

DELIVERY OF SPORT CLUB DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES: CASE OF CDP, CAPE METROPOLE, SOUTH AFRICA

Jakobo J. MOROE, Simeon S.E.H. DAVIES, Brendon KNOTT
*Sport Management Department, Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Mowbray,
Cape Town, Rep. of South Africa.*

ABSTRACT

Sport and Recreation South Africa (SRSA) initiated a national Club Development Programme (CDP) in 2006, which sought to increase participation in sport and recreation, and to develop the human resource capacity to manage sport within previously disadvantaged communities. The CDP serves numerous sporting codes, with football being the main focus. Despite its strategic intentions, the delivery of CDP was perceived as a weakness by some football clubs. This study aimed to identify the key factors influencing the delivery of the CDP within selected football community clubs in the Cape Metropole. Semi-structured interviews were used and a qualitative method was adopted. A purposeful sampling comprising of 14 programme coordinators representing the three arms of the Government was considered ideal for the study. The key findings highlighted that the delivery of CDP appeared to be most influenced by ineffectual relationships between key role players, a lack of competent officials and a lack of access to quality equipment. It is recommended that, for effective programme delivery, the CDP management in the Cape Metropole should address the aforesaid factors in order to ensure that the programme achieves its strategic intentions.

Keywords: CDP; Football; Community sport club; Sport programme delivery and management; Sport development; Cape Metropole; South Africa.

INTRODUCTION

In 2006, the Department of Sport and Recreation South Africa (SRSA) initiated the Club Development Programme (CDP), which is an on-going integral part of the Siyadlala Mass Participation Programme (SMPP). Singh (2015) emphasised that the CDP was introduced by SRSA because of the realisation that in many local communities, there were no formal clubs that were in existence or in operation. The blueprint for the Club Development Project stresses that the CDP seeks to empower, promote and revive sport clubs within previously disadvantaged communities across all the nine provinces in South Africa (SRSA, 2006).

The programme was designed in such a way that sport clubs from the previously disadvantaged communities become part of the CDP with the intent to receive support and assistance (such as, capacity building on club management, provision of transport, first aid kit, clothing & equipment) from SRSA for only a period of three years. After this period, all the CDP clubs are expected to be self-sustainable and exit the programme. At the completion of a three-year cycle, new community clubs are identified for potential inclusion in the programme and also to receive similar support and assistance as the previous clubs. Traditionally, the six sporting codes of the CDP include athletics, aquatics, netball, rugby, cricket and football. Since

the existence of the programme, more sporting codes were added by SRSA to be part of the CDP. Of all the CDP sporting codes, football was the main focus of the study. In the Western Cape Province, the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport (DCAS) is solely responsible for the effective delivery of the programme. From 2006 to the end of the 2014 financial year, SRSA had granted an estimated amount of R58.2 million to DCAS to promote and develop community clubs in the province (DCAS, 2008).

The Cape Metropole is one of the six districts within the Western Cape Province and it is located in the city of Cape Town, South Africa encompassing an area from Gordon's Bay to Atlantis and includes the suburbs of Khayelitsha and Mitchell's Plain. At the beginning of each year since 2006, the Sport Development Unit (SDU) within the DCAS structure responsible for the effective delivery of CDP in the Cape Metropole, set out their targets regarding the number of community clubs to be developed over a specified period of time. During the quarterly meeting in the third year of the CDP's operation, the government programme coordinators claimed that they were not appropriately briefed about the directives of the CDP by SRSA (DCAS, 2008).

The government programme coordinators believed that some community football clubs were receiving more attention and support from DCAS when compared to others. Given the challenges that the programme is believed to be faced with, it is against this background that all the regional coordinators agreed that the programme had good intentions, however, it is not being managed properly and delivered effectively within the Cape Metropole district. Furthermore, the government programme coordinators emphasised that there seemed to be many unidentified factors negatively impacting on the effective delivery of CDP in the Cape Metropole. In light of the background, the objective of this paper was to unveil the key factors that government programme coordinators are faced with regarding the effective delivery of CDP within the selected football communities in the Cape Metropole.

Sport and development

Generally, the terms 'sport' and 'development' have been interpreted and re-defined in many ways by various scholars and organisation across the globe. Therefore, given this background, it is crucial for anyone involved in the development space in relation to sport, to understand the context at which the two concepts can be applied in a broader context of development. De Coning (2014) argued that though these concepts may be used interchangeably, they should not be confused with either 'sport development' or 'sport for development' as it focuses on the full spectrum of development impacts that sport and recreation have on individuals and communities in terms of a broad range of development or socio-economic benefits.

In respect to the above view, the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG, 2008:6) described sport as a "tool that is increasingly used by both public and private institutions to promote health awareness, prevent diseases, strengthen child and youth development and education, foster social inclusion, prevent conflict and enhance inclusion of persons with disabilities".

Schulenkorf *et al.* (2016) shed some light that sport in the early twentieth century, was understood as a common good with the ability to provide people at different ages, as well as backgrounds, valuable social experiences. On the other hand, Cardenas (2013) affirmed that historically, sport was used as a catalyst to advance peace endeavours. In 2008, the Sport Diplomacy in the United States of America used sport as an engine to facilitate the interaction of different sections through training, reduce hostile perceptions and stereotypes in various

racial groups and alleviate some of the social conflict (Levermore, 2008). The scholar further emphasised that sport has a unique way of raising awareness in a manner that even politicians could not do. For example, Green (2008) indicated that the founder of the modern Olympic Movement, Mr Pierre Coubertin, recognised the value of sport as a vehicle for social and personal change, because of its potential to promote personal values, such as learning to work as a team, strive for excellence and respect for others while participating in sport. Thus, sport has been viewed as having the ability to foster social development, particularly in terms of unifying different groups of people.

In the South African context, sport is increasingly recognised and used as a vehicle that could potentially bridge relationships across social, economic and cultural divides within South African society. Additionally, Nicholson and Hoye (2008) also stated that even influential community stakeholders, such as politicians, academics, policymakers, journalists, athletes and commentators, hold a strong view that sport can be used as an ideal vehicle towards the creation and the maintenance of social capital within communities. MacDonald *et al.* (2012) concur with Nicholson and Hoye (2008) by articulating that sport can be described as an embodied cultural practice that is invested with several interrelated bio-political purposes beyond individual fulfilment, such as health promotions, social cohesion and nation-building.

In light of the view of Nicholson and Hoye (2008), it was interesting to note that politicians also acknowledge sport as a powerful tool for nation-building. For example, Mr Nelson Mandela (first South African democratic President) said that “Sport has the power to change the world, inspire, unite people in a way that little else can and also can awaken hope where there was previously only despair” (SRSA, 2011:13).

Sport development

Many scholars have defined ‘sport development’ in different ways. To comprehend what sport development comprises of, it is important to understand how the two arms of sport development, namely development of sport (also referred as Sport Development (SD) and development through sport (also known as Sport-for-Development (SFD) differ and operate. Schulenkorf *et al.* (2016) indicated that sport development (SD) aims to create a smooth pathway for professional participation and talent identification, while SFD mainly focuses on the role that sport can play to improve the specific social outcomes. The scholars continue to say the SD agenda is based on enhancing the sport related skills of a particular participant. On the contrary, SFD focuses on the improvement of sport and other social skills that could be attained through sport participation. Eady (1993) stressed that sport development is a process that enhances opportunities for people of all ages, of all degrees of interest and of all levels of ability to take part, improve and excel in their chosen sporting activities.

Sport development also incorporates fundamental elements, such as developing a process for positive change in society, providing equal opportunities for all ages to take part in sporting activities and enabling participants at all levels to achieve their full potential ability through sport. Reflecting on the view of Eady in relation to sport development, Green (2005) highlights that when wishing to develop a successful sport development programme, it is crucial for one not take it light-heartedly. Instead must be strategic about how systems, process and policies may be designed and implemented effectively within communities, because sport development contains a process of positive change in society, creation of equal opportunities for all ages to take part in sporting activities, as well as enabling participants at all levels to achieve their full potential through sport development programmes.

Challenges of community development programmes

The term 'community development' has been defined in different ways by various scholars. Vail (2007) alluded to the fact that community development is mainly about educating, teaching, learning and facilitating any programme related to the community. Hylton and Totten (2008:82) added that community development is about "building active and sustainable communities based on social justice and mutual respect". In light of the aforementioned views, Burnett (2010) also emphasised that community development programmes ought to be promoted in economically disadvantaged communities with the intention of affording young people the opportunity to benefit greatly from the capacity building programmes. Given the background in relation to the defined concept "community development", SRSA uses the CDP as a programme designed to develop communities through sport, because it serves marginalised sections of communities not limited to youth, disability, women and girls and rural communities (Bailey & Tutu, 2013).

In order for the community programme to be effective, it is important to bear in mind that community development is not solely the responsibility of the sport promotion officers (SPOs) alone, but of everyone residing in the community. However, some community members may not be in a position to effectively analyse all the factors impacting on community growth due to their lack of awareness and understanding of these community programmes operating in their areas. Therefore, the SPOs need to identify and address these potential shortcomings and, also where feasible, inform the community about the strategic approaches to be taken when dealing with such challenges accordingly.

Broadly speaking, there are many generic factors that need to be considered when developing a community sport programme. Among many, Nesti (2002) highlighted the generic factors to include financial resources, lack of clarity regarding staff roles, ability to design the programme, staff competence, knowledge base and as personal qualities for individuals and groups. Moreover, Hylton and Totten (2008) mentioned that SPOs are likely to be faced with challenges when consulting with the community, in terms of empowering the community and ensuring that a sustainable transformative change within communities would be effective.

It is critical to identify all the aspects that could potentially interrupt the smooth functioning of programmes within the identified community. Additionally, the SPOs ought to take each factor into account and also, where possible, to involve and assist the community with the process of identifying community challenges in general.

Key stakeholders in community development through sport

Understanding the significance of the role of key players within the sporting industry is of paramount importance. In order for a community programme to be successful, it is crucial that key role players get involved in the programme from the onset, because they play an influential role in the programme (Watt, 2003). Such a consideration is crucial, because "partnership can bring together different organisations with their own aims to achieve agreed common goals and through partnership everyone involved can be a winner" (Watt, 2003:83). Robson and Partington (2013) vividly warned the SPOs to be cognisant when characterising the nature of partnership as other partners could potentially advocate their own agenda to be prioritised at the expense of the collaboration.

If the partnership conditions are not clearly stipulated among the different parties in terms of who is responsible for which task, what the cost implications may be and the time frames attached to each part of an arrangement, the partnership is likely to fail or not achieve its goals.

To ensure that the partnership is effective and beneficial to both parties, Watt (2003) recommended that the following guiding principles should be adhered to, namely clear project objectives, shared desire and commitment to achieve the goals, honesty and trust, clearly allocated work roles, strong interpersonal relationships and dedicated hard work and effort.

The Australian Football League, (AFL, 2004) emphasised that generally, the key stakeholders that could play an influential role in assisting the SPOs in the implementation of a community programme are schools, local government, civil citizens (including local businesses), federations, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), in addition to community clubs. Nesti (2002) also emphasised that those driving community projects need to ensure that the roles of the SPOs and other relevant stakeholders involved in community sport development, should be made clear from the beginning. Moreover, it is essential for the SPOs who are dealing with community sport development (CSD) programmes to ensure that the development process is real and progressive.

In general, the Government plays a major role in developing the community through sport. The national policy, in terms of South African sport, states that the success of sport development is dependent on the smooth operation of a system that has a clear definition of authority, responsibility and accountability, combined with seamless progression, and that such a system must be consistent with government policy (SRSA, 2011). Consequently, it is vital for governments to strategically identify institutions that are directly involved in community development projects, because of the essential role that they play in capacity-building and in terms of empowering community coordinators (volunteers) to effectively implement sport programmes within the various communities.

Key strategies for managing sport development programmes at clubs

For community clubs to be successful, it is vital that effective management systems, policies and structures are in place. For example, the Australian government developed relevant structures and policy frameworks that enabled clubs to be more effectively structured and administered, particularly for the betterment of programme delivery within communities. The AFL (2004) contended that, for a programme to reach its goals and objectives, it should have the following in place: a well-established and coordinated structure for the administration and implementation of programmes; and an implementation plan that incorporates elements of fun, enjoyment, skill development and social skill, and, most importantly, the long-term benefits of a healthy lifestyle.

The literature review articulates an overview that developing community sport is not the sole responsibility of one person, but rather relies on forming partnerships with others within the identified communities. Forming a partnership with potential stakeholders and identifying their roles in the partnership is essential, because it helps each partner to be informed of their responsibilities so that they can work towards creating a smooth pathway to implement the community programmes effectively.

The forgoing explanations in community development through sport, provides evidence that sport in general plays a vital role in helping to foster social change and cohesion.

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH

The aim of this research was to identify the key factors affecting the delivery of the CDP within selected football community clubs in the Cape Metropole.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study adopted a qualitative paradigm. Qualitative results were primarily implemented to explore and understand in greater depth the participants' views concerning the key factors that could potentially influence the delivery of the CDP in the Cape Metropole. In total, 16 open-ended questions were asked in relation to key topics as identified in the literature.

Research setting

The study was conducted within the region of Cape Metropole, Western Cape, South Africa. Each interview was conducted at the workplace of the respondents. The majority of the respondents were based in the Western Cape Province. Some respondents representing national government were based in a different province, such as Gauteng (in Pretoria). All participants agreed that the interviews would be scheduled at the end of the business hours. This request was respected in the spirit of ensuring that there will be a minimum disruption during the interview proceedings.

Study population and sampling

The study population consisted of the programme coordinators from the three arms of the South African government, namely national, provincial and local. This population was purposefully selected on the basis that they possess a relevant skill, substantive experience, broader knowledge and also have the ability to provide insightful information regarding the research questions, because of their involvement and the leadership role that they played in the CDP since its inception in 2006. In total, 14 semi-structured interviews were conducted and each participant approached availed themselves for the interview.

Data collection procedure

Permission and ethics clearance (2018FBREC557) was obtained from the Higher Degree Research Committee (Senate) at the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT) and the study conforms to the research ethics principles espoused in the Helsinki Declaration. In addition, DCAS as the institution that is solely responsible for the promotion and development of sport and recreation in the Western Cape Province, granted the researcher permission to collect data from the targeted research participants. All participants were made aware that their involvement in this study was entirely voluntary and confidential. Should they decide to withdraw at any stage, they had the right to do so as the principal researcher will not hold any grudges against such a person nor disadvantage them in future.

Data collection method and instrument

For the purpose of this study, a qualitative approach was considered as an ideal method, while a semi-structured interview was considered as a useful instrument to collect data from the targeted group. Although some respondents representing national government were based in a different province, such as Gauteng (in Pretoria), a telephone interview was scheduled to take place at their offices at an agreed time. A face-to-face interview lasted between fifteen to twenty five minutes, while telephone interview lasted between twenty to forty five minutes. The reason for the vast difference was because some of the CDP officials were willing to give out more information on the implementation of the programme than the rest. A voice-recording tape

(VRT) was used for recording and storing all the information respondents shared. Once the interview was complete, the researcher could easily play back the tape, in order to obtain the exact response of the respondents, or in order to check to see whether certain information was omitted.

Analysis of data

In respect to analysing the key findings for this study, data was analysed manually. In order for the researcher to identify the key factors influencing the delivery of CDP in the Cape Metropole, a thematic analysis of the interviews was developed. Moreover, themes were created and grouped according to the common or similar responses. To ensure that there is consistency and that the responses had been captured correctly, a thematic analysis was done by going over the responses of the respondents frequently.

Validity and reliability

The principal researcher made an effort to ensure that the data derived from the interview transcripts was checked frequently and also, continually comparing the voice recordings that emerged from the interviews with the field notes. Furthermore, the semi-structured interviews were checked by the mentor in the field prior to the interview schedule.

Limitations and scope of the study

As a case study of a specific sport development programme, this study was limited to the Cape Metropole region, South Africa. For the purpose of this study, only government programme coordinators were considered. The findings are, therefore, most relevant for the unique South African setting concerning sports club development in these local communities. However, the generic recommendations may also be relevant for other contexts, especially within developing economies. The focus of the study was on the delivery of a programme, and therefore excluded strategic management planning or other aspects not related to programme delivery.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results presented herein represent the findings generated from the responses of the programme coordinators from the semi-structured interviews with representatives of the three arms of the South African government. Out of the numerous findings that emerged from this study, the following factors emerged as the key factors influencing the delivery of the CDP within the Cape Metropole district:

Lack of talent identification programme

Most respondents attested to the fact that the CDP is a good concept. However, it was viewed as a programme that appears not to be sustainable due to the absence of formal league structures in respective communities. Given this view, it is concerning to note that the programme seems to have not yet yielded a positive outcome that is in line with its strategic objectives. It is evident that the delivery of the programme is in contradiction with its vision and also one of the key strategic objectives of the CDP, which intends to “ensure that those athletes with talent are channelled into the competitive areas of sport” (SRSA, 2006:4). Hylton and Totten (2008) also indicated that a talent identification programme is regarded as the centre of CSD project. In

support of this sentiment, Schulenkorf *et al.* (2016) also emphasised that programmes with SD goals, such as the CDP, should aim at creating a smooth pathway for professional participation and talent identification.

Staffing

The majority of the respondents strongly disagreed that the CDP has sufficient capacity (such as experts and volunteers) to implement the programme successfully within communities. Furthermore, the respondents felt that more competent personnel could assist with implementing the programme effectively. Given the finding, it was disturbing to discover that the people who are responsible for the delivery of the programme have discarded this recommendation and asserted that the programme has sufficient coordinators to help with the delivery of the programme across the Cape Metropole districts.

Based on this finding, it is clear that there appears to be a contradiction between what is currently happening versus what was initially meant to happen. According to the blueprint of the Club Development Project (SRSA, 2006), the guiding policy vividly state that in order for the CDP to be successfully implemented within communities, it is crucial that necessary support is provided to those who are involved with the delivery of the programme. Ibsen *et al.* (2015) highlighted that there was a lack of recruiting sufficient and competent staff that resorts to the challenges facing sport clubs to do well.

Training and skills

The respondents were asked to comment whether they had received any training courses to improve their skills as government coordinators for the CDP. The majority of the respondents confirmed that they had not attended any training courses aimed at improving their skills as the programme coordinators, In contrast, only a very few respondents indicated that they had attended other courses that appeared to be related to the successful implementation of the CDP within the communities. This outcome gave rise to a concern that only a few government programme coordinators had attended the training since the inception of the CDP, while the majority had not received training.

This finding might be pivotal for explaining why the delivery of CDP appeared to be largely ineffective within the community football clubs in the Cape Metropole region. In order to ensure that community sport is properly governed, Nichols and Taylor (2015) pointed out the significance of undergoing frequent training that may be relevant towards enhancing the day-to-day duties within the sporting organisation. Additionally, the United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force report (UNIATF SDP, 2003) on Sport-for-Development and Peace further revealed that those involved in sport (regardless of age, gender or race) could learn life skills, such as enhancing psychological well-being, increased resilience and self-esteem. This context implies that it is crucial for the government coordinators to possess the necessary knowledge and unique skill to periodically monitor and evaluate progress made by the athletes.

Equipment

The provision and distribution of quality equipment was also reported to be amongst the factors influencing the effective delivery of the programme in the Cape Metropole district. With reference to this question, most respondents mentioned that many community football clubs had not received quality sport playing kit or first aid equipment in time, while few community football clubs had received equipment on time.

In light of this response, it is evident that very few community football clubs received equipment and kit in time, while others (most) received it late or the equipment that was distributed to the majority of community football clubs had been of poor quality. Brentwood Borough Council (2011) emphasised that, in order to ensure that maximum participation takes place, it is vital for the SPOs to provide equal and safe equipment to all community clubs. This emphasis was adopted from the International Charter on Physical Education and Sport, where Article 5 of the policy states “Adequate facilities and equipment are essential to physical education and sport” (UNESCO, 1978:1-5).

Key stakeholders in developing community sport

The majority of the respondents articulated that there is a lack of good working relationship between the three arms of the South African government, as well as community clubs that are part of the CDP. This concern was derived from the view point that government programme coordinators appear to have struggled to gain access to important CDP information effectively. Lindsey and Banda (2010:90) endorsed the views on the significance and relevance of partnership by declaring that “partnerships are advocated as an effective approach to achieving policy goals”. Furthermore, Robson and Partington (2013) stressed that for a partnership to work, it is reliant on the idea that the identified key stakeholders show commitment to each other in terms of what they are able to put into the partnership, on the basis that some or all of the outputs would help them attain their overall goals.

KEY FINDINGS

The key findings presented provide a broader understanding as to why the CDP appeared not to have achieved its objectives. Thus, the responses and analyses clearly show that the main challenge facing the CDP coordinators was largely about ‘implementation’. Vail (2007:573) makes the point that “community development is centrally concerned with educating, teaching, learning and facilitating the development work within communities”. Therefore, it is fundamentally important, if the CDP programme is to be successful, that the management safeguards that all the coordinators involved in the programme are well orientated to execute their roles and responsibilities efficiently and effectively.

The lack of quality education and training was a factor, which appeared to hinder the success of the programme. Vail (2007:574) emphasised the significance and value of capacitating everyone involved in the programme, stressing that the “intent of community development is to educate and involve citizens in the process of individual empowerment and community change”. Moreover, the inability to provide quality equipment on time to community football clubs and the perception of unfair treatment by the programme coordinators appeared to be of great concern.

In order for the programme to be successfully implemented within communities, the facilitation of capacity building skills were reported to be important for the SPOs, notably the following skills: interpersonal communicating, planning, researching, thinking and others (Watt, 2003). A further challenge was the lack of competent and suitably qualified personnel to support CDP. This was discovered after the respondents expressed their view that the CDP did not have individuals with the competencies and abilities to plan realistic goals and also to actively interact with the community clubs.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

This paper has highlighted key factors and considerations for the effective delivery of the CDP within the selected football community clubs in the Cape Metropole district. The following provide resonance and direction for CDP officials from all the three arms of government and articulate the issues that need to be addressed. Based on these findings, it is therefore recommended that:

- The CDP management should ensure that all CDP officials undergo training to gain important skills needed to improve the programme;
- There is improved and regular communication with all the key stakeholders involved, in order to establish sustainable relationships;
- The CDP management should recruit more personnel to assist with the programme implementation;
- The CDP management should distribute sufficient equipment to community clubs that have not yet received it;
- The CDP management must ensure that they identify a supplier(s) that can produce and deliver quality equipment to all community clubs; and
- The CDP management must ensure that structures are in place for creating sustainable leagues in respective communities.

Given the unique circumstances in South African sport clubs, particularly within previously disadvantaged communities, the findings are useful for any programme being used to develop the community through sport in this country regardless of the sporting code. The findings could furthermore be generalised as key factors influencing the delivery of other sport development programmes in other developing economies.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that the CDP appeared to be largely ineffective within communities because only a few community football clubs had received relevant training, while the majority of the programme coordinators also had not received sufficient training to effectively implement the programme. Additionally, ineffectual relationships between key partners and the inconsistent delivery of resources was an additional concern with some community football clubs receiving more attention and support in terms of development, compared to others operating in the CDP.

For the effective and successful programme, the following factors are essential precursors to underpin the success of CDP, including the need for frequent training for both community club officials and programme coordinators (from the three arms of the South African government), regular communication with key partners need to be prioritised, a supplier who can produce and deliver quality equipment ought to be identified as well as ensuring that equal treatment is provided to all community sport clubs that are part of the CDP.

Moreover, it is important to note that the aforementioned factors may therefore have had some influence on the programme and as a consequence also mitigated against the successful implementation and achievement of CDP goals in the Cape Metropole region. In a broader context, it could be concluded that the challenge with the CDP mainly lies in the delivery of the service. Regarding equipment, two observations could be made. Firstly, the equipment provided to community football clubs by the government programme coordinators appeared to have been of low quality due to its lack of durability. Secondly, there appears to have been

inconsistency in terms of equipment distribution within the programme, as some clubs had received equipment, whilst others had not.

REFERENCES

- AFL (Australian Football League) (2004). *AFL club management program: Junior development for football clubs*. Sydney, Australia: Australian Football League.
- BAILEY, B. & TUTU, T. (2013). Personal interview with the Director and Deputy Director of Sport Promotion at the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport (DCAS), 16 May 2013, Cape Town.
- BRENTWOOD BOROUGH COUNCIL (2011). Sports development strategy 2007-2011. Hyperlink: [https://www.brentwood.gov.uk/pdf/pdf_1246.pdf]. Retrieved on 20 May 2011.
- BURNETT, C. (2010). Sport-for-development approaches in the South African context: A case study analysis. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 32(1): 29-42.
- CARDENAS, A. (2013). Peace building through sport? An introduction to Sport for Development and Peace. *Journal of Conflictology*, 4(1): 24-33.
- DCAS (Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport) (2008). Quarterly district meeting for CDP, 14 April 2008. Cape Town, South Africa: Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport.
- DE CONING, C. (2014). *The case for sport in the Western Cape: Socio-economic benefits and impacts of sport and recreation*. Cape Town, South Africa: University of the Western Cape (UWC).
- EADY, J. (1993). *Practical sports development*. London, UK: Pitnam.
- GREEN, B.C. (2005). Building sport programs to optimise athlete recruitment, retention, and transition: Towards a normative theory of sport development. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19(19): 233-253.
- GREEN, B.C. (2008). Sport as an agent for social and personal change. In V. Girginov (Ed.), *Management of sports development* (pp. 129-145). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.
- HYLTON, K. & TOTTEN, M. (2008). Community sport development. In K. Hylton & P. Bramham (Eds.), *Sports development: Policy, process and practice* (pp. 77-116). London, UK: Routledge.
- IBSEN, B.; OSTERLUND, K. & LAUB, T. (2015). Sport clubs in Denmark. In C. Breuer, R. Hoekman, S. Nagel & H. Van der Werff (Eds), *Sport clubs in Europe: A cross national comparative perspective* (pp. 85-110). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- LEVERMORE, R. (2008). Sport: A new engine of development? *Progress in Development Studies*, (8)2: 183-190.
- LINDSEY, I. & BANDA, D. (2010). Sport and the fight against HIV/AIDS in Zambia: A 'partnership approach'? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 46(1): 90-107.
- MACDONALD, D.; PANG, B.; KNEZ, K.; NELSON, A. & MCCUAIG, L. (2012). The will for inclusion: Bothering the inclusion/exclusion discourses of sport. In S. Dagkas & K. Armour (Eds.), *Inclusion and exclusion through youth sport* (pp. 9-23). New York, NY: Routledge.
- NESTI, M. (2002). Working in sports development. In K. Hylton., P. Bramham, D. Jackson & M. Nesti (Eds.), *Sports development: Policy, process and practice* (pp. 195-213). London, UK: Routledge.
- NICHOLS, G. & TAYLOR, P. (2015). Sport clubs in England. In C. Breuer, R. Hoekman, S. Nagel & H. Van der Werff (Eds.), *Sport clubs in Europe: A cross-national comparative perspective* (pp. 111-130). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- NICHOLSON, M. & HOYE, R. (2008). Sport and social capital: An introduction. In M. Nicholson, & R. Hoye (Eds.), *Sport and social capital* (pp. 1-18). New York, NY: Elsevier.
- ROBSON, S & PARTINGTON, J. (2013). Partnerships in sport. In K. Hylton (Ed.), *Sport development: policy, process and practice* (pp. 127-149). London, UK: Routledge.

- 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. 1-11). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- SDP IWG (Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group) (2008). *Harnessing the power of sport for development and peace: Recommendations to governments*. Toronto, Canada: Right to Play International.
- SINGH, P. (2015). Twenty years of freedom and democracy: A focus on club development, from policy to practice. *Journal of Sport and Recreation*, 2(4): 10-15.
- SRSA (Department of Sport and Recreation South Africa) (2006). Club development project Draft: A bridge from foundation to elite. Unpublished internal memorandum.
- SRSA (Department of Sport and Recreation South Africa) (2011). National Sport and Recreation Plan (NSRP): Consultation in preparation for national indaba. From policy to practice. Pretoria, South Africa: Department of Sport and Recreation South Africa.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation) (1978). International charter of physical education and sport.
- UNIATF SDP (United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace) (2003). *Sport for development and peace: Towards achieving the millennium development goals*. New York, NY: United Nations Publication.
- VAIL, S.E. (2007). Community development and sport participation. *Journal of Sport Management*. 21(4): 571-596.
- WATT, D.C. (2003). *Sports management and administration*. London, UK: Routledge.

Corresponding author: Mr Jakobo Moroe; **Email:** Moroej@cput.ac.za

(Subject editor: Dr. Marié Young)