary gatekeeper for this

study by connecting me with the youth participants. After receiving approval from ethics, Hakeem arranged all contact that I had with the youth participants. Hakeem organized the youth coming to the community centre to receive an information letter and learn more about the study. He also scheduled the interviews with the youth and booked rooms in the Rosewood community centre for the interviews to take place. In addition to facilitating contact with the youth, Hakeem also participated in the study as an interviewee.

Other participants for the study included staff from the City of Riverdale and the Rosewood community centre who were involved in the soccer program. Involvement of these individuals varied from program development and oversight, to administrative work and day-to-day program operations. Individuals from the local police and fire department who were involved in the program were also invited to participate in the study. The police officer who acted as the coach for the program participated in the study, however the representative from the fire department declined to be interviewed. Lastly, the manager of the Riverdale Soccer Association was invited to participate in the study, but did not respond to invitations or communications that were sent. Overall, there was a total of 13 interview participants for the study, including eight youth, one police officer, and four City of Riverdale staff, including those who work at the Rosewood community centre.

3.3 Data Collection

All data was collected from August 2017 – to October 2017. A total of 13 semi-structured interviews were conducted. All stakeholder interviews including the police and City and community centre staff were one-on-one interviews and were approximately 60 minutes in length. The youth interviews were also semi-structured in nature; however, they were done as small group interviews, with two to three youth in each interview. Small group interviews

allowed for richer data to be collected as the youth were more comfortable with the researcher and the overall interview process. Small group interviews also helped to promote discussion amongst the youth, which allowed many of the youth to recall particular events and stories. The youth interviews ranged from 30 to 60 minutes in length. All interviews, including youth and stakeholder interviews, took place in a public setting including the Rosewood community centre, City Hall, and the local police station.

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as a form of data collection as it allowed me to focus on key areas related to the research questions while still maintaining some flexibility. Since there was a clear focus to the research, the use of semi-structured interviews allowed for specific issues pertaining to the focus of the research to be addressed (Bryman et al., 2012). Although semi-structured interviews have a consistent focus across interviews, the interviewee still has some flexibility in how they answer the questions and the researcher could probe for new insights as they emerge (Bryman et al., 2012). This allowed for different insights to be gained, while maintaining a clear path of focus. Overall, the use of semi-structured interviews allowed me as the researcher to get specific and detailed responses from the interviewees, allowing for issues related to the research questions to be explored in depth. The semi-structured nature of the interview allowed for the results to be comparable across those who are interviewed and for themes to be identified. In order to conduct the semi-structured interviews, three separate interview guides were created for the following groups: youth participants (Appendix A), program stakeholders (Appendix B), and police officers (Appendix C).

The questions used in the interview guides were designed to address the two research questions. For instance, in order to answer the first research question, what are the conditions which facilitate contact within a sport-based youth development program, questions related to

Allport's (1954) conditions of positive contact were asked. Allport (1954) suggests that the following four conditions should be in place in order for optimal contact to occur: equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and institutional support. Additionally, Pettigrew (1998) suggests that there is a fifth condition, friendship potential. Therefore, the questions used in the first portion of the interview guide sought to understand whether or not Allport (1954) and Pettigrew's (1998) conditions of positive contact were met. In addition to exploring Allport (1954) and Pettigrew's (1998) conditions of contact, program stakeholders were asked questions about how the program was designed and what factors needed to be considered in order to promote positive contact amongst the youth and the police. This was done in order to gain an understanding of what conditions were key to facilitating contact amongst the youth and the police in the program.

In seeking to answer the second research question, how does contact influence stakeholders involved in a sport-based youth development program, questions about outcomes of the program were asked. According to Allport's (1954) contact hypothesis, positive contact can influence stakeholders in a number of ways. Indeed, Allport (1954) proposes that positive contact can reduce conflict between groups, improve intergroup attitudes, reduce intergroup anxiety, and promote positive relationship development. With this in mind, questions about the program outcomes and the impact that the program had on each stakeholder group were asked.

3.4 Data analysis

Throughout the data collection process, I simultaneously collected and analyzed the data (Charmaz, 2006). This allowed me to become familiar with the themes emerging in the data and advance my understanding of what took place within the soccer program. By beginning the transcription and analysis phases after collecting each interview, I was able to gain an

understanding of what was occurring in the data, which helped to direct the research moving

forward. In order to analyze the data, methods of grounded theory were used. Before describing

the steps that were taken to analyze the data, it is important to note that grounded theory methods

only specify the data analysis strategies, and not the methods of data collection (Charmaz, 2003).

The use of grounded theory techniques in analyzing the data helped to ensure that there was a

systematic and rigid process in place for analyzing the data.

After transcribing the data, I began to code each interview. One of the main features of grounded

theory is coding. Indeed, some would even say that "grounded theory coding generates the bones

of your analysis" (Charmaz, 2006, p. 45). Coding is a pivotal phase between collecting the data

and being able to explain the data (Charmaz, 2006). Through coding, the researcher is able to

shape an analytic frame from where they can define what is happening in the data and begin to

understand what it means (Charmaz, 2006). Charmaz (2006) indicates that:

> grounded theory coding consists of at least two main phases: 1) an initial phase
>
> involving naming each word, line, or segment of the data followed by 2) a focused,
>
> selective phase that uses the most significant or frequent initial codes to sort, synthesize,
>
> integrate, and organize large amounts of data. (p. 46)

In addition to the two main phases of coding outlined by Charmaz (2006), Strauss and Corbin

(1990), present a third type of coding, axial coding. Axial coding, puts the data back together in

new ways by making connections between the categories that were created with open the open

coding procedures (Bryman et al., 2012). The use of axial coding helped to give clarity to the

analysis as the data was shaped into major categories (Charmaz, 2006).

Overall, through this interactive coding process, you interact with your data over and

over again (Charmaz, 2006) allowing you to become very familiar with your data and the themes

that are emerging. Accordingly, a main feature of grounded theory is that it is under constant comparative analysis, meaning that each item of data is compared with every other item of data, and that data collection and analysis occur simultaneously (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

During the initial coding phase, I began by reading the data closely to becoming familiar with it while still remaining open to all possible directions the data could take me (Charmaz, 2006). During this phase, I treated the data analytically and asked myself important questions such as: what does the data suggest, and from whose point of view? I worked with each segment of data on its own, rather than trying to apply preexisting categories to it (Charmaz, 2006). In order to do so, I went through the data line-by-line and assigned codes. Assigning codes allowed for me to begin to make meaning of my data and pinpoint gaps that I could focus on in subsequent data collection (Charmaz, 2003). During the initial coding phase, I followed Charamaz's (2006) line-by-line coding technique. Line-by-line coding involved me going through the data and naming each line (Charmaz, 2006). Doing this allowed me to get a close look at what the participants were really saying in the data (Charmaz, 2006). Line-by-line coding allowed me to look at the data critically and analytically as it allowed me to identify important processes in the data and begin to see themes (Charmaz, 2006).

After establishing analytic directions through the line-by-line coding process I began to synthesize and explain larger segments of the data through focused coding (Charmaz, 2006). During the focused coding phase, I used the most significant and frequent codes from the line-by-line coding to sift through large amounts of data (Charmaz, 2006). I began to pinpoint and develop categories throughout the data (Charmaz, 2006). Through the focused coding process, I was able to move across interviews and compare participants' experiences allowing me to condense the data into focused codes (Charmaz, 2006). I then compared the data to the focused

codes, which helped me to refine them (Charmaz, 2006). Overall, the focused coding process allowed me to begin to synthesize and explain larger pieces of the data by focusing on reoccurring and significant codes within the data.

The third phase of the coding process, axial coding involved relating categories to subcategories and asking how they are related (Charmaz, 2006). Axial coding helped to give clarity to the analysis as the data was shaped into major categories (Charmaz, 2006). The purpose of axial coding was to sort, synthesize and organize large amounts of data and resemble them in new ways (Charmaz, 2006). Axial coding allowed me to bring the data back together into a coherent whole (Charmaz, 2006). Overall, axial coding helped me to develop the data into categories. These categories were then used to identify major themes across the data.

3.5 Credibility and Trustworthiness

Credibility is a very important component of the research process. Indeed, "the quality of the research and the trust which can be placed in it depends on the methods used and the care with which they have been deployed" (Veal, 2011, p. 46). Typically, when dealing with credibility, validity and reliability are used as the criteria for judging whether or not the research is credible. However, it has been identified that the criteria of validity and reliability come from positivists traditions, and are not always appropriate measures in every research approach (Veal, 2011). Since validity and reliability are not applicable constructs to use within qualitative research, (Bryman et al., 2012) other measures such as trustworthiness and authenticity, will be used to ensure quality of the research. For the current study, the following four criteria are used: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Veal, 2011).

The criterion of credibility identifies that people view the world in various ways, and therefore the research must ensure that the researcher's interpretations presented are reflective of

the participants' actual experiences (Bryman et al., 2012). By discussing preliminary findings of

the research with key stakeholders along the way, I was able to ensure the information presented

in the study was reflective of the events that took place and the participants' experiences in the

soccer program. The next criterion, dependability, refers to the consistency and reliability of the

researcher's approaches (Bryman et al., 2012; Creswell, 2014). I was able to demonstrate this by

ensuring that I was consistent with my research methods throughout the entire research process.

The next criterion, transferability, is concerned with the transfer of findings to another setting

(Veal, 2011). However, in qualitative research, the findings are often only truly transferable to

the study itself (Veal, 2011). With this in mind, Bryman et al. (2012) and Creswell (2014)

suggest that rather than being concerned with transferability, researchers should provide thick

description. Thick description helps to provide rich and detailed accounts of people's

experiences which provides others with the information they need to possibly transfer the

findings to other settings (Bryman et al., 2012). In the interest of transferability, I provide rich,

detailed and transparent accounts of the entire research process. The third criterion,

dependability, suggests that researchers keep complete records of the research process (Bryman

et al., 2012). In order to do this, I took field notes as a I went along the research process. This

helped me to stay on track and remember important details, or questions and ideas that popped

up while I was out on the field. I also kept record of the activities I was doing so that I could

have a detailed record of the research process. Lastly, since objectivity and removing of personal

values is near impossible in social research, the criterion of confirmability was used instead

(Bryman et al., 2012). Confirmability is concerned with whether or not the researcher has acted

in good faith (Bryman et al., 2012). In other words, it should be clear that personal values or

theoretical inclinations are not the main factors influencing the research conduct or findings

(Bryman et al., 2012). In order to ensure confirmability, I thought critically throughout the research process and was aware of my own personal values and beliefs and was mindful of the impact they might have on the study. Further, as suggested by Creswell (2014), my research supervisor reviewed the study throughout the research process to help confirm the results.

3.6 Ethical considerations

Since this study is dealing with matters of public interest, involves individuals under the age of 18 years, and may have some sensitive material, there were many ethical considerations taken into account. As a researcher, I am aware of my ethical and moral obligations, and ensured that these were upheld throughout the entire research process. I gave every research participant an information letter about the study so that they could be fully aware of the research and the aim of the study. I reviewed the information letter with the participants and answered any questions that they had. After going through the letter with each participant in detail, they were asked to sign a consent form if they wished to participate in the study. All participants were made aware that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw their consent at any time. After the interview was over, I gave each participant a letter that thanked them for their participation in the study. All of my contact information, as well as my supervisor's contact information was in the letter so that they could follow up with either one of us if they had any concerns. They were also given contact information for the University of Waterloo Research Ethics Office in case they wanted to contact them directly with any concerns.

In order to protect everyone involved in the study, pseudonyms were used for all individuals and organizations so that nobody can be identified through the research. In order to protect the confidentially of participants throughout the research process, particularly the data

collection and analysis phases, all data collected was secured in a locked cabinet to ensure that only the primary investigators could have access to the raw data.

3.7 Role as the researcher

The project began to unfold during the Winter 2016 term when Dr. Katie Misener and myself met with some of the leadership of the municipality that we intended to work with. One of the leaders from the municipality who oversees the municipality's recreation department was a guest speaker for a class that Dr. Katie Misener was teaching over the Fall 2015 term. I was a teaching assistant for the course and found the presentation very interesting. In particular, I was interested in the soccer program that the municipality had developed to help build relationships amongst youth and police within a specific community. Shortly after the presentation Dr. Katie Misener contacted the presenter and asked if we could meet with him to discuss the potential of doing a research project on the soccer program. Dr. Misener and myself met with both the presenter and the director of the community centre where the soccer program took place to discuss our ideas in regards to the research project. Both individuals were very receptive of, and excited about the project. Both individuals agreed to be gatekeepers for the study moving forward.

After reviewing relative literature, building a framework for the study, and receiving ethical clearance, I contacted the leaders from the municipality over the spring 2017 term to see if they were still interested in Dr. Katie Misener and myself doing a research project on the soccer program. They indicated that they were still interested and a meeting was set up between myself, the director of the community centre, and the program facilitator. The three of us met to discuss the timeline for the study and steps that would be taken for data collection. Collectively, we came up with a mutually agreed upon plan to move forward with data collection. I worked

with both individuals to contact potential participants. The director of the community centre provided me with contact information for the program stakeholders. The program facilitator contacted the youth on my behalf to see if they would come to the community centre to learn about the study and potentially participate. Throughout the study it was my responsibility to communicate with the participants and conduct the interviews. I worked with participants to set up interviews at a time that was convenient to them. All interviews were held in a public location. After collecting the data, I was responsible for transcription, analysis, and interpretation of all of the interviews that were conducted.

Throughout the entire research process, I took an overt route meaning that everyone I interacted with was aware of my role as a researcher (Bryman et al., 2012). I was transparent with everyone I interacted with in regards to the study to ensure that they were fully aware of my role as a researcher and the intentions of the project. I clearly explained the project, the goals of the study, and what participation would and would not involve to all research participants. I maintained a professional relationship with all individuals with whom I interacted. I had no previous relationships with any of the research participants or organizations involved in the study. I thought critically throughout the study, always thinking about the larger picture and how the data I was collecting would fit into the larger research project. This helped me ensure that there weren't any gaps in the research. I often reflected on my role in the study and thought critically of the experiences and privileges that I hold and how they may impact the research. Such reflexivity was important as it helped me to constantly be aware of my status as a research, gender, ethnicity, social class, age, and sexual orientation and how such factors may impact and influence the research. I maintained regular communication with my supervisor Dr. Katie Misener to discuss my progress throughout the research process. This provided me with valuable

feedback and helped me to think more critically about my research. Dr. Misener asked important questions and gave me things to think about while conducting the study.

3.8 Challenges within the study

Overall, the research project ran smoothly, and there were only a few challenges that were encountered. One of the main challenges that I faced was with regards to participation. There were a couple of individuals who were identified as key informants for the study, but either did not want to participate, or could not be contacted. One of the individuals contacted would not respond to any forms of communication. The other potential participant was not interested in being involved in the study in any way. In order to respect the privacy of the individuals and their right to not participate, they were not asked to participate any further. Although this is the nature of research, it was unfortunate as they could have provided some valuable data and insights into the study.

A second challenge that was encountered in the study was with regards to the youth interviews. The program facilitator at the community centre that I was working with said that they would set up all of the youth interviews for me. It was agreed upon that all interviews would take place over the summer before the youth had to return to school. The program facilitator had to be contacted a number of times, which delayed the youth interviews by a number of weeks. The program facilitator scheduled the interviews a week before summer was over and asked all of the youth participants to come on the same day. This posed a number of challenges. For starters, the youth interviews were supposed to be one-on-one interviews, lasting 30-60 mins each. After doing the first youth interview, it became clear that the other youth would not want to sit around waiting to be interviewed. In light of this, I interviewed multiple youth at the same

time. While this was not the intention, it was interesting to observe how the interactions amongst

the youth during the interviews.

4. Chapter Four: Findings

The findings of this research revealed that many factors played a role in facilitating contact within the sport-based youth development program. This was evident from program conception to program development and implementation. For instance, in order for positive contact to occur, program stakeholders (city staff, police, and community partners) had to first identify what the needs of the community were. One of the main needs that was identified was that there was a poor relationship between the youth and the police, and as a result there was a need for greater understanding between these two groups. However, facilitating contact between the youth and the police was not straight forward. This was largely due to the fact that the youth did not want to interact with the police. Therefore, in order to facilitate contact between the youth and the police, program stakeholders needed to develop a program that the youth would be interested in participating in. Accordingly, the program stakeholders identified that many of the youth in the community were passionate about soccer. Therefore, based on the youth's passions and interests, a soccer program was developed. Not only did the youths' passion and interests play a role in facilitating contact amongst the groups, but the success of the soccer program in facilitating contact also relied heavily upon program stakeholders who acted as champions of youth development. Indeed, the program required many resources including human, time and financial, and such resources were often strained.

This section of the thesis will answer the first research question, which was "what factors facilitate contact within a sport-based youth development program?". In answering research question number one, the following core themes were identified: (1) recognition of group needs, (2) relevant programming, (3) champions of youth development, and (4) resource requirement. These themes and their sub-themes are described in the following section of the thesis.

4.1 Understanding Stakeholder Attitudes

The research revealed that in order to promote positive contact between groups, it was important to understand the various perspectives of the stakeholder groups. This was evident in many of the stakeholder interviews. In particular, Hakeem (program facilitator) expressed that communities and perspectives are fluid "so as social workers, as community services we have to mimic what the needs are in the community". Hakeem also suggested that not only is it important to understand the stakeholder groups, but it is also important to keep in mind that what works in one community might not work in another. For instance, Hakeem (program facilitator) explained that:

One of the things that we've also learned and I always share is that…just because a program is successful in such time period, or is successful in another area in neighbourhoods, doesn't mean that we can take that and implement it somewhere else. (Hakeem/program facilitator).

Indeed, he believes that "every neighbourhood is different, it's just that we need to figure out what those neighbourhoods are like and find a way to develop that. (Hakeem/program facilitator). Based on this, it was important that the program developers identified what each of the stakeholder groups' attitudes were so that they could initiate meaningful contact. The findings of the study indicated that in order to promote positive contact between the youth and the police, the program needed to be mindful of each of the stakeholder groups' attitudes. For instance, it was identified was that the youth had a fear of authority figures and a lack of trust. In particular, many of the youth feared and avoided the police. In addition to the fear and distrust, there was a poor relationship with the youth in the community and the police officers. This led to increased tension between the two groups and the use of aggressive policing tactics. Based on

these factors, the community centre and the police identified that there was a strong need to build

a relationship between the youth in the community and the police.

4.1.1 Recognizing Fear and Distrust of Authority

In their interviews, many of the youth described how they had a fear of the police, and as

a result often avoided them. Not only did the youth avoid the police, but so did many other

people who lived in the community. Goy (youth participant) explains this when he says,

"especially like when you see all the people around here and they, they don't, no one goes to the

police. When they see the police, they walk away". This had an impact on some of the youth, as

they would follow what others in the community did. Goy (youth participant) explains:

So we are seeing the all the brothers and friends that they, they don't wanna see the

police. . . you just follow the people that live around here cause you know them, like you

gonna look different if you are like "ohh the police", you know? You don't want nothing

to do with them.

Many of the youth described how they would run from the police when they saw them.

When Sajid (youth participant) was asked why they ran away he said:

It's because they will arrest you. . . "they actually thought it was funny, a big group of us

after YDI (Youth Drop In) we used to run away, so they chase us, sometimes they caught

one guy, they used to arrest them, we thought it was funny, like a manhunt game.

Frank (police officer) described how many of the youth "they just wouldn't talk to you. I mean

they wouldn't come up to your car, they wouldn't come up to you at the community centre,

you'd get yes and no answers, or they would just leave". Barry (director of community resources

and services) also explained how when the police came into the community the youth would

scatter. Barry (director of community resources and services) describes:

They see a police officer, you scatter automatically right, but once you're, once you start, you have a police officer driving a cruiser into the community who's a community resource officer, he's in full gear, he's got a gun, he's got everything. So, before the soccer program started, they'd see that and run or just kind of turn away, even if they weren't doing anything.

Even when it came to joining the soccer team, many of the youth were hesitant to join due to the fact that the police would be involved in the program. Goy (youth participant) describes this in his following statement, "then I joined the team, first I wasn't thinking about it cause I thought it was like the police, and then I didn't want nothing to do with them, you know". "At first, I wasn't feelin' it, I didn't know it was gonna be, like how it was you know" (Goy/youth participant). This was because many of the youth didn't trust the police. For example, Sajid (youth participant) explains:

I didn't trust them much. That's why I didn't participate in the first place, we used to never play the Tuesday program thing like that, we didn't really play, like we just come and just do whatever we wanted you know.

When the soccer program was developed, some youth feared that it was actually a set up. Sajid (youth participant) said, "that's when I used to think, oh they just come for us people now. Rosewood make a team to see who has anger problems, you know". When asked about this further Sajid (youth participant) said:

In my head I was thinking I should not go in your know, like…it's a police, I was thinking like in practice sometimes I play really rough, if you kick somebody there's a police officer there you know. They could start something, they can give you a charge you know what I mean?

Fear and distrust of the police was also evident among some of the youth's parents. Karen

(community centre director) describes this in the following:

> There was concerns too from the parents that they didn't want their kids hanging out with
>
> the police because back home the police would take them and all of a sudden they'd be in
>
> something else that was even worse than where they were at before.

The soccer program and community centre staff expressed that they felt that the distrust may

have been a result of the diverse backgrounds of the youth and the relationship with

authority/police that exists in many of the countries where the program participants were from.

Barry (director of community programs and services) explains that "some of the countries

parents came from there's not a lot of trust in the policing anyway". Hakeem (program

facilitator) also explains that "those who immigrated here also from their countries police are not

friendly, so if you see a police you run away, that's what sort of how they grew up".

Overall, recognizing the fear and distrust that the youth held towards the police was a key

mechanism in facilitating contact. Since many of the youth had a strong fear of, and distrust in,

the police, many of them were hesitant to participate in the program. In fact, when the program

first started, the program facilitators struggled to get the youth to come out to the program.

As a result, the program stakeholders had to work hard to get the youth to even come out to the

program. If the youth never participated in the program, positive contact would not have

occurred. Therefore, recognizing and being mindful of the youths' fear and distrust was key

when it came to actually facilitating contact between the youth and the police.

4.1.2 Recognizing tension between youth and police

In addition to understanding the fear and distrust that the youth held towards the police, it

was also important to recognize the high degree of tension that existed between the youth and the

police prior to the implementation of the program. When participants were asked to reflect on their experiences with the police prior to the soccer program, it was clear that within the community that there was no relationship between the youth and the police and that tensions were high between these diverse groups. Frank (police officer) describes how:

> There was no relationship, they didn't, they didn't want to talk to police, they didn't
>
> wanna have anything to do with us only because there was no relationship there.

Hakeem (program facilitator) also explained that "there was a lot of issues with the relationship with the community and policing". Further, he explains how "there was no connection with the youth, with the community and so on" (Hakeem/program facilitator). In their interviews, some of the youth described some negative interactions that they had with the police. Braveen (youth participant) explained how "the police used to come here they randomly used to stop people for no reason like…I'm telling you, you just an object". He further explained how:

> They used to come to Timmies to bother us after soccer, they used to tell us oh what are
>
> you doing here? They used to come sit next to us at Tim Hortons you know like ask, yo
>
> why you here? Why you not buying something? Sometimes we would just sit on the
>
> desk. No one has money, you know, they even told the staff not to give us water, or the
>
> cups for it. (Braveen /youth participant).

Indeed, some of the youth even described the tension in the relationship by discussing situations where the police used aggressive tactics towards them. For instance, Sajid (youth participant) explained how "one time, the man pushed me to the window". Goy (youth participant) also explained how "even in the winter they chase you and they kick you in the legs and you fall down and they step on you in the chest, they abuse you so bad that we don't like them". Sajid (youth participant) also describes a story of how:

They were so mean, you know what they used to do? So YDI (Youth Drop In) finishes at

ten right, I mean at night, so the kids is just chilling outside everybody waiting their rides

sometimes, you know, just chillin outside in the parking lot, they used to come and give

us tickets for standing in the parking lot until ten.

From the perspective of authority figures, Karen (community centre director) described how

"anecdotally we were hearing that some officers didn't want to come to respond to calls in this

neighbourhood". Further to this, the community was described as being a red zone. Karen

(community centre director) explains:

Because of the amount of crime in the neighbourhood, so with the calls for service, um

the police identified this as a red zone, which when they do, one of their ways to mid-, to

mitigate uh the crime is to send in what they call the core unit, which is the, um…crime,

oh I forget what it stands for, crime oppression, response or something, and that is almost

like a SWAT team, like heavy uniform, different than a beat cop, and they were just

taking…arrests, they were making a lot of arrests, taking kids down.

Overall, things in the community, as Karen (community centre director) describes:

were pretty tense as well, I mean we were having lots of issues with vandalism

…tensions and accusations, and that's when police were arresting youth, so they thought

sometimes that our, our staff were responsible for their arrests, so we had dealings with

retaliation and retribution.

4.1.3 Understanding the need for relationship development

Based on the youth's fear of and distrust in the police, as well as the high tensions

between the police and the youth, it was identified that there was a need to build a relationship

amongst the youth and the police in the community. The soccer program then, as Hakeem

(program facilitator) describes "was developed based on the needs that we've seen in the community". The main need that was identified in the community and became the rationale behind developing the program, was a need to develop a relationship between the youth and the police in the community. Likewise, Chris (community centre staff) explains that "the soccer program was developed as a partnership originally with the kit-, with fire, the police and the city was developed to create a better relationship with officers and youth". Barry (director of community programs and services) further explains that:

> The soccer program was developed, in that particular community based on needs and the wants of the kids in the community. The program was started as a result of some issues that were going on in the community, and they were largely issues of youth being involved in a negative way with police. Vandalizing, larger crimes, there was a want for the police and community to have better interactions.

Based on this desire, the community centre decided to develop a program that was relevant to the youth in the community and would provide a positive developmental opportunity for youth in this area, and offer a mechanism for re-shaping relationships between authority and youth.

Overall, a key mechanism for facilitating contact between the youth and the police was understanding each of the groups' attitudes. By understanding the attitudes that the police and youth held towards one another, such as the fear and distrust the youth held towards the police, and the tensions that existed between the two groups, and the need to promote positive relationship development, the program could be designed in way that promoted positive contact between these two groups. Indeed, given the complex relationship between the youth and the police, it was not as simple as bringing the two groups together. Rather, the program had to be

designed in a way that was mindful of each stakeholder group's attitudes and experiences with one another.

4.2 Relevant Programming

In order to bring the two groups together (police and youth) and facilitate contact, a relevant and meaningful program had to be developed. Many of the program stakeholders recognized this as Karen (community centre director) explains how:

> We started talking to the community resource officer and said you know what can we do because we wanted to improve the relationships with police and youth, and then we started talking about well what would engage them. I mean, they're not going to sit and have a meeting, that's just not how youth conduct themselves.

Based on this recognition, the program stakeholders identified that the youth in the community had a strong passion for soccer and lacked opportunities to play the sport in an organized way. In light of this, the program organizers decided to use soccer as a tool to promote positive contact between the youth and the police. Overall, developing a relevant program, was another key mechanism when it came to promoting contact between the youth and the police.

4.2.1 Youth passion for soccer

In their interviews, many of the youth expressed how they had a strong interest in soccer and for many of them, soccer was their "favourite sport" (Braveen, youth participant). Another youth said that "everyone in this community, everyone likes soccer, everyone loves soccer" (Omar/youth participant). Prior to the soccer program being developed, some of the youth even expressed interest in developing a soccer team. Indeed, Max (youth participant) said:

> I thought it was really nice…and the other reason was because like we actually wanted, wanted a [Rosewood] team, like a soccer [Rosewood] team and then like we talked to the

community centre about that and they're like we'll see what we can do and it was like a

few years before the soccer even started.

The program stakeholders also recognized that the youth had a strong interest in soccer as

Hakeem (program facilitator) explained that "it was clear that they loved soccer". Hakeem

(program facilitator) further explained that one of the reasons it was clear that the youth had an

interest in soccer was because:

They're hitting balls {laughs} on the wall, and we have issues with that". Further, he

said that he "saw their sense of competition, like they really like to compete with each

other.

He also said that "when we open for the youth drop in all they want to do is play soccer, no other

sports, so we chose soccer by looking at that and seeing that's really something that they love"

(Hakeem/program facilitator). Similarily, Chris (community centre staff) said that it was because

"soccer was so big and so powerful here, they thought that was a good bridge kind of thing".

4.2.2 Providing opportunities for youth engagement

In addition to the youth being passionate about soccer, many of the youth also lacked

opportunities for engagement within their community. One of the youth expressed that "we are

youth and we didn't know what to do" (Goy/youth participant). Goy (youth participant) also

explained how there was a

Tuesday program that's like a lot of people used to come and they used to not allow us,

you know we were kids back then, they're like you're too young, you can't play and like

that. We used to complain about it and fight, make trouble in there, you know.

Many of the youth wanted something to do in the community. Emanuel (youth participant) said

that:

I wanted something to do after school…and participate, and after the class is done and

all that…so if I ever go home I'm not bored and all that like I wanted an activity to play,

and get fit and all that.

Karen (community centre director) said that "and at the end for the end goal was really to create

an opportunity for youth engagement". This was because prior to the soccer program "they were

engaging negatively" (Karen/community centre director). With this in mind, "the goal was to

provide a positive engagement opportunity for youth, it didn't matter the vehicle that it was"

(Karen/community centre director). Barry (director of community programs and services) agreed

that one of the goals was to "provide some structure to some of the activities they do, cause they,

there isn't a lot of structure to their activity, they go outside, and it's just free activity". He said it

was all about "trying to find unique programs to engage youth and it's not that kids don't want to

be engaged in that community, it's just about what's relevant to them" (Barry/director of

community programs and services).

4.2.3 Leveraging youth passion

Based on the youth's passion for the sport of soccer and lack of opportunities for youth

engagement, the program stakeholders thought that soccer, more so than other sports, would be a

good tool for facilitating contact. Indeed, the program stakeholders leveraged the youths' passion

for soccer in order to promote positive contact. Hakeem (program facilitator) explained how:

We all came together and said okay, what if we do a soccer program that helps the youth

because they love doing that and…so we use that uh as a tool to build relationship.

Hakeem (program facilitator) believed that in order to attract the youth to the program and

promote contact, you have to give them something. Indeed, he said that "you have to give

something the kids love, to catch them in, which is usually most of the time sports"

(Hakeem/program facilitator). Hakeem (program facilitator) explained that:

> I wouldn't be successful, nobody would be successful if we would've said, we have this
> mentorship program um we have all these good stuff for the kids, let's call them up and
> see if they come, no one would show up. But, if you say, I have a league, a soccer league
> for you, they love soccer, they play with everyday, and they would, they get excited
> about that.

Even some of the youth agreed that soccer was key to promoting contact. In his interview, Omar

(youth participant) said that:

> "If there was a whole bunch of people that want to play different sports other than soccer
> then we would have like…like no connection then and our games, we'd have no
> communication or nothing like that.

Additionally, Omar (youth participant) said that:

> It's cause you have to be a team player and that's why it brings people together and
> cause…the people that played soccer they love to play soccer so like you can't take that
> away from them and, and they meet other people who love soccer so right away you have
> a connection. Some people, a lot of people have differences, but there's one thing that
> everyone liked, everyone like soccer, so if you know someone likes soccer you can't
> really hate them cause you also like soccer.

Overall, through leveraging the youths' passion and interest in soccer, many youth were attracted

to participate in the program and engage in contact with the police whom they previously had a

fear of an distrusted. Indeed, developing a relevant and meaningful program for the youth was a

key factor in facilitating contact between the youth and the police.

4.3 Champions of Youth Development

Individual stakeholders who acted as champions of youth development represented a key factor when it came to facilitating positive intergroup contact. Indeed, many of the stakeholders went above and beyond what was expected of them in order to make the program successful in achieving its goal of reducing conflict and promoting relationship development amongst the police and the youth. For instance, some of the stakeholders had pre-existing relationships with the youth which was key to engaging youth in the new soccer program. Further, many of the stakeholders went above and beyond the scope of their role in the program in order to support the youth. While certain tasks were assigned as part of each stakeholder's role, much of the work was done in addition to the stakeholder's assigned tasks and done "above and beyond" their role within their organization. Indeed, Karen (community centre director) described "this wasn't a dedicated project for any of us, we were working on this off the side of our desk". The following sections outline how these stakeholders represented champions of youth development through the soccer program.

4.3.1 Pre-existing relationships

Some of the community centre staff had pre-existing relationships with some of the youth in the community, and demonstrated champion-like behaviour in trying to support the youth. For instance, the relationship that Hakeem (program facilitator) had with some of the youth was key to getting many of the youth to participate in the program. As previously mentioned, some of the youth were hesitant to join the program at the start due to their poor relationship with the police. Hakeem (program facilitator) was able to convince some of the youth to participate as a result of his relationship with them. Sajid (youth participant) described how "[Hakeem], he talks to me, he used to be like, they won't do nothing to you - just join". Many of the youth trusted that Hakeem

would not steer them wrong and therefore made the decision to participate. Indeed, Karen

(community centre director) described how:

> It took the relationship of [Hakeem] our facilitator here too because at the beginning
>
> nobody would sign up. . . it took the relationships that [Hakeem] had with families and
>
> youth in the community to convince them to sign up.

The interviews with youth revealed that the youth also trusted Karen (community centre director)

because of how long they had known her through her role at the community centre. One of the

youth said that:

> Tthe first day I came the only lady that was there was [Karen] that's the only lady that I
>
> trusted cause I did a lot of stuff in the community centre, she's the only one that like
>
> when security come and police come and they looking for me, she said 'oh, [Sajid] is just
>
> a young kid', like she used to talk my way out of it, you know. (Sajid/youth participant)

Overall, pre-existing relationships among authority figures and youth in the community were key

to getting some of the youth to participate in the program. Such relationships were established

well before the soccer program as these individuals had an vested interest in the youth and the

community, and provided support to them as best as they could. Without such relationships,

many of the youth would not have participated in the soccer program, and therefore would not

have engaged in contact with the police. Therefore, the pre-existing relationships that the youth

had with some of the community centre staff was a key mechanism when it came to facilitating

contact.

4.3.2 Supporting youth development

In addition to supporting the youth to come out to the program, many of the program

stakeholders actively supported the youth. Hakeem (program facilitator) explained that "we

make sure that if they have issues they can come talk to us and see what we can help them out with". Frank (police officer) commented on how he told many of the youth "you know what if you need anything call me here on my cell phone, you don't have to call the dispatch number, and talk to me whenever". As a result, one of the youth did indeed reach out to Frank for support. In his interview, Sajid (youth participant) told a story of how Frank (police officer) supported him in a time of need. Sajid (youth participant) explained how he and his friend

> Stole something, and then we got caught, me and my other friend…then a week later they have our pictures, they came, two police came to my house, I was shocked, I was like dam bro, they know us you know. Then I, I came to talk to [Frank], the coach, I told him yo, I'm in trouble you know, I'm going through this and he just told me he would talk to them and like I just have to write a paper why I take that stuff, I told them I didn't have the money to buy it at the time you know and I need it cause, and then he talk to them, he was like, the other two came up to me and they were like if it wasn't for [Frank] we would've taken you to court you know.

The experience of having Frank on their side was noted by several participants who felt that he cared about their development. Having a police officer who supported the youths' development was a key mechanism of the positive contact as the youth developed a sense of comfort and trust in Frank. In doing so, the youth were able to learn that the police could be a support to them, which changed many of the youths' perspectives towards the police (explained further in findings).

4.3.3 Going above and beyond

In addition to the soccer league itself, events were planned outside of soccer practices and games. This was done outside of the scope of the initial project and required program

stakeholders to go above and beyond their role in the program. Omar (youth participant) describes how "they tried to get things organized for us like a tournament after the season". Frank (police officer) went above and beyond his role as a coach and organized the team to go to a different city, which was an hour away to participate in a soccer tournament. Frank (police officer) said that "we went down to, we rented a bus, took them down to [Snowville], played all day on Saturday and then Sunday morning, we lost every game". In addition to taking the team down to Snowville to play in a soccer tournament, Frank (police officer) organized an afternoon soccer game that brought the youth, the police department and the fire department together, again to promote positive contact through playing a game of soccer together. They also ordered pizza and organized for the youth got to go swimming afterwards. Frank (police officer) went above and beyond the scope of his role and organized this event to foster more opportunities for intergroup contact. Karen (community centre director) said that "it was just an opportunity again to develop relationships".

In addition to organizing tournaments, Frank (police officer) went above and beyond to support one of the youth in the soccer program who was a talented soccer player and capable of playing in a higher soccer division, but lacked the resources to do so. Frank (police officer) said "this guy here (points to picture of the soccer team) has never played soccer before in his life, and he's probably one of the best kids on the team". However, many of the youth "just don't have money or the ability to go on and play on a, on A or double A or triple A team cause it costs thousands of dollars". Frank (police officer) helped him get organized and access funding through community programs such as Canadian Tire's Jump Start program so that the youth could go on the play at a higher level.

4.3.4 Volunteers as champions

The soccer program was developed outside of the roles of each of the program partners (community centre, police and Rosewood Soccer Association). When asked how the program started, Frank (police officer) said that:

We started the program…3 years ago…and myself, my partner from the community resource office, and a member of the [Riverdale] fire department met for breakfast and discussed…options and programs that we could develop for the [Rosewood] neighbourhood.

From there, "when we came up with the soccer idea we took it to the [City of Riverdale]. From there, the program development began. Omar (youth participant) described how:

The coaches wouldn't get paid for this like the fireman and the police officers right they wouldn't get paid, so they would take time to come from their families and like coach us…n their spare time when they could just be with their families.

Max (youth participant) also explained that:

Even though they have like jobs, they have people to save, they have jobs they still take even the time that they have left, they could spend it with their family, but they spend it with us, they, like spend it with us to coach us, to play soccer with us, that like, I just have so much respect for them.

These and other participants were grateful for the important role of volunteers who didn't "need" to be part of the program but chose to spend their leisure time investing in the community's youth and acting as champions of their development. Overall, it was clear from many of the youth interviews that having individuals who acted as champions of youth development in the program was key to facilitating positive contact. Indeed, the support that the youth received from some of

the program stakeholders helped to promote positive contact and relationship development between the youth and the police.

4.4 Resource Requirements

Another key factor that played a role facilitating contact between the youth and the police was resources. Indeed, the findings of this study revealed that the program required a variety of resources in order for the program to operate. However, as a community based organization, resources were limited. Hakeem (program facilitator) describes this as he said "there was a lot I mean that we wanted to do, and, and a lot that we wanted to accomplish, but we didn't have much to do so. We did whatever we did based on what, what we had to do it". The main resources that were required to run the program were, human, financial, and partnerships. These resource requirements are described further in the sections below.

4.4.1 Human resources

Many of the research participants highlighted the importance of human resources in order for positive contact to be facilitated. Indeed, from program development to implementation and ongoing maintenance, human resources were in high demand. A key human resource for the program were the police officers who acted as the coaches. The police officers involved in the program had no previous experience with soccer, or coaching. Indeed, Frank (police officer) said "I never played and I never coached". In light of this, they had to take a coaching clinic. Not only did this require time, but it also required shifting around schedules to make this happen. Frank (police officer), explained that they "ended up through the police services allowed us to switch two days, so we actually took a soccer clinic in Mississauga". Frank (police) went on to explain that the course was done over a weekend on a Saturday and Sunday. The course allowed the police officers to "learn the rules and learn how to coach" (Frank/police) as they had no previous

70

experience. Not only did coaching require skill development of the coaches, but it also required a lot of time commitment from the coaches. Frank (police) said that it was "a big commitment, like we're there every Monday and every Wednesday from May to August". As a result, the coaches would sometimes split up the coaching to accommodate other things. As Frank (police) says "we try to divide it up a little bit…sometimes we will both be there, but sometimes if he has something at night like family or whatever, he'll go and the next week maybe I'll take a night off and he'll go".

The time commitment required for coaching was further complicated as the police had to justify their hours and involvement in the soccer program. Karen (community centre director) explains:

I know police services has to justify their officers' hours. So you know they have to sell it to their police board that, I mean, they probably don't have to go down to that level of detail…having, having those officers doing this work needs to be justified.

Further to this, the police officers that were involved in the program were not your typical beat officers. Rather, they were community resource officers meaning that they primarily focus on crime prevention and building safer communities in schools and in neighbourhoods. However, police services "only have a finite source of resource officers" (Barry/director of community programs and services). So "it was the same officer that would be doing this, so the same officer has been doing this in the community" (Barry/director of community programs and services). There were also some changes in coaches throughout the program. For instance, there was a firefighter who was a coach and dropped out part way through the program. Karen (community centre director) explains that:

The one year the head coach was from fire, and then when he backed out then we looked

for Dave. That was who we got last year, and then this year, our staff had to take more of

a lead, in that aspect so that, that also makes it tough, right.

This placed some strain on the community centre. For instance, Karen (community centre

director) asks "when things break down, like a coach, the coaches don't show up, you know, do

we step in?". She further states that "we have, but that's not been um our…we have

administrative staff here" (Karen/community centre director). "I don't hire soccer coaches and so

luckily (Chris) has a great interest in soccer and has some soccer skills that way, but if it was

another staff they may not, and so what would that look like from our, our end?"

(Kelly/community centre director). Chris (community centre staff) also indicated that "this year

was a little different because of a lack of a volunteer to coach, I helped coach some nights". Even

with the human resources that they were able to pull together to make the program run, they

could still use more. Frank (police officer) explains:

Nope, I think we would just need more, we need more volunteers, um we gotta make sure

that we have all those people lined up, cause in the middle of the summer time it's hard to

get people to come out on a hot Wednesday night to, to volunteer.

As illustrated by the data, the program required a lot of human resources in order for the soccer

program to run, and thus for contact to be facilitated.

4.4.2 Financial Resources

Another Key resource for the program was financial resources. Indeed, financial

resources were required at various levels. Not only did the program itself require financial

resources to operate, but the youth involved in the program also lacked financial resources,

which made soccer participation difficult. Goy (youth participant) indicated that most of the

youth "don't have enough money to join a academy or anything". As a result, prior to the soccer program, the youth were not able to play organized soccer as many of them desired too. In light of this, many of the youth were drawn to the soccer program as it provided them an opportunity to play organized soccer. Goy (youth participant) explains that he "used to come here just for soccer, you know, cause I didn't have money to pay for soccer, or my mom, like…we take welfare you know, she doesn't work". Some of the youth couldn't even afford things like a pair of shoes for soccer. Frank (police) described how some of the youth would "come up and say we don't have money for a pair of shoes so we used some of the budget from our officer to buy shoes for some of the kids that didn't have them".

Many of the youth recognized that one of the reasons the soccer program was developed was to provide them with an opportunity to play soccer. When Emanuel (youth participant) was asked why he thought the soccer program was developed, he it was because "it was easier for kids around our area to like…like some people aren't that…like they're non-middle class so like they're not… like they can't like some people can't afford like the 200, 300 dollars for actual soccer so then they pay so everyone can have a chance to play". Given that the youth lacked financial resources, the cost burden of the program was greater, thus requiring more financial resources for the program to operate. Furthermore, the project was done off the side of everyone's desk and not included in any of the program partners' budgets. Karen (community centre director) describes that "the program cost money, and so that wasn't in any of our budgets, so how were we going to generate some funds to make this happen. In light of this, they had to try and generate funds to even get the program going. Karen (community centre director) explained that they

Found a little bit of money from things that we could cover here. So I was able to cover

the registration fees for a tournament they wanted to participate in, we were able to get

someone to personally donate…that came from the money of the senior officer, fire had

some money that they were able to donate for food.

Karen (community centre director) further states that "we kind of had to piece it all together. So,

it does make it difficult to sustain a program when you don't have funding and it adds to the

frustration as you're trying to seek out funding". Overall, financial resources were key to

developing and sustaining the soccer program and thus promoting contact.

4.4.3 Partnerships

Lastly, another key resource that was critical to the program was partnerships. Indeed, in

order for the program to operate in the way that it did and for contact to be facilitated, multiple

key partnerships were required. The partners involved in the project were, the community centre,

the local police and fire departments, and the Riverdale Soccer Association. The partnership

initially started between the community centre and the police. Karen (community centre director)

describes that:

It started off with a partnership with police and we were recognizing the issues in the

neighbourhood, particularly with youth and so we started talking to the community

resource officer and said you know what can we do because we wanted to improve the

relationship with police and, and youth, and so capitalizing on what we were seeing as

their interest area, and then the needs for us to build relationships, we started to develop

that partnership.

After a partnership was developed between the community centre and the police, Karen reached

out to the fire department to see if they would consider being involved in the program in order to

foster positive contact with them as well. Karen (community centre director) explains that:

> We then linked in with fire because at the same time, I believe there were some fires
>
> being set in the neighbourhoods and so it just made sense to link in fire and then one of
>
> the fire reps really loved soccer and was a soccer coach and so it was a win all around.

From there, Karen (community centre director) explains that:

> As we started to develop that partnership what we realized was the kids didn't want to
>
> just come out and practice soccer and not have anything to work towards, we realized
>
> they needed to enter into some sort of competition, so being able to play games against
>
> someone else.

In light of this, Karen (community centre director) described how they "approached [Riverdale

Soccer Association] and said is there a way that we could incorporate a team from a

neighbourhood in your programming which was unheard of because they never wanted to do

neighbourhood teams, they wanted it to be scattered". After some discussion with the Riverdale

Soccer Association about some of the barriers they were facing, the Riverdale Soccer

Association made some adjustments to their scheduling so that the youth could participate in the

soccer league. In addition to this, Frank (police) explains how the Riverdale soccer team even

"donated the jerseys for us to wear the first year". After getting all of the partnerships in place,

Karen (community centre director) explains how they "did things like we created a terms of

reference for kind of got together, what were our goals, what were our objectives? Keeping

people on track". Overall, the partnership was critical to the success of the program as Frank

(police) describes that "if one of those partners didn't come through, we either, we wouldn't

have a field, or we wouldn't have equipment, or we wouldn't have somebody to register the kids, or we wouldn't have a coach, or a mentor, like…everybody had to participate to make it, to make it work". Indeed, partnerships were key to even having a soccer program. Without the partnerships, the soccer program might not have been possible, meaning that positive contact between the groups may not have occurred.

4.5 The Effects of Contact on Program Stakeholders

This next section of the paper will answer the second research question of how contact influences program stakeholders. The findings of this research revealed that contact influenced the stakeholders and participants involved in the sport-based youth development program in a number of ways. For instance, it was clear within the data that through intergroup contact, many positive relationships were developed. For starters, the youth were able to develop a positive relationship with authority figures. Moreover, the youth were able to develop a sense of trust in authority figures, which was previous lacking. In addition to the positive relationships that were developed, the youth also exhibited positive behaviour changes. For example, prior to the soccer program, the community centre was dealing with youth deviance and conflict on a regular basis. However, this began to change as the soccer program went under way. Not only did these negative behaviours change, but many of the youth began taking on more of a leadership role in the community. Indeed, many of the youth developed a sense of pride and ownership towards their community. In addition to the youth, contact also affected many of the program stakeholders. For instance, as the police got to know the youth their attitudes and interactions with the youth began to change. Indeed, the police began to have more positive interactions with the youth which had a positive impact on the community at large. This was also true for the community centre staff. Many of the community centre staff reported in their interviews that

they had more positive interactions with the youth as a result of the soccer program. Overall, the impacts that contact had on all program stakeholder groups will be explored in greater detail in the sections below.

4.5.1 Positive Relationship Development

Overall, by using soccer as a tool for contact, the program was successful in promoting positive relationship development between various groups. This was seen as the youth were able to develop a relationship with authority figures with whom they had conflict with previously. Not only were they able to develop a relationship with them, but they also developed a more positive outlook towards the outgroup. Additionally, many of the youth developed a new-found sense of trust in authority figures within their community. Lastly, the youth developed more positive relationships with each other as they were able to develop and grow as a team.

4.5.2 Youth connecting with authority figures

Despite their relationship with authority figures prior to the soccer program, many of the youth were able to develop positive relationships with authority figures in their community. Emanuel (youth participant) described how as a result of the program he feels "connected to like more, like to communities and like you know…like making friends easily and all that". Omar (youth participant) explained that "there wasn't anyone that I didn't really connect with because everyone's just there to be like, everyone's there to help you and you can't really not connect to them". Omar felt like he had more in common with the police after participating in the program. He describes how he had "more in common because like…I knew that the, the police and fire department were like athletic, but like…I didn't know that they were going to be coaching like our league and I thought it was like different" (Omar/youth participant). Max (youth participant) talked about the soccer tournament against the police and fire department and said:

It was so fun, cause like playing with firefighters and police officers was so fun, we

never thought we'd actually get along with firefighters and police officers it's more like

uh, we should be afraid of them and you know it's like run away, but like we got really,

we got along with them, like they respected us, we respected them.

The connections that were developed were not only beneficial for the youth involved in the

program, but it was also beneficial to the authority figures. Hakeem (youth participant) describes

that now "if a kid misbehaves right now, I can say, I don't like your behaviour because of that I

need you out for the day, and because it's me…[Hakeem], they will look at me and say, fine, I

will go". When further prompted, Hakeem (program facilitator) explained that it was "because

they saw that we're here to help them out, we're no longer their enemy. We really gained so

much, we developed those relationships, some of those kids we helped them out getting jobs".

When Chris (community centre staff) was asked why he thought connections were made and

relationships were developed he said, "I think it's just the, seeing each other week in and week

out and building, not to say friendship, but a friendship and understanding that you can trust that

person". Further, he said that "especially a lot of the kids that I've been involved at the soccer,

they trust me and they, they want, they talk, they come to talk to me because of that"

(Chris/community centre staff). In his interview, Frank (police officer) also explained the

positive effect that the relationship development had, he explains "um, so yea, they're a, that

relationship gets built, when you drive into that neighbourhood, they're more likely to…come up

to you and talk" (Frank/police officer). Frank (police officer further describes how now he is:

Able to go into the community centre and have a discussion with them about, hey I

haven't seen you in 3 months, how's school going? Whereas before you, you might know

the face, but you wouldn't even know their name, right. So now, you know names, they

know your name, you can have discussion and stop and talk to them about school, or

what they're up to.

Frank (police officer) described how even after the soccer program he still has a positive

relationship with some of the youth. He said, "some of them have graduated from the soccer

program and you still see them, and they're still very receptive" (Frank/police officer). Hakeem

believes that the connections that were made may even have a ripple effect within the

community. He describes how:

Whatever we were doing with them, they will go back in the neighbourhood and sort of

disseminating that with the rest of the kids, some would say forget it, I don't believe in

that, some would accept it and build better relationship, and they say such and such are

saying about this, so I'm, I feel differently about the community right now, right so it, it

sort of …what is the word I'm looking for…it's a ripple effect. (Hakeem/program

facilitator)

4.5.3 Youth shifting perspectives towards authority figures

Prior to the contact with the police through the soccer program, many of the youth held

negative attitudes toward the police. Not only did the soccer program promote positive contact

and relationship development with the police, but it also changed the youths' attitudes and

perspectives towards the police. In his interview Goy (youth participant) expressed that "we had

a problem with the police outside here, so we are not friends with the police like that, but after

that the coach who was the police, he was a good guy, we know that the police is a help and

things like that". Similarly, Sajid (youth participant) said that "that's when I used to think, oh

they just come for us people now, [Rosewood] make a team to see who has anger problems you

know, like I was thinking about that, but then I realized they were good people". Many of the

youth became more comfortable around the police as well. For instance, Omar (youth participant) described that "my views on them like went up cause I…cause I was feeling more connected with them, it was easier to like talk to them". When asked what his perspective on the police were after the soccer program, Emanuel (youth participant) expressed that "it changed by like you know, I thought like they're, they're just normal people like, they just you know, same level and like they're trying to like you know interact with other youth and all that". When asked why his perspective changed, Emanuel (youth participant) responded, "well because while the program was going I get to know them more, and like you know, they get to know me more and all that". Some of the youth were surprised at their change in perspective towards the police. Max (youth participant) explained how he thought "it's more like we should be afraid of them and you know it's like run away, but like we got really, we got along with them, like they respected us, we respected them". Further, he said that "we have a lot of respect for police officers now, how hard they work" (Max/youth participant). Overall, many of the youth learned a lot about the police and developed connections with them, which resulted in a change in perspective towards the police. Hakeem (program facilitator) thinks that this was because "if they will see uh, the police officers working with them in a different lens, right and see that builds relationship with them". Indeed, Barry (director of programs and services) said that "for a very fortunate small group of youth in the community it provided a very, very different perspective on adults…especially the police".

4.5.4 Developing a sense of trust

As indicated in research question one, prior to the program starting, many of the youth did not trust police. However, through contact with the police in the soccer program, the youth were able to develop a sense of trust in the police. In particular, the youth developed a strong

sense of trust in Frank, who was the police officer involved in the program. Indeed, many of the youth had very positive things to say about Frank, overall. Moreover, many of them expressed that they trusted him. In his interview, Emanuel (youth participant) expressed that "yea, like I could have talked to them if I, if something was bothering me I could like tell them what's bothering me and all that". Chris (community centre staff) described that he saw the youth developing a sense of trust in Frank. He described:

> And like you could see how they like, they gravitated towards him after a while because they could trust him, and whenever they had issues or anything like that, I felt like they could trust [Frank] with what to say, and now they build the trust with the, with a police officer.

When asked why he thought this was he responded "I think it's just the, seeing each other week in and week out and building not to say friendship, but a friendship and understanding that you can trust that person" (Chris/community centre staff). Similarly, Frank (police officer) said, "like any other relationship, the more you see people, the more that you build that relationship and they feel that they can trust you, or they can ask you questions about something".

4.5.5 Mentorship

A large part of the soccer program was about mentoring the youth. Barry (director of community programs and services) described how many of the youth "probably didn't have that type of mentorship in the past". In particular, Frank (police officer) mentored the youth in a variety of ways. For instance, one of the youth described how he and his friends used to sit outside late at night and sometimes the police would stop them to see what they were doing. Goy talked about how Frank (police officer) talked to the youth about their behaviours and their respective consequences. Goy (youth participant) explained that:

We sit there all night he would tell you why you sit there, for what reason? You know

why you wasting your time? Instead of a police officer seeing you and just catching you

and arresting you or harming you, why don't you just go to your house at that, like

around ten or nine and go play games, do something better instead of sitting there. That's

what he tells you, and you, you will get it too you know, if you do the mat like you'll

figure it out.

When asked about the mentorship provided to youth Frank (police officer) explained that:

There would be serious conversations, whether it was like soccer related, or not, so if

something happened on the field about sportsmanship and stuff like that, so we'd have

those conversations, but we could still have…serious conversations and at the next

practice still have fun, so I would say it would range from anything from um…difficulties

that they have at home to sportsmanship on the field.

Chris (community centre staff) commented on how he saw the police mentoring the kids as well.

He said, "I saw how they could control and talk to the kids and explain to them why their

behaviour wasn't acceptable" (Chris/community centre staff). Many of the youth began to look

up to Frank. Indeed, in his interview Braveen (youth participant) said that "I kind of looked up to

them in that…in the soccer league". When asked why he responded, "it took like a little bit of

time like it took like a few games and I realized that yea they want us to win all our games, so I

was like okay" (Braveen/youth participant).

4.5.6 Developing a sense of teamwork

Not only did the youth develop more positive relationships with authority figures, a sense

of trust with 'others', and a change in attitudes/perspective towards authority figures, but many of

the youth also developed a stronger relationship with each other as peers and developed as a

team. In his interview, Max (youth participant) explained how at the beginning "we weren't really good, we weren't really good as a team". When asked further about it he said it was:

> Cause we weren't passing the ball around, we weren't like, we didn't get along with each other so like, we would like ball hog, or like probably like get mad at someone and get mad at the team so we would like swear and everything so we didn't really have much respect back then so and then like since we got along all the way through the season, like we calmed down more, we played as a team, we passed the ball around. (Max/youth participant)

Likewise, Omar (youth participant) said "the first year we, we had no chemistry, so we lost many games". This however changed throughout the season and the youth started to work together more, Frank (police officer) said that "it made it more fun cause there was more interaction with everyone, and you could see more guys were scoring instead of just the one guy was scoring so that kind of made it more interesting, too". Moreover, Frank said "it shifted more teamwork because like you had the defense moving forward like because they knew, like compared to the year before, they knew not just to rifle the ball with one guy, you had the three forwards that could all score" (Frank/police officer). Karen (community centre director) also agreed with this as she expressed, "I would say the kids learned to play as a team, so they came to the team, and worked together as a team".

4.6 Youth Behaviour Change

Prior to the soccer program, the community struggled with negative youth behaviour and conflict. Indeed, many of the youth were not connected to the community or to each other. Vandalism and fights amongst youth were common within the community centre itself. However, after the soccer program, many of these behaviours changed. The youth became more

connected to the community and each other. Furthermore, some of the youth even began to demonstrate leadership behaviour within the community.

4.6.1 Decrease in youth deviance

Prior to the soccer program, there was a high level of youth deviance within the community. Sajid (youth participant) described that before the soccer program, there "was always fights in the gym, police used to show up". Even some of the youth recognized this. Sajid (youth participant) even said, "to be honest, for me, I was a bad kid, like now I changed, you know, like before…I wasn't connected to nobody, I was a bad kid". He gives an example of his prior behaviour: "I remember one time I broke a window you know, that glass (points to window in the community centre) that big glass, like you know the main entrance, yea, I broke it because they wouldn't let me play video games on the computer" (Sajid/youth participant). Hakeem (program facilitator) also described this as he described how, "we used to have kids breaking windows…at the community centre, then they get charged and then things escalate and get bigger, right". Likewise, Chris (community centre staff) described how, there used to be some vandalism in the community centre". He said, "someone spray painted the glass on the back, they spray painted it, it was just a little bit of spray paint and we just had to clean it up" (Chris/community centre staff). Barry (director of community programs and services) said that "things weren't talked out, things were, they were, it was emotionally charged, lashed out, lashing out, there was graffiti, vandalism…on the community centre property".

After participating in the soccer program however, many of the youths' behaviours changed. After describing how the youth used to break windows and vandalize the community centre, Hakeem (program facilitator) described how "those guys who used to do that became part of the soccer program, and was the opposite because they loved that sport". Hakeem (program

facilitator) gives an example of behaviour change that he saw in one particular youth. Hakeem

(Program facilitator) explained:

> In the tournament that we went to, one of the kids that we all, that we always used to
>
> think he's very violent…another kid, his opponent was talking a lot of crap and sort of
>
> poked him, and you know, a lot to get his reaction, and we were watching and we said, oh
>
> boy…he didn't do anything he just look, he looked at him and walked by and I called him
>
> up and said hey [Sajid], why did you do that? He goes, you guys, you know supported us
>
> to come here in this tournament, I'm not going to make issues, he's just talking, who
>
> cares, but if that was year and a half ago [Sajid] that would provoke him, and would've
>
> done you know, it would've, get involved in violence, so things change.

Part of this behaviour change could be due in part to the fact that the youth had to sign a contract

stating that they would demonstrate good behaviour or they couldn't pay soccer. Indeed, Chris

(community centre staff) said that:

> Their behaviour in here was also supposed to be reflectant, so we were supposed to
>
> communicate that if someone was misbehaving in the centre that they weren't supposed
>
> to play soccer and that was a big thing to these guys, cause they wanted it all the time that
>
> they could play cause soccer was so important to them, they would make sure that they
>
> behaved kind of thing.

4.6.2 Decrease in youth conflict

In addition to their behaviour change, many of the youth noted that they had previously

experienced conflict with each other, which also changed after participating in the program.

Indeed, Emanuel (youth participant) said, "yea, there's less arguments you know, we, after the

soccer we just you know forget about it, we just, become friends, family and all that". When asked why he thought this was, Emanuel (youth participant) responded,

Well because you know like…before the program, we didn't like, we didn't have anything to like take our mind off of it and then in soccer, like the soccer program made it, take like…made us take our mind off of the argument and all that, and then after, after like, after when we get in an argument we just like you know, just take out mind off of it, we just like you, let's just start over.

Likewise, Omar (youth participant) said, "if someone messed up like if they messed up like a shot or pass right, some of our players would like get like a little mad, and then, and then we would try and like resolve it". Moreover, he said, "they're resolved after like the game uh after the game the player um apologized to everyone, the players and the coach". (Omar/youth participant). This decrease in conflict extended outside of soccer and into the community centre as well. Chris (community centre staff) described some of the changes that he saw within the community centre. Chris (community centre staff) explains:

We used to have a youth program at night, and there was more aggression at each other, it was pretty aggressive some nights. Like, I, when I started here, I worked at least, there's two, it's two nights a week, I worked one night, so it was probably within a month I would deal with some crazy situation where they're yelling and screaming and like loud disagreement, it went from that to…like you don't really need my presence here kind of thing.

When asked why he thought this change occurred, he said, "I think just being involved together, I think that was a big thing being involved as a team and seeing each other as comrade's kind of

thing instead of just this guy's messing up my game kind of thing" (Chris/community centre staff).

4.6.3 Developing leadership among youth

In addition to a decrease in deviant behaviour, and less conflict, many of the youth actually began to take on more a leadership role within the community. Although some youth were more reserved, and this did not change, some of the more outspoken and outgoing youth took on an active leadership role. For instance, in his interview, Omar (youth participant) described how he "grew as a person, like I, I grew…like I became more of a leader because sometimes I would lead the team and then some other, some other games other people would lead the team". Similarly, Max (youth participant) described how he "actually helped them ref and…coach this year". Indeed, many of the youth described how they felt like more of a leader in the community. Imran (youth participant) said "first of all like…we felt good about, good about ourselves, like we felt like we…like we felt like we were a leader in this community, that we were important in this community, and people knew us…and we also got medals and stuff that also felt good". Hakeem (program facilitator) described an example of leadership behaviour that he witnessed in some of the youth. Hakeem explains that:

> There was a time that a couple of students did a, did a good, uh they went to the market and, and took all the food that was, that was left – still good food, and brought them here and said you know we want to give back to the community. The soccer team, I wasn't even here, the other staff were here, they were hanging out and they went to the staff and said how can we help? As a soccer team, they went out and helped. (Hakeem/program facilitator)

When asked about the main outcomes of the program Hakeem (program facilitator) said that he thought one of "the main outcomes is leadership development, yea leadership in the youth". Hakeem (program facilitator) further described how some of the youth actually went on to get jobs in the community centre, he explains: "because they were better lead, some of them came back and got hired in the community centre to do, to become a staff of the YDI (Youth Drop In) or, CY (Children and Youth) programs, or working for the neighbourhood associations". Similarly, Chris (community centre staff) said that "some of them are now a, two of them, they're looking out for volunteer opportunities in the community instead of trying to look elsewhere, so they're doing their respectful thing that way".

4.7 Effects of Contact on Community

Not only did the soccer program have a positive impact on stakeholders in the soccer program, but it also had a positive impact on the overall community. For instance, many of the youth developed a sense of pride and ownership towards their community and became more engaged citizens. Such behaviours trickled into the community at large as the youth began exhibiting more positive behaviours through involvement within their community. Additionally, the findings revealed that the neighbourhood crime levels went down, which resulted in a safer community, overall.

4.7.1 Community pride and ownership

As a result of participating in the program, many of the youth developed sense of pride and ownership towards their community. Part of this was a result of the structure of the soccer program. Hakeem (program facilitator) explains how "we used to go out and collect garbage in the neighbourhood, and would say, we need to clean the neighbourhood, have that sense of ownership in your community". Karen (community centre director) also described this as she

said that "that was part of the contract as well, they had to participate in community initiatives, and the first year they did, they helped a community clean-up". Indeed, Hakeem (program facilitator) said, "we created a sense of ownership, now the kids that used to see the community centre as a centre…of their enemy, right, or a place that you know they can through their steam, and anger, the centre became their second home". When asked about this was, Karen (community centre director) said, "I don't know, I think the just saw themselves as part of a community, and soccer brought that as opposed to all individuals running amuck". Chris (community centre staff) described some of the benefits that he saw with this as he said, "when you come back to the area with the lessons of community clean-ups and stuff like that you could see…there, there was less dam-, you see the correlation there was no vandalism anymore".

In addition to a sense of ownership in their community, many of the youth developed a sense of pride as well. Max (youth participant) said that the soccer program "made me love this community, cause a lot of people know about this community and how good they are at soccer". He said, "we were like [Rosewood] the undefeated team and people were like telling me when is your next meeting, I wanna come, I wanna be on your team, and I'm like okay come, so we had more people interested in our team". Many of the program stakeholders also recognized a sense of pride development in the youth. Karen (community centre director) explained how "there was a lot of pride, in being part of the team". Chris (community centre director) explained how many of the youth were excited about the program as he described:

> They'd come back to the centre, they'd yell, [Chris!], [Chris!], [Chris!] we just won!
> Like and they, they'd talk to this other guy who wasn't on the team, and they'd talk to
> this, and they would actually ask questions and like, so it was a general excitement about
> what [Rosewood] was doing.

Barry (director of community programs and services) explained that:

> They were known as the [Rosewood] soccer team…and so that pride and ownership,
> within the community they were, by everybody they were seen as the soccer team, these
> kids were seen as the soccer team, and as a soccer team they were, they were supposed to
> represent the community so what they did was represent the community.

He also explained how "they'll wear their shirts around even when they're not playing a game"
(Barry/director of community services and programs). This type of behaviour showed how many
of the youth were proud to be on the soccer team and to represent their community.

4.7.2 Neighbourhood Safety

A major outcome of the soccer program was neighbourhood safety. Indeed, prior to the
soccer program there was a lot of issues in the community, such as criminal activity and deviant
youth behaviour. As a result of the issues the community was facing, the police received high
calls to service, which resulted in a strong police presence in the community. Indeed, Karen
(community centre director) explained how "because of the amount of crime in the
neighbourhood, so with the calls for service, the police identified this as a red zone". However,
after the soccer program, Karen (community centre director) described how "the calls for service
went down dramatically". Further, she said that "the program was so successful that the
constable [Frank], he won an award" (Kelly/community centre director), as a result of the
decrease in calls for service. Frank (police officer) also explained how the calls for service went
down, as he explains how the calls for service "over the last 3 years have gone down". Frank
(police officer) explained how this was beneficial as he said:

> The benefits of having, and as an example, having 100 calls for service and the time and
> the effort it takes to deal with 100 calls for service, opposed to 25, now you have 75 calls

that you can allocate to the rest of the region and spend more time there, or just free up an

officer to do more proactive work.

Such proactive work would not only help to prevent crime from occurring in the neighbourhood,

but it would also provide opportunities for relationship development.

5. Chapter Five: Discussion

In order understand the role of contact within an inner-city youth SFD program, semi-structured interviews were conducted with community/program stakeholders and youth participants of an inner-city youth SFD program. This was done in order to gain an understanding of the factors that facilitated intergroup contact within an inner-city youth SFD program context and to explore the impact that contact had on program participants, stakeholders and the overall community. This research furthers our understanding of the conditions that influence contact in a youth SFD program and the potential benefits that are associated with it. Understanding such factors may be beneficial to program managers as it shows the complexity of factors that can influence contact within an inner-city youth SFD program. If program practitioners are mindful of the factors that can influence contact, then they can design programs intended to maximize positive contact and beneficial outcomes within similar programs. In this chapter of the thesis, I will explore the findings of the present study in light of the related research literature. Additionally, I will discuss practice based implications and recommendations, as well as suggested areas of future research.

5.1 Understanding individual factors

Existing literature demonstrates that individual level factors can play a role in influencing contact. Individual differences often refer to individual level variability that is relative to personal and intergroup life (Hodson, Turner & Choma, 2017). Such individual level factors may influence the outcomes of contact. For instance, as both Allport (1954) and Pettigrew (1998) point out, a person who has a high initial level of prejudice may have a different experience with contact compared to someone who has a low level of prejudice. However, individual factors that may influence the contact are not as simple as one's level of prejudice. With this in mind, a study

by Hodson et. al (2017) indicates that there a variety of other distal personality factors that should be considered. Hodson et. al (2017) lists the following as examples of personality traits that may influence how contact evolves and influences relationships: "Agreeableness (being friendly and cooperative), openness to Experience (being accepting of new situations, knowledge and change) and extraversion (being sociable, talkative, etc.)" (Hodson et. al., 2017, p. 9). Although individual level differences were not measured in the current study, it was identified that individual characteristics such as whether or not the individual was outgoing, and their previous experiences with the out-group played a role in contact. For instance, the youth who were more outspoken had a different experience than those who were more reserved. Moreover, the individual youth's previous experiences with authority figures also played a role in contact. For example, many of the youth had a fear and distrust of authority figures prior to engaging in the soccer program. This played a role in the contact situation as many of the youth were hesitant to even participate in the program in the first place. However, after participating in the program many of the youths' perspectives towards authority figures began to change. Likewise, many of the youth were able to develop a sense of trust in the authority figures involved.

Allport (1954) points out that factors such as whether or not the contact situation is voluntary or not may play a role when it comes to the affects that contact has. In the present study, many of the youth had a strong passion for soccer and participated voluntarily, however many of them lacked the resources to actually play soccer. As such, many of the youth were drawn to participate in the program as it may have been the only chance many of them would get to play soccer. This complicates the notion of whether or not participation in the contact situation was voluntary for the youth. Without the opportunity to play on a soccer team many of the youth may have avoided the contact situation altogether.

The literature suggests that without having an understanding of individual level factors and how they may impact the contact situation, the intent of intergroup contact may "backfire". Indeed, Hodson et al. (2017) describe how some interventions designed to promote contact have actually made the intergroup relations worse, particularly among those who had an initially high level of prejudice. Thus, given that the intent of many programs focusing on intergroup contact is to improve intergroup relations, it is extremely important to consider individual factors when planning a program involving a high degree of contact. By understanding individual factors, program practitioners can mitigate possible negative outcomes.

5.2 Developing relevant programs

The findings of the current study demonstrate that in order to promote contact amongst the police and the youth, a relevant and meaningful program needed to be developed. In his study on sport-for-development programming, Schulenkorf (2010) suggests that it is important to make programs exciting for participants and ensure that the program meets the needs of all participating groups and is deemed relevant and interesting. The findings of the current study support this notion as the soccer program was indeed designed to meet the needs of all groups involved and participants discussed how the relevance of the program and the strong connection to the youth's passion for soccer was an important factor in the program's success. Specifically, the program met the needs of the youth by providing them with an opportunity to participate in organized soccer, which was often cited as their favourite sport/leisure activity. Secondly, the program was deemed relevant for community stakeholders as it met the needs of the police who desired stronger interactions with the Rosewood community and sought to develop positive relationships with the youth. Lastly, the community centre was facing a variety of issues as a

result of the conflict between the youth and the police and wanted to do something to change this dynamic.

5.3 Having champions for youth development

On the whole, there has been in increase in the use of sport as a tool for inter-community development, generally speaking. However, the Schulenkorf (2010) highlights that there has been a lack of empirical investigation with regards to the roles and responsibilities of the change agent within development projects. Although there has been a lack of research in regards to the roles and responsibilities of change agents in SFD programs, it was clear within the present study that individual stakeholders involved in the program, such as the police and community centre staff were key to the success achieved within the program. Indeed, many of the stakeholders went above and beyond their roles in the program in order to provide more opportunities and support to the youth participants. For instance, events were organized outside of the program, which provided the youth with more engagement opportunities. It also provided more opportunities for contact. This is consistent with the literature, as it is suggested that a change agent should act as a networker by continuously providing opportunities for networking on interpersonal levels, among groups, and between groups and institutions of power (Schulenkorf, 2010). Individual program stakeholders went above and beyond the soccer program to organize such opportunities on their own time. In doing so, the program stakeholders demonstrated respect and commitment to working with diverse groups (Schulenkorf, 2010). In sum, change agents are key to successful SFD initiatives as they fill many important roles. "In cooperation with local communities, change agents can create fresh spaces for intergroup contact and celebration, where people from different backgrounds get the chance to work, learn, and celebrate with each other" (Schulenkorf, 2010, p. 127). Indeed, change agents may play an

important role in promoting positive contact amongst diverse groups within SFD programs and initiatives. Overall, the role of the change agent is an important one, especially when it comes to reducing conflict and promoting sustainable development outcomes.

5.4 Resources for program delivery

Many minority youth often lack the resources needed to participate in sport (Jones et. al., 2016). This was true in the current study as both the youth and the program stakeholders discussed the barriers that the youth faced when it came to sport participation. The youth lacked financial resources to acquire the equipment required for soccer. Further, many of the youth could not afford the registration costs of participating in organized soccer. This created strain on the program stakeholders as the program required a great deal of resources to not only run the program, but to support the youth in participating in the program. According to MacIntosh et. al. (2016), SFD programs rely heavily on resources flowing from all partners involved. This was true in the present study as the partnerships were key in gaining access to necessary resources. Indeed, within the context of SFD programs, partnerships play a key role in program design, delivery and outcomes (MacIntosh et. al., 2016). This may be because partnerships allow for more resources such as money, skills, space and knowledge to be available (MacIntosh et. al., 2016). This allowed them to have enough funds to run the program as the program would not have been possible without the partnership of the local soccer club. Indeed, the local soccer club provided many resources such as equipment and field space. Moreover, the local soccer club organized the team to be able to play in an actual league and compete against other teams in the community.

5.5 Positive relationship development through intergroup contact

The findings highlighted how intergroup contact did in fact promote positive intergroup

relations. Indeed, many of the youth were able to develop relationships authority figures whom they previously had conflict with. This finding is consistent with the literature as many studies have found that intergroup contact is in fact effective in improving intergroup relations (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Indeed, during their interviews many of the youth discussed how they developed relationships and friendships as a result of participating in the soccer program. The friendships developed were not just among the youth themselves, but also between the youth and some of the authority figures. This finding is in line with Pettigrew's (1998) fifth condition of optimal contact, which is friendship potential. Here, Pettigrew (1998) suggests that by providing participants opportunities to develop friendships with each other, the bonds between the groups may strengthened. In the current study, there was a strong focus on relationship development. As a result, the program was structured in a way that gave many opportunities for relationships and friendships to be developed. Interestingly, many of the relationships and friendships developed within the soccer extended outside of the soccer program itself. Both the program stakeholders and the youth provided examples of this in their interviews.

Overall, the current study provides support to Allport' (1954) contact hypothesis. Moreover, the current study enhances our understanding of the role of contact in youth sport settings. Allport (1954) suggests that positive intergroup contact can reduce intergroup anxiety and promote positive intergroup attitudes. This was evident in the current study as prior to the program many of the youth had a fear of the police. As the program progressed however this fear and anxiety was reduced. In fact, many of the youth began to feel more comfortable around the police. Moreover, their opinions and attitudes towards the police changed, overall. As the youth got to know the police and learn about them their opinions changed and they developed a respect for the police. This finding support's Pettigrew and Tropp's (2008) notion that certain processes

like empathy and learning about the out-group may have an effect on the outcome of the contact situation. Indeed, as many of the youth began to learn about the police and their role in the community, their attitude towards the police began to shift. Moreover, some of the youth even developed empathy for the police. For instance, some of the youth expressed that they now appreciate how hard the police work and the fact that they now understand how the police take time out of their lives and away from their families to do the things that they do. Such findings are also supported by SFD literature. For instance, in their SFDT framework, Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011) recommend that within the SFD context there should be conditions for positive learning experiences and promotion of empathy. Welty Peachey (2011) similarly suggests that within SFD settings, instructors can act as mentors and create a culture of friendship and understanding. This too was supported in the current study as the program stakeholders mentored and supported the youth. Moreover, they promoted and created opportunities for relationship development.

In addition to providing support for Allport's (1954) conditions of positive contact, the current study provides us with a unique perspective of one of Allport's (1954) conditions of contact. Indeed, Allport's (1954) equal status condition, which suggests that the groups engaging in contact should have equal status to one another may look different in situations involving youth and figures of authority. Without a doubt, there is an unequal distribution of power when it comes to youth and police. Such unequal distributions of power can never truly be removed. Since they cannot be removed, it is important to be mindful of the unequal power distribution and take steps to reduce the impacts that it might have. Within the current study the police officers involved in the program were very aware of how the youth may perceive them as a result of the power imbalance that existed. As such, the police officers took a few steps to help make

the youth feel more comfortable. For instance, the police officers never wore their uniforms when engaging in the youth soccer program. Moreover, at the first practice of the season they told the youth that within the context of the soccer program they were their coach, and not a police officer. Although the power imbalance was never fully removed, behaviours such as these helped to reduce the impact that the power imbalance had. In sum, this provides us a with a unique understanding of Allport's (1954) equal status condition as this may not ever be able to be fully achieved in sport settings involving youth and figures of authority. It is important to be mindful of this when designing programs such as these. Although power imbalances may not be able to be fully removed, it is important for program stakeholders to take steps to make them less prominent.

5.6 Youth behaviour change

There is support in the literature that sport can contribute positively to youth growth and development. Indeed, it has been suggested that sport can be used as a tool for development, and in particular, it can be used to tackle anti-social behaviour and crime (Beutler, 2008). Such programs typically target at-risk populations (Lyras & Welty Peachey, 2011). This was true in the current study as the soccer program targeted at risk youth in hopes of building a positive relationship between the youth and the police. Further, the program attempted to tackle the anti-social behaviour and criminal activities that the youth were engaging in. The findings of the study indicate that the program was successful in changing such youth behaviours. For instance, prior to the soccer program the community centre was dealing with youth vandalism and conflict. However, after the soccer program this was no longer an issue. Not only was vandalism and conflict no longer an issue, but the youth began to engage in the community in positive ways. Many of the youth began to engage in volunteer opportunities within the community.

Likewise, they became leaders and role models within the community. This is consistent with findings in the SFD literature. For example, a study by Marshall & Barry (2015) found that SFD programs helped to facilitate behaviour change and develop leaders.

5.7 Community development

SFD programs are typically focused on improving the lives of those in marginalized and conflict-affected communities (Black, 2010). Indeed, there is often an inherent assumption that participation in sport will lead to positive personal development, which will result in broader positive societal impacts (Coalter, 2007, 2010). This was true in the current study as many of the youth grew and developed as individuals, which in turn, had a positive impact on their broader community. For instance, many of the youth became more engaged in the community. For instance, some of them became volunteers within the community centre, or would provide support to activities occurring within the community centre by doing things like setting up tables. Such behaviours had an impact on the broader community as the youth began to provide support to their community. According to Skinner et. al. (2008) such levels of engagement within a community can create opportunities that foster social inclusion, community development, and high levels of social capital.

According to Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011), achieving some of the more positive outcomes of SFD programs can depend on the structure, conditions, context, and methods of the sport initiative. This was true in the current study, as the program was structured in a way that allowed for specific outcomes to be achieved. An example of this is the community ownership that developed in many of the youth. Indeed, the program was structured in such a way to instill positive values such as community ownership in the youth. One of the ways in which this was done was by having the youth sign a contract saying that they would respect their community

and take part in community initiatives. This contract was signed at the beginning of the program

and upheld throughout the duration of the program. If the youth broke the contract, they risked

not being able to play soccer, which was a big deal for many of them given their passion for

soccer.

5.8 Practice based implications and recommendations

Overall, it was found that there are a number of key factors that facilitate contact within

an inner-city youth SFD program. Such findings have a number of practice based implications.

For instance, the present study highlights the importance of understanding your target population

prior to developing a SFD program intended to promote contact. Indeed, the findings of the

current study indicate that SFD programs should be designed in a way that meets the needs of the

target population. If the program is meaningful to the target population it will promote

participation in the contact situation. In the current study, given the conflict that the youth had

with the police, many of the youth would not have participated in a contact intervention unless it

was meaningful to them in some way. Since many of the youth were so passionate about soccer,

the opportunity to play on an organized soccer team was very appealing. In light of this, soccer

was used as a tool to promote positive contact amongst the youth and the police. This finding

shows that understanding your target population and their needs is critical when it comes to

developing programs intended to promote positive contact. This finding was key to the success

of the program investigated in this particular study.

The role of partnerships in program development and delivery cannot be underestimated.

Indeed, without the partners involved in the current case study, the program would not have been

made possible. The partnership allowed for the acquisition of resources that were needed to run

the program. Therefore, after understanding your target population and their needs, it is

recommended that partnerships are developed with relevant stakeholders needed to implement the program. It is recommended that such partnerships are developed early in the conception of the project so that partners can collectively develop a vision and mutual goals for the project. Within the current study, one of the partners was brought in after program development had begun. Indeed, the local soccer club was brought in after the vision of the program had been set by the other partners involved. This created some tension as the local soccer club had to shift their own schedule and needs in order to accommodate the program. By bringing partners in early on, situations like this can be avoided as all partners can work to set the vision, goals and action plan together.

Similar to developing partnerships, it is critical to have individuals who will act as champions of youth development. Indeed, the current program would not have achieved its outcomes without the stakeholders who were involved. Many of the stakeholders demonstrated their commitment to championing youth development by going above and beyond to support the needs of the youth. This resulted in many positive outcomes such as the development of positive relationships and more opportunities for youth engagement. Furthermore, the champions acted as role models and mentors for the youth which helped to shape the youths' positive change in behaviour. Therefore, it is recommended that SFD programs in similar contexts identify and promote the use of at least one champion.

Future areas for research

In addition to practice based implications and recommendations, the study also offers avenues for future research. For instance, although the program under investigation had many positive effects, the long-term impact of the program outcomes was not explored. Indeed, Shulenkorf (2016) discusses the importance of long-term benefits of SFD programs. As such,

longitudinal research would allow us to see what the long-term impact of SFD programs intended to promote positive impact have over time. This would allow for programs to be managed and designed in order to sustain the immediate impacts into long-term outcomes (Schulenkorf, 2016).

In addition to looking at long-term impacts of such programs, more research is needed on the role of authority figures and the possibilities for sport-for-development interventions to alter perceptions of authority. For instance, many of the youths' behaviour changed after participating in the program. Indeed, prior to the program some of the youth were engaging in deviant behaviours. These behaviours decreased after participating in the program however this project does not claim that these changes are a direct result of involvement in this program and further research could also explore situational factors such as education and economics in determining how a youth SFD program can influence youth behaviour change. Similarly, future research should explore the role of race and gender in intergroup contact with SFD. Indeed, in the current study race and ethnicity played a large role in the program, however this was not explored. Likewise, the participants of the program were all males, which was also not explored.

Future research should also explore perspectives of stakeholders that may have been missing from the present study. For instance, there were a couple of individuals who were identified as key informants for the study, but either could not be contacted, or did not wish to participate in the study. Indeed, one of the individuals did not want to participate in the study because they had a negative experience with the program. Having this particular individual participate in the study would have allowed for richer data collection as it would have promoted a more critical understanding of the soccer program. Such a critical perspective was missing

from the current study, as many of the participants discussed positive experiences with the program.

The results of the current study also provide us with some practice based implications. Indeed, it was identified in the current study that there is a need to formalize the soccer program. As was identified in the research, the program was done off of the side of the program stakeholders' desks. Moreover, the program lacked funding and formal commitment from each of the partners involved. Formalizing the program and having a firm commitment from each of the program partners would allow for the program to become more integrated into each of the program partners' roles. This would allow for a greater commitment from each partner, which in turn, would help with the overall sustainability of the program.

Overall, the current study highlights the role that contact plays in an inner-city youth SFD program and the factors that needed to be considered when facilitating contact amongst diverse groups. However, longitudinal research and more research on the direct impacts of contact would allow us to develop a further understanding of intergroup contact in inner-city youth SFD programs. Likewise, gaining the perspectives of individuals who may have had a different opinion from that of the majority in the current study would allow for a richer understanding of the multitude of factors that play a role in contact within a youth SFD program. Lastly, when examining programs such as these it is important to explore the practice based implications and the impacts that the findings may have in real life settings.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice: 25th anniversary edition*. New York, NY: Perseus Books Group.

Aboud, F. E., Tredoux, C., Tropp, L. R., Brown, C. S., Niens, U., Noor, N. M., & the Global Evaluation Group. (2012). Interventions to reduce prejudice and enhance inclusion and respect for ethnic differences in early childhood: A systematic review. *Developmental Review, 32*(4), 307-336.

Beelmann, A., & Heinemann, K. S. (2014). Preventing prejudice and improving intergroup attitudes: A meta-analysis of child and adolescent training programs. *Journal of Applied Development Psychology, 35*, 10-24.

Beutler, I. (2008). Sport serving development and peace: Achieving the goals of the United Nations through sport. *Sport in Society, 11*(4), 359-369.

Bowers, M. T., & Green, C. B. (2016). Theory of development of and through sport. In E. Sherry, N. Schulenkorf, & P. Phillips (Eds.), *Managing Sport Development: An International Approach* (pp. 12-27). Abingdon, OX: Routledge.

Bryman, A., Bell, E., & Teevan, J. J. (2012). *Social research methods* (3rd ed). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Burnett, C., & Uys, T. (2000). Sport development impact assessment: Towards a rationale and tool. *Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, 22*(1), 27-40.

Cameron, L., & Turner, R. N. (2017). Intergroup contact among children. In L. Vezzali and S. Stathi (Eds.), *Intergroup contact theory: Recent developments and future directions* (pp. 151-168). Abingdon, OX: Routledge.

Canadian Immigration Consultant. (2017). *2017 LICO - Canadian Immigration Consultant*.

[online] Retrieved from https://fullskillsexamprep.com/blog/2017-lico/ [Accessed 19 Dec. 2017].

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Coding in grounded theory practice*. In K. C. Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis (pp. 42-71). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2003). *Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods*. In N. K. Denzin and L. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Strategies of qualitative research (pp. 249-291). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Coalter, F. (2010). Sport-for-development: Going beyond the boundary? *Sport in Society, 13*(9), 1374-1391.

Coalter, F. (2008). Sport-in-development: development for and through sport? In M. Nicholson, & R. Hoye (Eds). *Sport and Social Capital* (pp. 39-68). Jordan Hill, OX: Elsevier.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology, 13*(1), 3-21.

Crabbe, T. (2008). Avoiding the numbers game: Social theory, policy and sport's role in the art of relationship building. In M. Nicholson, & R. Hoye (Eds). *Sport and Social Capital* (pp. 21-37). Jordan Hill, OX: Elsevier.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y, (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (3rd ed,)* (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Doherty, A., & Misener, K. (2008). Community sport networks. In M. Nicholson &

R. Hoye (Eds.), *Sport and Social Capital* (pp. 113-141). Jordan Hill, OX: Elsevier Ltd.

Fraser-Thomas, J. L., Côté, J., & Deakin, J. (2005). Youth sport programs: An avenue to foster positive youth development. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, *10*(1), 19-40.

Glaser B. & Strauss A.L. (1967) *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Nathan, S., Blunde-Birouste, A., Evers, C., Kemp, L., MacKenzie, J., & Henley, R. (2010). Social cohesion through football: A quasi-experimental mixed methods design to evaluate a complex health promotion program. *BMC Public Health, 10*(587), 1-12.

Jones, G. J., Carlton, T. A., Bocarro, J. N., Bunds, K. S., & Edwards, M. B. (2016). The salience of sport in cross-race friendship selection. *Journal of Amateur Sport*, 73-98.

Kidd, B. (2011). Cautions, questions and opportunities in sport for development and peace. *Third World Quarterly*, *32*(3), 603-609.

Kidd, B. (2008). A new social movement: Sport for development and peace. *Sport in Society, 11*(4), 370-380.

Kramer, R. M. & Specht, H. (1975). *Readings in community organization practice* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Levermore, R. (2011). Evaluating sport-for-development: Approaches and critical issues. *Progress in Development Studies, 11*(4), 339-353.

Lyras, A., & Welty Peachey, J. W. (2011). Integrating sport-for-development theory and praxis. *Sport Management Review, 14*, 311-326.

Lyras, A. (2007). Characteristics and psycho-social impacts of an inter-ethnic educational sport initiative on Greek and Turkish Cypriot youth. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

Macintosh, E., Arellano, A., & Forneris, T. (2016). Exploring the community and external-agency partnership in sport-for-development programming. European Sport Management Quarterly, 16(1), 38-57.

Marshall, S. K., & Barry, P. (2015). Community sport for development: Perceptions from practice in Southern Africa. *Journal of Sport Management, 29*, 109-121.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 271-280.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 922-934.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751-783.

Schulenkorf, N. (2016). Managing sport-for-development: Reflections and outlook. *Sport Management Review*, 1-9.

Schulenkorf, N. (2013). Sport-for-development events and social capital building: A critical analysis of experiences from Sri Lanka. *Journal of Sport for Development*, *1*(1), 25-36.

Schulenkorf, N. (2012). Sustainable community development through sport and events: A conceptual framework for sport-for-development projects. *Sport Management Review, 15*, 1-12.

Schulenkorf, N. (2010). The roles and responsibilities of a change agent in sport event development projects*. Sport Management Review, 13*, 118-128.

Schulenkorf, N., Sherry, E., & Phillips, P. (2016). What is sport development?. In E. Sherry, N.

Schulenkorf, & P. Phillips (Eds.), *Managing Sport Development: An International Approach* (pp. 3-11). Abingdon, OX: Routledge.

Schulenkorf, N., Sherry, E., & Rowe, K. (2016). Sport for development: An integrated literature review. *Journal of Sport Management, 30*, 22-39.

Schulenkorf, N., Sugden, J., & Sugden J. (2016). Sport for conflict resolution and peace building. In E. Sherry, N. Schulenkorf, & P. Phillips (Eds.), *Managing Sport Development: An International Approach* (pp. 148-158). Abingdon, OX: Routledge.

Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The sage dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Shilbury, D., Sotiriadou, K., Green, C. B. (2008). Sport development. Systems, policies and pathways: An introduction to the special issue. *Sport Management Review, 11*, 217-223.

Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practice*. London, UK: Sage publications Inc.

Skinner, J., Zakus, D. H., & Cowell, J. (2008). Development through sport: Building social capital in disadvantaged communities. *Sport Management Review, 11*(3), 253–275

Stake, R. E. (2003). *Case Studies*. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), Strategies of qualitative inquiry 2nd ed. (pp. 134-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Statistics Canada. (2015). *Low income in Canada: A multi-line and multi-index perspective*. (Catalogue no. 75F0002M). Retrieved from
https://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75f0002m/2012002/lico-sfr-eng.htm

Sugden, J. (2006). Teaching and playing sport for conflict resolution and co-existence in Israel. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 41*(2), 221-240.

Thomas, G. (2011). A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse, and structure, *Qualitative Inquiry, 17*(6), 511-521.

Thomas, G. (2010). Doing case study: abduction not induction, phronesis not theory. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(7), 575-582.

Ruck, M. D., Park, H., Killen, M., & Crystal, D. S. (2011). Intergroup contact and evaluations of race-based exclusion in urban minority children and adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 40*, 633-643.

United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace (2016). Annual Report 2015. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/sport/sites/www.un.org.sport/files/ckfiles/files/UNOSDP_Annual_Report_2015%20(1).pdf

United Nations. (2011). *Sport for development and peace: The UN system in action*. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/home/sport

United Nations. (2003). *Sport for development and peace: Towards achieving the millennium development goals*. Report from the United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/sport/shared/sport/pdfs/Reports/2003_interagency_report_ENGLISH.pdf

Veal, A. J. (2011*). Research methods for leisure and tourism: A practical guide* (4th ed.). Essex, EG: Pearson Education Limited.

Welty Peachy, J., & Sherry, E. (2016). Sport and social inclusion. In E. Sherry, N. Schulenkorf, & P. Phillips (Eds.), *Managing Sport Development: An International Approach* (pp. 135-146). Abingdon, OX: Routledge.

Appendix A
Youth semi-structured interview guide

INTERVIEW GUDIE #1
Semi-structured interview guide for YOUTH PARTICIPANTS

Background Questions:

Lead Question: Tell me about the soccer program that you are/were involved in…

Follow-up questions:

    A. How did you become involved in the program?

    B. Why do you think the soccer program was developed?

    C. What do you believe were the goals of the program?

Research Question 1: What are the conditions which facilitate contact within a sport-based youth development program?

Conditions of positive contact (i.e. level of prejudice, intergroup anxiety, equal status, institutional support, frequency and quality of interactions.) questions:

Lead Question 1A: Who was involved in the program?

Follow-up questions:

    A. Who were the coaches?

    B. Who were the participants?

    C. Who organized the program?

    D. Was there anyone else involved in the program?

Lead Question 1A: When the program first started, who did you feel like you connected with the most? The other youth in the program? The police? Other (i.e. community centre staff/volunteers?)

Follow up Questions:

    A. Why do you think you connected with them the most?

    B. Who did you feel like you connected with the least? Why do you think this was?

Lead Question 1B: What did you think of the police before you started the program

<u>Follow up Questions:</u>

    A. What was your relationship/interactions with the police like before you started the program?

    B. What did you think the role of the police in the community was?

    C. Did you trust the police? Please explain.

    D. Did you ever feel uncomfortable/anxious around the police? Please explain.

Lead Question 1C: Describe what your interactions with the police were like once the program started…

<u>Follow up Questions:</u>

    A. What was the role of the police in the program?

    B. How often did you interact with the police in the program?

    C. Entering the soccer program, did you feel like you had a lot in common with the police? Please explain.

    D. Entering the soccer program, did you feel like there were differences between you and the police? Please explain.

    E. After being involved in the soccer program did you feel like you had more or less in common with the police? Please explain

    F. Did your initial thoughts of the police change after having a chance to interact with the police? How so?

    G. Did you learn anything new about the police?

    H. Did you trust the police more or less after participating in the program? Please explain

Lead Question 1D: Why do you believe your thoughts/opinions of the police changed after participating in the program?...

<u>Follow up questions:</u>

    A. How did the soccer program change your views of the police, overall?

B. Did your views towards the police only change towards the police that you interacted with? Or did your change in views extend to the police as a whole?

Research Question 2: How does contact influence stakeholders involved in a sport-based youth development program?

Program Outcomes Questions (Reduction in prejudice, increase in trust)

Lead Question 2A: What do you believe were some of the main outcomes of the program?...

Follow-up questions:

A. What did you as an individual got out of participating in the program?

B. Did you learn anything new?

Lead Question 2B: What do believe made the program so successful, overall?

Follow-up Questions

A. What do you believe to be the main factors that allowed the program to be successful?

B. How do you think that having interactions with other individuals (participants and other stakeholders) involved in the program contributed to the success of the program?

Lead Question 2C: If you had the opportunity to change anything about the program, or to develop a new program, what would you do?

Follow-up Questions

A. Is there anything you would have changed about the program?

B. What other types of programs would you like to see offered?

C. Who would you like to be involved in these programs?

Lead Question 2C: Is there anything else about the program that I may have missed and you would like to share?...

Appendix B
Program stakeholder interview guide

INTERVIEW GUDIE #2
Semi-structured interview guide for PROGRAM DEVLOPERS and ADMINISTERS (City representatives, including staff and volunteers, as well as partners from other organizations who may have been involved at this level)

Background Questions:

Lead Question A: Tell me about the youth soccer program that was developed…

Follow-up Questions:

    A. Why was the soccer program developed?

    B. What was the overall vision/goal for the program?

    C. Who were some of the key stakeholders involved in the program?

    D. What do you believe the program hoped to achieve by bringing the youth and the police together through the use of soccer?

Research Question 2: How does contact influence stakeholders involved in a sport-based youth development program?

Lead Question 2A: What was the role of the police in the program?

Follow-up Questions:

    A. Why were the police chosen to be a participant in this program?

    B. How often were the police involved in the program?

Lead Question 2B: How were the youth selected to participate in the program?

Follow-up Question:

    A. Why were these youths selected to participate?

Lead Question 2C: How were initial interactions between the youth and the police facilitated?

Follow-up Question:

    A. How were these two diverse groups initially brought together?

B. How were interactions facilitated throughout the rest of the program?

Lead Question 2D: What key factors of the program helped to facilitate positive interactions between the youth and the police?...

Follow-up Questions

A. How did you use soccer as a tool to bring the youth and police together?

B. What key factors of the program helped to facilitate positive interactions between the youth and the police?

Lead Question 2A: Why was sport chosen as a tool to bring two diverse groups of people together?

Follow-up Questions

A. Was anything other than soccer used to bring the two groups together throughout as part of the program? Please explain.

Research Question 1: What are the conditions which facilitate contact within a sport-based youth development program?

Program outcomes

Lead Question 1A: What do you believe were some of the main outcomes of the program?...

Follow-up questions:

A. Why do you believe these outcomes occurred?

B. What key aspects of the program contributed to these outcomes?

C. Were there any outcomes that you had hoped would occur that did not? If so, why do you think this was?

Lead Question 1B: What advice would you give to other organizations who wanted to develop a similar program?

Follow-up questions:

A. What are the key factors that should be considered when developing a program like this?

B. What would you do the same? Why?

    C. What would you do differently? Why?

Lead Question 1C: Is there anything else about the program that I may have missed that you would like to share?

Appendix C
Police interview guide

INTERVIEW GUDIE #3
Semi-structured interview guide for POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT

Background Questions:

Lead Question: Tell me about the soccer program that you are/were involved in…

Follow-up questions:

D. How did you become involved in the program?

E. What did you like most about the program? Explain.

F. Was there anything that you did not like about the program? Explain.

Research Question 1: What are the conditions which facilitate contact within a sport-based youth development program?

Conditions of positive contact (i.e. level of prejudice, intergroup anxiety, equal status, institutional support, frequency and quality of interactions.) questions:

Lead Question 1A: When the program first started, who did you feel like you connected with the most? The other police involved in the program? The youth? Other (i.e. community centre staff/volunteers?)

Follow up Questions:

C. Why do you think you connected with them the most?

D. Who did you feel like you connected with the least? Why do you think this was?

Lead Question 1B: What did you think of the youth before you started the program?

Follow up Questions:

E. What was your relationship/interactions with the youth like before you started the program?

F. What did you think the role of the youth in the community was?

G. Did you trust the youth? Please explain.

H. Did you ever feel uncomfortable/anxious around the youth? Please explain.

Lead Question 1C: Describe what your interactions with the youth were like once the program started…

Follow up Questions:

I. What was your role in the program?

J. How often did you interact with the youth in the program?

K. Entering the soccer program, did you feel like you had a lot in common with the youth? Please explain.

L. Entering the soccer program, did you feel like there were differences between you and the youth? Please explain.

M. After being involved in the soccer program did you feel like you had more or less in common with the youth? Please explain.

N. Did your initial thoughts of the youth change after having a chance to interact with the police? How so?

O. Did you learn anything new about the youth?

P. Did you trust the youth more or less after participating in the program? Please explain

Lead Question 1D: Why do you believe your thoughts/opinions of the youth changed after participating in the program?...

Follow up questions:

C. How did the soccer program change your views towards the youth, overall?

D. Did your views towards the police only change towards the youth that you interacted with? Or did your change in views extend to youth with similar experiences as a whole?

Research Question 2: How does contact influence stakeholders involved in a sport-based youth development program?

Program Outcomes Questions (Reduction in prejudice, increase in trust)

Lead Question 2A: What do you believe were some of the main outcomes of the program?...

Follow-up questions:

C. What did you as an individual got out of participating in the program?

D. Did you learn anything new?

Lead Question 2B: What do believe made the program so successful, overall?

<u>Follow up Questions</u>

C. What do you believe to be the main factors that allowed the program to be successful?

D. How do you think that having interactions with other individuals (participants and other stakeholders) involved in the program contributed to the success of the program?

E. Is there anything that you would change about the program?

Lead Question 2C: Is there anything else about the program that I may have missed and you would like to share?...