Abstract

Currently, international cricket organizations have mandates to increase cricket participation globally by 1.5 million people. To do this, these organizations are sponsoring cricket-focused international development programs across the globe. This study was inspired by concerns from scholars such as Darnell (2012) about potentially negative outcomes of ‘sport for development and peace’ (SDP) work for targeted populations – and a recognition that little is known about how decisions are made by executives of international sport federations to pursue SDP initiatives. This study explores the international development work of the globally-prominent International Cricket Council (ICC) and the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC), and is guided by the following research questions: 1) How have decisions been made by high-level executives of global cricket organizations about engaging in development-related work and how are these decisions explained?; 2) How do key decision-makers understand the notion of development and what are their perceptions of development-related issues?; 3) How are development-related goals portrayed to stakeholders and how do these goals align with broader organizational goals?; and 4) What are the benefits of and problems with cricket-related development work as revealed through discussions with key decision-makers? This study is informed by literature on developmentalism, SDP, cricket and globalization, and urban (re)development. Theoretically, postcolonialism is featured because this perspective is concerned with the politics, cultures, and economies of societies living with legacies of colonialism; ongoing impacts of neoliberal forms of development in these societies and; the lived experiences of individuals in contexts where postcolonial forces are especially intense (McEwan, 2009).
Nine semi-structured interviews were conducted with executives in the ICC and MCC. The results illustrate that: (a) a select group of executives in the ICC and MCC make decisions hierarchically, and that decisions reflect organizational mandates; (b), decision-makers tend to be dismissive of critiques of SDP, with notable exceptions; and (c) development-related programs are portrayed differently to different audiences. This study concluded with commentary on the importance of interviewing a range of individuals working in SDP, the sometimes contradictory ways that cricket continues to be implicated in postcolonial relationships, and roles of reflexive decision-makers working in organizations governed by neoliberal policies.
Preface

This thesis is original, unpublished, independent work by the author, Devra Waldman.
# Table of Contents

Abstract ................................................................................................................. ii
Preface .................................................................................................................... iv
Table of Contents ...................................................................................................... v
List of Abbreviations ............................................................................................... viii
Acknowledgements ................................................................................................. ix
Chapter 1: Introduction .............................................................................................. 1
   Justification, Contributions, and Significance ...................................................... 1
Chapter 2: Literature Review ..................................................................................... 6
   Postcolonial Theoretical Approach ........................................................................ 6
   Developmentalism .................................................................................................. 8
   Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) ............................................................... 10
   Sport/Leisure and Urban (Re)development ......................................................... 13
   Cricket and Globalization ...................................................................................... 16
   Reflections ............................................................................................................. 19
Chapter 3: Methods ................................................................................................... 21
   Data Collection ..................................................................................................... 21
   Data Analysis ........................................................................................................ 27
   Ethical Considerations .......................................................................................... 29
   Background on Programs Investigated in this Study ............................................ 30
Chapter 4: Results .................................................................................................... 33
   How Have Decisions Been Made by Executives at the Highest Levels of the ICC
   and MCC to Engage in Development-Related Work and How do Key
   Decision-Makers Explain the Decisions They Have Made? .................................. 34
   How do Key Decision-Makers Understand the Notion of Development and
   What are Their Perceptions of Development-Related Issues? ................................. 49
   How are Development-Related Goals and Issues Portrayed to Stakeholders
   and How do These Development Goals Align with Broader Organizational Goals? .. 66
Chapter 5: Discussion ............................................................................................... 70
   Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) ............................................................... 70
   Hegemonic Decision-Making and Impression Management .................................. 81
   Globalization of Cricket through International Development .............................. 82
Chapter 6: Conclusion and Future Recommendations ............................................. 89
References ................................................................................................................ 95
Appendix A1 — Interview Protocol for ICC.................................................................106
Appendix A2 — Interview Protocol for MCC ...............................................................107
Appendix B1 — Letter of Contact..............................................................................108
Appendix B2 — Information and Consent Form ...........................................................109
List of Tables

Table 1.0: Interview Information.........................................................................................................................24
List of Abbreviations

AIDS — Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome

CfC — Cricket for Change

HIV — Human Immunodeficiency Virus

ICC — International Cricket Council

MCC — Marylebone Cricket Club

SDP — Sport for Development and Peace

UN — United Nations

UNAIDS — The Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS

UNICEF — United Nations Children Fund
Acknowledgements

This thesis has been influenced by many great minds, friends, and family members. I would like to convey my gratitude to all of you. I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Brian Wilson. You were the first to encourage what seemed to be a very unlikely research exchange. Without your ongoing support and patience in answering my many questions and consistent guidance through my ideas, this thesis would have never been produced. Thank you to my committee members, Dr. Wendy Frisby and Dr. Patricia Vertinsky. Your warm encouragement and insightful comments have helped shape this document in numerous ways. Also, thank you to Dr. Michael Silk and the Physical Cultural Studies group at the University of Bath for your warm reception and frequent talks over lunch through my data collection in the UK.

Thank you to Liv Yoon, Shawna Lawson, Gavin Weedon, Shawn Forde, Erica Bennett, Alex Korotchenko, Nicolien van Luijk and the rest of the Annex crew for the encouragement, coffee breaks, intellectual stimulation, and fun.

To my family, I cannot say enough. To my Dad for his constant love, support, good humour, and computer troubleshooting. To my Mom for her enthusiasm, creativity, long conversations and debates, and commitment to making sure my thoughts are always well articulated. To my brother, Sam, for being in my corner, and always finding ways to make me laugh. Finally, my heartfelt appreciation goes to Jon Gula. You always believe in me even when I don’t believe in myself. If not for your unwavering friendship, love, and understanding, none of this would have been possible.
Chapter 1: Introduction

In this study, I examine how and why decisions are made by executives of the International Cricket Council (ICC) and the Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC) to engage in and support development-related work in various geographic locations. Through interviews with executives in the ICC and MCC, I use this investigation of international development work in order to learn more about the ways in which cricket is being used and implemented as a development tool, how decisions are made at the highest institutional levels to support sport-related development initiatives, and what broader socio-political factors allow for these sorts of programs to develop.

My study is guided by the following research questions: 1) How have decisions been made by executives at the highest levels of global cricket organizations about engaging in development-related work and how do these organizations and key decision makers explain the decisions they have made?; 2) How do key decision-makers understand the notion of development and what are their perceptions of development related issues?; 3) How are development-related goals and issues portrayed to stakeholders and how do these development goals align with broader organizational goals?; and 4) What are the benefits of and problems with cricket-related development work that are revealed through discussions with key decision-makers?

Justification, Contributions, and Significance

A critical examination of ICC and MCC-supported development programs provides a way of looking at the broader political issues surrounding sport for development and peace.
(SDP) programs. Over the last 30 years the idea of using sport to promote development has been gaining political and public momentum. As a result, there has been a dramatic surge in sport-focused development programs that operate worldwide. For example, in 2001 the United Nations recognized sport as a vehicle that has the potential to help accomplish the Millennium Development Goals of ending poverty, achieving gender equity, improving health, universal education, combatting HIV/AIDS, increasing environmental sustainability, and forging international partnerships (United Nations, 2003). Only recently has there been critical attention to the SDP movement by scholars in the field of sociology of sport (see Black, 2010; Darnell, 2007, 2012; Giulianotti, 2004; Guest, 2009). These scholars have critiqued SDP for being (neo)colonial in nature and/or for privileging interests of transnational corporations over interests of citizens. These assessments of SDP offered by these scholars are sound in the sense that sport-driven development work is generally initiated and controlled by groups based in the Global North for those in the Global South, often resulting in unequal power relationships and a prioritization of Western values in sport-related development programs. Despite these advances in critical research little is known about how and why multinational sporting organizations, such as the ICC and MCC, are choosing to create and support SDP programs globally and research that includes the first-hand perspectives of decision-makers is essentially non-existent.

More specifically, cricket is an interesting case study because of the role it played in British colonization (and local resistance to colonization) and the ways in which it is being used as a development tool in contemporary society. Cricket, as a British colonial export, was historically used in development. Particularly, cricket was actively exported to various
British Imperial outposts as a way to ‘civilize’ the local populations and strengthen bonds between the colonized and the ‘Mother Country’ (Malcolm, 2001). Playing cricket was embedded with ideologies about ‘rationality’, ‘muscular Christianity’, and ‘racial superiority’ as it was often thought that the colonized were not intelligent or advanced enough to be able to learn to play the ‘quintessentially English’ game (Malcolm, 2013). When individuals in the colonies were able to effectively play the game it became a symbol of inclusion into the British Empire and loyalty to the crown (Malcolm, 2013; Stoddart & Sandiford, 1998). In some cases cricket was taken up by local groups and used as a form of resistance to British colonialism. For example, in Beyond a Boundary, C.L.R. James argues that issues of race, class and politics were often dramatized through cricket matches between the British and West Indians during colonial rule and that cricket played an essential role in constructing West Indian identity in postcolonial struggles (James, 1963; Stoddart, 2004). Carrington (2002), in an analysis of the Caribbean Cricket Club in England, notes that cricket can provide a mode through which there can be black cultural resistance to racism.

Currently the ICC has a mandate to increase cricket participation globally by 1.5 million people. One way they are attempting to achieve this goal is by sponsoring various cricket-focused development programs (International Cricket Council, 2013a). For example, in 2009 the ICC adopted the popular United Nations rhetoric of the power and potential of sport to encourage positive social change by spearheading their ‘Think Wise’ campaign. Through the Think Wise Campaign, the ICC partnered with UNAIDS, UNICEF, and the Global Media AIDS initiative to “use the power of cricket to help tackle key issues around AIDS” (International Cricket Council, 2013b). Through the Think Wise campaign, the ICC is
supporting development programs in multiple locations in Sub-Saharan Africa that link the
sport to messages about HIV/AIDS prevention. Outside of the Think Wise campaign, the ICC
is supporting initiatives in Europe that use cricket to target at-risk youth and provide
mentorship opportunities for future employment. Additionally, the MCC is attempting to
mobilize the sport for more than just positive social change as they are also seeking capital
accumulation by supporting a proposal to build 12 branded communities – each of these
organized around a cricket club – in India.

Based on the growing popularity of sport-focused development programs generally,
and cricket-focused development programs specifically, this study is both timely and
relevant. What follows are the contributions this study will make to existing literature and the
potential social significance of this research project.

First, this study bridges literatures on developmentalism, SDP, cricket and
globalization, and sport/leisure and urban (re)development. As I will show, these bodies of
literature can both inform this study and can be informed by this study. The literature on
developmentalism focuses on global development practices, yet largely ignores the role that
sport plays in international development; the literature on SDP is concentrated around the
implications of these initiatives, yet says little about how decisions are made at the top levels
of multinational sporting organizations to create and engage in development work; the
literature on cricket and globalization primarily examines international cricket competitions
and professional cricket leagues, but limited work investigates grassroots cricket movements;
and the literature on sport and urban (re)development focuses on how sport is used by
transnational corporations to reimagine space, while saying little about how these
reimaginations are connected and related to global SDP initiatives. The literature on postcolonial theory – which also informs this study – centres on how societies are continually impacted by (neo)colonial processes, but includes few studies that explore the particular ways that sport and physical culture contributes to the (re)colonization of various societies.

Beyond articulating different groups of literature, this study makes specific contributions to the literature on SDP. While there is a growing body of research on the SDP movement, the majority of this work examines the monitoring and evaluation of individual cases, issues with program delivery, and potential implications for recipient communities. To date, there has been little research on how decisions are made at the highest institutional levels to engage in development-related work and how these decision-makers perceive development-related issues. Indeed, work that has tried to address this gap is largely speculative as it relies on discourse analysis of program documents or press releases.

Additionally, this study fills a gap in the literature on cricket in society and SDP. I make this claim because sport scholars that focus on cricket have, to date, said little about how cricket is being used to promote various forms of development. Additionally, sport scholars that focus on SDP have directed attention to soccer, basketball, and martial arts-focused development programs, but have little to say about cricket in this context. As cricket is being employed as a development tool in multiple locations around the globe – and in light of the sport’s historical and contemporary links with colonization practices – it is essential to direct attention to this sport and the role it is playing in the SDP movement.
Postcolonial Theoretical Approach

Postcolonialism is a useful theoretical framework for this study because the perspective is concerned with (among other topics) the politics, culture, and economies of societies that are living with the legacies and aftermath of colonialism; the ongoing impacts of neoliberal forms of capitalism and development in these societies, and; the lived experiences of individuals in the local contexts where postcolonial forces are especially intense (Hayhurst et al., 2011; Kay, 2011; McEwan, 2001, 2009; Mohanty, 1988, 2003; Nicholls & Giles, 2007). ‘Global sport’ is often considered to be a particular example of neocolonial activity because the power of global sport is located in the Global North and is tied to the opening of new markets outside of the Global North (Maguire, 2006).

Scholars of postcolonialism are especially concerned with ‘development’, as it is part of what postcolonialists see as the “dominant, universalizing, and arrogant discourses of the North” (McEwan, 2009, p. 27). It is essential to note that Western-imposed development practices originated with modern colonization and globalization (Loomba, 2005). As McEwan (2009) notes:

By creating linkages with distant parts of the world, European imperialism and colonialism provided the basis for globalization in the twentieth century. It also established enduring power inequalities between North and South that have continued despite independence, limiting the autonomy of former colonies to determine their own futures and paths to development. Indeed, many critics would argue that the power of Europe and the US to intervene in the affairs of other countries in the name of development is ‘neocolonialism’, or the continued dominance of the North. (p. 88)
Given that colonial legacies paved the way for modern globalization, many postcolonial theorists have critiqued development in multiple ways. For example, the space and place of development is a usual topic of concern (McEwan, 2001, 2009), as the Global North is seen as the originator of development ideas and policies that people and societies in the Global South should be recipients of (Parpart, 2002; Smith, 1999). Additionally, a postcolonial perspective challenges and investigates how images of the North and South are formed through the mass media, and how understandings of the culture and politics of people and nations in different parts of the world are shaped, and how particular stereotypes tend to be reinforced (McEwan, 2009). These images are key to the formation of ‘imagined geographies’ of other societies. The problem here, among others, is that the specific vocabulary and imagery about people and places is thought to ‘become reality’ for individuals located in the Global North especially (McEwan, 2009; Said, 1978).

Development discourse, dominated by the ‘West’ and lacking the complexity and nuance required to speak about large and diverse populations, has often represented those in the South as lacking in comparison to the Northern counterparts (McEwan, 2001, 2009). Put another way, many postcolonial scholars challenge how Euro/Western-centric dominance has created particular imagined geographies that place the North at the highest stage of civilization and progress, and thus the standard of development (McEwan, 2009). Through all this, postcolonial studies seek to direct attention to and create spaces for voices of those traditionally excluded, marginalized, or silenced by development agendas and projects (Mohanty, 1988).
Given the colonial history of cricket and the development work that is currently being supported by the ICC and MCC, postcolonial theory is a useful theoretical approach to guide this study. It is useful because it will inform an analysis of power dynamics between the ICC and the MCC and the target recipients by helping to: destabilize ethnocentric discourses; disrupt the understanding that the power to know and define is produced by the ‘North’; critique language that subjugates those in the South; and recovers the voices that were silenced by colonialism (McEwan, 2009; Smith, 1999).

**Developmentalism**

There is a significant body of work that focuses on the history of and trends in international development. Scholars in this field examine how the ‘Third World’ was produced by discourses and practices of development that were initiated in the post World War II era (Escobar, 1995; Schuurman, 2001; Sylvester, 1999; Tomlinson, 2001; Tucker 1999). As Schuurman (2001) notes, the ‘developmentalism’ paradigm (characterized by an unconditional belief in the concept of progress and modernization, the essentialization of the ‘Third World’ as homogenous, and the importance of the nation state and its role in realizing progress) can be traced back to United States President, Harry Truman’s famous 1949 inaugural address. In his speech, he urged economically-advanced countries to help create more opportunities for industrialization and material production in the world’s poorest countries (Escobar, 1995). Authors such as Escobar (1995) critique this famous address by noting that it marked a significant shift in thinking about ‘development’ and sparked creation of the idea of the ‘Third World’ as poor, traditional, backward and in need of the modernity
that defined the West. Indeed, scholars in the field contend that the ‘Third World’ was created economically, culturally, and politically by governmental, academic, and international institutions in the 1950s through a global development agenda that was characterized by ethnocentric norms of rationality, economic growth, and techno-scientific truth (Sylvester, 1999; Tucker, 1999).

Nineteen-fifties developmentalism served to increase the divide between those considered ‘developed’ and ‘underdeveloped’, which gave way to a new conceptualization of development from the 1970s onwards. This new wave of development recognized the growing gap between those in the Global North and the Global South, yet reinforced the belief of the ‘Third World’ as inferior (Escobar, 1995). Development then became characterized by neoliberal ideologies and multi-national free trade agreements (Escobar, 1995; Sylvester, 1999). Neoliberalism in this context is associated with an emphasis on individual freedom and responsibility, a capitalist orientation of the market, an increasing role of the private sector combined with limited involvement of government in regulation of the marketplace, and dismantling of social welfare systems (Miller et al., 1999). International institutions such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund encouraged this new wave of development and placed requirements of neoliberal economic reform – which would privilege free market capitalism, corporatization, and privatization – on societies seeking loans (Escobar, 1995; Sylvester, 1999; Tucker, 1999). As Sylvester (1999) notes, these conditions did not alleviate poverty as intended, but instead tied developing economies to those of the developed economies, which further exacerbated the division of wealth between societies. This literature that traces the evolution and effects of development practices
provides essential context for analyzing the work that the ICC and MCC is doing within the SDP movement.

Sport for Development and Peace (SDP)

The literature on SDP can be divided into three distinct yet interrelated themes: the pros and possibilities of utilizing sport as a development tool; the challenges in delivering SDP programs due to tensions between funders and implementers, and; critiques of the movement as being (neo)colonial in nature.

The literature that offers cautious support of SDP programs is based on the underlying idea that by its very nature, sport requires cooperation, which thereby fosters problem-solving and communication (Armstrong, 2004; Beutler, 2008; Brady & Khan, 2002; Gasser & Levinsen, 2004; Kidd, 2008; Munro, 2009; Sugden, 2008; 2010; Willis, 2000). Building on this, it has been said that, “Sport, as an international language can build bridges between people, help overcome cultural differences and spread an atmosphere of tolerance” (Beutler, 2008, p. 359). Scholars have discussed how this rhetoric has been recognized by the United Nations (sparking the formation of a dedicated international working group on sport for development and peace) as a way to help achieve the 2003 Millennium Development Goals, which led to the creation of thousands of international, national, and local programs worldwide (Beutler, 2008; Coalter, 2007).

Recognizing the momentum that sport in international development has been gaining, many sport scholars have highlighted what they see as successful case studies. For example, multiple case studies have garnered support for the Mathare Youth Sports Association
(MYSA) which is an organization based in Kenya that has programs that utilize soccer to address gender imbalances and to community development and HIV/AIDS prevention. Scholars investigating MYSA have argued that the use of their soccer-based development programs have worked to help foster community development, empower youth, challenge gender norms, and tackle health threats (Brady & Khan, 2002; Munro, 2009; Willis, 2000). Additionally, Gasser and Levinsen (2004) have highlighted how Open Fun Football Schools have been successful in reintegrating post-war communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Similarly, Armstrong (2004) notes that soccer-focused development programs in Liberia helped to provide tangible access to health and (micro)economic opportunities for impoverished citizens.

While many of these scholars cautiously support the success of SDP programs in achieving development initiatives, some have commented on the tensions that arise within and between the different levels of administration. For example, Hayhurst and Frisby (2010) note that SDP NGOs often partner with high performance sporting organizations. These partnerships arise out of a dire need for funding, and in many cases to recognize the legitimacy of sport for development programs (Hayhurst & Frisby, 2010). In some cases, these partnerships have resulted in the NGO being seen as a feeder system for the high performance counterpart that is concerned with sport development not development-through-sport. For this reason, NGOs commonly have to reorganize their goals to meet the requirements of the high performance organizations (Hayhurst & Frisby, 2010). Similarly, Giulianotti (2011) found that SDP officials recognized the benefits of partnering with non-sport NGOs (e.g., UNICEF, the World Health Organization) and their respective donors as it
provided more sustainability for programs, but also led to “uneven ideological, financial, and political consequences” as there was a lack of trust within organizations regarding the allocation of financial resources (Giulianotti, 2011, p. 65).

There is also a growing body of literature that critiques those carrying out international SDP-related work for being neo-colonial in nature and imposing Western middle-class views on target communities. Some fear that the neocolonialist nature of sport development projects has led to the displacement of traditional sports in developing nations (Coalter, 2007). In his investigation of SDP, Giulianotti (2004) raised questions about whether or not there is sufficient dialogue between donors and recipients, how (or if) the recipients are empowered to govern these initiatives, and how power imbalances between donors and recipients influence cooperation between both groups. Indeed, the assimilation and imposition of Western values combined with power imbalances and lack of cultural sensitivity may result in these development projects leading to (like other development projects in the past) the ‘creative destruction’ of local community culture (Black, 2010).

Along these lines, Darnell (2007, 2012) and Guest (2009) found that Whiteness is privileged through SDP interventions and that leaders of these programs position themselves as the generous, benevolent providers, compared to recipients that are reduced to de-political and automatically grateful participants. Darnell (2007), for example, notes that “the result is the construction of northern, white subjects that possess knowledge and bodies of color that have the potential to know” (p. 569). The critique of SDP as positioning the Global North as the provider of development is something that must be addressed. As Black (2010) underscores:
…development is ubiquitous – a process that unfolds in the global ‘North’ as well as the global ‘South’, albeit with different levels of intensity and stakes. Those of us in the global North who study and work on development should be mindful, therefore, of the need to critically re-examine our own development experiences, as well as our complicity (whether directly or indirectly) in conditions of polarization and poverty in the South. (p. 124).

As the programs the ICC and MCC is supporting fit under the umbrella of SDP, this literature, and the studies highlighted within it, provide important reference points for this thesis study. Because the development programs supported by the ICC and MCC are likely made up of a variety of public/private partnerships (such as the proposal to build privatized cricket-focused communities in India), this study can also be informed by research on the role sport plays in urban redevelopment.

**Sport/Leisure and Urban (Re)development**

Many scholars are examining how public-private amalgamations are increasingly influencing the governance of cities in the name of urban regeneration (Raco & Tunney, 2010; Silk, 2007). Organizations are doing this by reorienting city spaces around consumption (through shopping malls, themed restaurants, gentrified housing), (re)developing certain city areas in the process of preparing for various mega events (such as the Olympics), or physically building entire isolated, branded, city spaces (such as Disney Corporation’s Celebration, Florida) (Bartling, 2006; Silk 2004, 2007; Silk & Amis, 2005; Silk & Andrews, 2008; Raco & Tunney, 2010; Sze, 2009). Scholars such as Sze (2009), Silk and Andrews (2008), and Raco and Tunney (2010) have described how various city spaces are being reconstituted into environments that are designed for conspicuous consumption and
capital accumulation as the role of the private sector increases in decision-making processes. As private organizations have more control over the design of city spaces, and therefore who is welcome within it and what it can be used for, Silk (2004) urges us to remember that space is a site of social struggle where dominant power relations are constructed and reproduced (Silk, 2004; Sze, 2009).

In particular, Silk (2004) uses the term ‘urban imagineering’ to describe the adoption of an entrepreneurial stance in urban redevelopment to attract capital and refurbish the built environment and spaces within it, around a particular identity and ideology (Silk, 2004). Using Silk’s concept of urban imagineering, Raco & Tunney (2010) found that the development agendas of organizations in charge of regeneration in preparation for the Olympic Games often reflect dominant imaginations of how cities should function and how they should appear (Raco & Tunney, 2010). Specifically, the organizers and developers for the London 2012 Olympics problematized East London as unsightly, unproductive, and old-fashioned (despite the many productive small firms that worked in the area) and looked to (re)develop the space into something interpreted by the organizers as something attractive (particularly to an international audience) (Raco & Tunney, 2010). The end result was the removal of over 200 small businesses from the site to make way for a more visually pleasing and sanitized ‘Legacy Park’ (Raco & Tunney, 2010). This is similar to other contexts where the gentrification of urban environments and associated development of professional sports stadia have taken place (Bartling, 2006; Silk & Amis, 2005; Sze, 2009).

In the creation of and management of such spaces, selective ideologies, histories, and narratives are mobilized to produce particular meanings of space that are highly manipulated
and exploited by both public and private actors in institutionalized contexts (Silk, 2004, 2007; Sze, 2009). These meanings then become abstracted from local cultures – and thus mask the complexities and contradictions of everyday life (e.g., the exacerbation of inequalities through development practices) as they become translated into marketable cultural meanings (Silk & Amis, 2005).

With particular visions of city space, history, heritage, and ideology deployed, Silk (2007) asks questions about exactly whose ideologies/histories/visions are privileged and preserved and whose are destructed and excluded? For example, when discussing the rebranding of downtown Memphis an ultimate spectacularized leisure and entertainment centre, Silk (2007) notes:

The frozen interiors of the civil rights museum…the thematized Beale Street … and the emergence of post-nostalgic, transient and depthless forms of entertainment, elide material differences in symbolic novelties. This simultaneously operates to detach histories and traditions from their roots that obscure the very real structural derivations and inequalities that continue to inform relations between dominant and minority cultures. History endures then, but in a neatly designed, decorative, commercial and manufactured form…within the rather shallow packaging of Memphis as a tourist/leisure destination. History is excavated and some degree rendered for consumption, but only those histories selected to serve capital accumulation. (p. 269)

Therefore, it is essential to address and problematize who ‘we’ refers to and not assume ‘we’ is self-evident (Sze, 2009).

Because the work that the ICC is supporting is focused on using cricket as a tool for grassroots and social development as well as using cricket to reimagine city space in India, this literature is pertinent to this study.
Cricket and Globalization

There is a tradition of research by scholars like Malcolm (2013) and Stoddart and Sandiford (1998) that focuses on the historical evolution of the game of cricket, how the game has been taken up in various societies, and how the sport and its significance changes within the contemporary landscape of globalization. The literature can be divided roughly into three sub themes: loss of British influence and control over the sport; conflicts and contestations over the power structures embedded within the international cricket system; and the relationship between the sport, English nationalism, and the ‘Other’.

As previously mentioned, cricket is historically understood as the “quintessentially English” game (Stoddart & Sandiford, 1998). While historically constructed and interpreted as a sport that is distinctly English in nature, scholars are commenting on how power that had been firmly cemented within English institutions to administer the sport may be shifting. As decolonization began to occur, and the sport began gaining popularity in other parts of the world, the ‘Englishness’ of the game has been destabilized (Malcolm et al., 2009; Malcolm, 2013). For example, the Imperial Cricket Conference was renamed the International Cricket Council (to reflect the decolonization of various locations) in 1965, England and Australia lost veto power in the International Cricket Council in 1993, and the International Cricket Council was moved out of Lord’s Cricket Ground in England to what was interpreted as a more ‘neutral’ location in Dubai in 2005 (Malcolm, 2013).

Overlapping with a formalized decentralization of power in the governing spaces of international cricket is what has been called the “Indianization” of the sport. Indeed, Ashes Nandy (1989) has gone so far as to suggest that “Cricket is an Indian game accidentally
discovered by the English” (p. 1). Gupta (2009) and Mehta et al. (2009) have both used the establishment of the Indian Premier League (a professional, commercialized cricket league in India) to illustrate how the popularity of cricket combined with the economic might of India has destabilized the power centre of the sport. The Indian Premier League offers salaries that are so lucrative that many of the top players from the West Indies, New Zealand, Australia, and Pakistan are trying to manage schedules so that they can play both at home and in the professional league. In some cases these players are attempting to pressure their national cricket organizations to make concessions in order to allow them to play in the Indian Premier League, or are fighting bans imposed by their home teams that bar them from playing in the Indian Premier League (Mehta et al., 2009). It has been suggested that the Indian Premier League offers a significant example of this power shift as many national teams are in a position where making concessions for players offered contracts (or altering the international test match scheduling completely) is the only way to avoid losing their top players (Gupta, 2009; Mehta et al., 2009).

Many authors assert that India is both the cultural and economic centre of the sport (Gupta, 2009; Mehta et al., 2009; Malcolm 2009, 2013; Sen, 2001). India represents 80% of the ICC income, and in recent years has used its financial power to ensure that more test matches occur in Asia, and that the 2011 World Cup be held in India (Mehta et al., 2009). Scholars in this field suggest that these shifts in power are highly contested. For example, Mehta et al. (2009) describes how in 2008 an Australian player accused an Indian player of uttering a racial slur against him during an international test match. With questionable evidence available, the ICC deemed the Indian player to be guilty (Mehta et al., 2009). If the
charges were not dropped, the Indian team threatened to withdraw from the remaining tour through Australia, which would have resulted with a $60 million lawsuit against the Australian Cricket Council over lost television rights. The Australian team dropped the case, but this resulted in a row that split the cricket world along the lines of the ‘Asians’ versus the ‘Rest’ (Mehta et al., 2009). Mehta et al., (2009) suggests that the debates that are happening currently within cricket reflect anxieties of the colonial past, postcolonial assertions and the profound changes afflicted by economic forms of globalization and related neocolonial forms of development.

As part of a quintessential English identity, cricket has been used as way of privileging British superiority while painting the ‘Other’ as lacking and inferior in comparison. Historically, this was the case throughout the British colonies, as local individuals were not initially seen as being intelligent or civilized enough to learn or play the sport of cricket (Malcolm, 2001, 2009, 2013). However, contemporary research on international cricket reveals that this still pervades discourses about the sport. For example, Sen (2001) discusses how a South African player was found guilty of match fixing with an Indian bookmaker. In the discourses that followed, media outlets and individuals from South Africa, Australia, and England were in denial as such “heroic, patriotic, Christian athletes… could never be guilty” (p. 238). Indeed, “...Indian investigators were incompetent and malicious” and the athletes were corrupted by the “innate immorality of the subcontinent” (p. 238-239). Similarly, Malcolm (2013) discusses the murder scandal of Bob Woolmer, the British coach of the Pakistan national team at the Cricket World Cup in Jamaica in 2007. His analysis of the media reporting following the murder revealed the underlying assumptions
about Western and English superiority (Malcolm, 2013). While the murder was never solved, Malcolm (2013) summarizes the media discourse by saying:

If Woolmer was murdered by bookmakers, it was because the (Pan-Asian) bookmakers are more deviant, corrupt, evil and violent… and they have terrorist links. If Woolmer was murdered by a cricket fan, it was because Pakistanis have an irrational attachment to their national cricket team and a propensity towards violence. If Woolmer was murdered by a Pakistan player, or indeed ‘Muslim radicals’, it stemmed from a devotion to Islam which illustrates the essential incompatibility of Eastern and Western cultures…. [If] Woolmer died during an attempted burglary, [it] evokes different, but similarly negative stereotypes about Caribbean society. (p. 155)

Reflections

Research on SDP, has, to date, focused largely on evaluation of particular SDP programmes, issues with program delivery, and potential implications for recipient communities – with many of these studies assessing programs that use soccer as a development tool. Currently, there is little research that examines how cricket is being used in international development and with what effects (see Bateman & Binns, 2014). It remains unclear whether there are similar or different practices and implications of using cricket as a development tool compared with soccer or other sports, and how these practices and implications might be different in different parts of the world. Moreover, the unique history and values attached to cricket have not been critically examined in the context of international development. This study provides is an opportunity to learn more about the ways in which cricket is being used in international development, for what reasons, and for whom.
It is also noteworthy that few studies on SDP offer any comment on how decisions are made at the highest institutional levels to engage in development-related work or how individuals who make these decisions perceive development-related issues. This is a key gap in the literature that this study is to address. The overarching goal here is to pursue a better understanding of how and why sport is being used in international development – a pursuit that would be aided by engaging those whose decisions are arguably most influential: executives of multinational sporting organizations. It is these individuals who decide what programs to fund, how much support to give them, and what programs are organizationally and socially important.
Chapter 3: Methods

In this section I outline the strategies I used to learn more about decision-making by high-level executives in international cricket and about cricket-related development projects. I begin by offering background information on my study sample and circumstances surrounding my data collection.

Data Collection

Sample and recruitment

Between September 29 and November 28, 2013 I travelled to England on a research exchange to the University of Bath. While there, I conducted the formal interviews for my thesis. Nine semi-structured interviews were conducted with key executives in the ICC and MCC. The interviews were conducted between October 9, 2013 and November 13, 2013 in the interviewees personal offices located at Lords Cricket Ground in London, England or in locations in and around the 2013 ICC Europe Conference that took place in Bologna, Italy between October 26 and October 28, 2013.

Individuals in the ICC and MCC were recruited for this study through a personal contact that had a working relationship with an ICC Top-Level Executive. The personal contact was asked if he was open to being contacted by me about participating in my study. This ICC executive was interested in speaking with me and we arranged an informal conversation over Skype in March of 2013. After speaking with him about my interests and the development work that is being supported by the ICC, this executive put me in touch via email with another ICC Top-level Executive and an MCC Executive. Thus, this ICC
executive became a ‘gatekeeper’. Once in England, this individual invited me to attend the ICC Europe Conference that was held in Bologna, Italy in October, 2013. This conference was attended by representatives from 27 of the 32 member countries from ICC Europe as well as ICC Top-Level Executives and ICC Middle-Level Executives who oversee country representatives. While at the conference, I conducted 4 interviews with individuals who represent different countries for the ICC, as well as an interview with an ICC Top-Level Executive.

This sample is purposive (Bryman, 2012), which is to say, individuals who were well-positioned to speak to the main topics of the study were targeted for interviews (Bryman, 2012). In this case, executives of the ICC with knowledge of development-related work being conducted and planned within and around the ICC were targeted. Additionally, because I worked through a personal contact, this sample represents a convenience sample (Bryman, 2012). This personal contact (or ‘gatekeeper’) was available by chance, and had some influence over my access to interviewees.

In particular, individuals were selected because of their ‘elite’ status. Elites are a relatively small, but powerful group that are recognized for the influence that they may hold, talent they possess, or exclusive privileges they are afforded (Delaney, 2007; Rice, 2010; Welch et al., 2002). While elites tend to be visible inside and outside the organizations they are affiliated with, they are often understudied because of their power and ability to protect themselves from intrusion and/or criticism (Mikecz, 2012; Welch et al., 2002). While a sample of elites may often be small, Delaney (2007) argues that studying elites is a unique opportunity to understand the worldviews of those who have significant influence on key
decisions with often notable societal impacts. Thus, the individuals were selected based on
the insider knowledge they possess on the development-related decisions that their
organizations made, the strategies they use to garner support for these projects, and the
perspectives they have on development-related issues.

**Interviews**

Table 1.0 below lists information about the interviews. As noted earlier, 9 interviews
were completed for this study. Seven individuals were interviewed who had positions within
the ICC and 1 individual was interviewed from the MCC. A follow-up interview was
conducted with the MCC Executive as well. I chose to interview 7 individuals from the ICC
for a few reasons. First, these individuals held diverse roles within the ICC (from country
representative, mid-level executive, to top-level executive). In this way, I was able to find out
about the perspectives of those who held a variety of positions within this organization.
Through interviewing these individuals, I still was able to obtain perspectives that oftentimes
confirmed one another to some degree.

Additionally, individuals in the ICC were quite open to having discussions with me
about their development-related decisions and practices. This openness came particularly
from one of the ICC Top-Level Executives – the gatekeeper for me in this study. He was very
enthusiastic about participating in the study and facilitated interviews with other individuals
that he thought might be helpful for me. It is important to note that he did not ‘select’
particular individuals for me to interview, but rather suggested and/or pointed out people that
might have the knowledge that I was specifically seeking. For example, while at the ICC
Europe Conference he pointed out representatives from various countries that were implementing cricket-for-development programs. Ultimately, the interviews conducted with the ICC reflect the availability of individuals from this organization.

Table 1.0: Interview Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Informant’s Position</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 9, 2013</td>
<td>Lords Cricket Ground</td>
<td>MCC Executive</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16, 2013</td>
<td>Lords Cricket Ground</td>
<td>ICC Top-Level Executive</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26, 2013</td>
<td>Conference Hotel – Bologna, Italy</td>
<td>ICC Country Representative</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26, 2013</td>
<td>Conference Hotel – Bologna, Italy</td>
<td>ICC Country Representative</td>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 2013</td>
<td>Cricket Ground, Bologna, Italy</td>
<td>ICC Top-Level Executive</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 2013</td>
<td>Cricket Ground, Bologna, Italy</td>
<td>ICC Country Representative</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2013</td>
<td>Conference Hotel: Bologna, Italy</td>
<td>ICC Country Representative</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2013</td>
<td>Lords Cricket Ground</td>
<td>ICC Middle-Level Executive</td>
<td>Jed</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2013</td>
<td>Lords Cricket Ground</td>
<td>ICC Middle-Level Executive</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I acknowledge that there is a significant difference in the sample size between those I interviewed from the ICC and the MCC. I interviewed one individual from the MCC. He was also the only executive that I conducted a second interview with and the only person available to me from the MCC for this study. The MCC was not as open as the ICC about participating in this study and when I asked the MCC Executive if he could put me in touch with others for this study he said quite simply that ‘it was highly unlikely that anyone else would be willing to talk with me’. This could partly be because the MCC is a relatively small (but still globally influential), private, for-profit, highly exclusive members club. This is distinct from the ICC, which is the global, non-profit, governing body of the sport.

However, and as will become clearer in my results and discussion, the ICC and the MCC are inextricably linked in many ways. This is especially reflected in the fact that the MCC continues to be the safe-keepers (and owners) of the international cricket ‘laws’ that the ICC institutes and abides by, and that many members of the MCC and ICC sit on one another’s governing committees. Because interviews were focused around the types of development work being conducted and how decisions were made about development initiatives, I see the MCC Executive as another perspective on the global international development work that is being done by the two most prominent cricketing organizations. While this sample does not reflect all decision-makers in this context, those I did interview were well-positioned informants and the interviews were designed to be in-depth. These individuals are working in different geographic regions and are involved in development
work that is taking place in different locations around the globe, which further ensures that I engaged in discussions with knowledgeable individuals across different developmental roles in the ICC and MCC.

The interviews were semi-structured in nature. Semi-structured interviews were used because this strategy ensures that there are systematic and consistent questions that attend to the research questions across each interview (Bryman, 2012). While ensuring consistency, this interview technique offers flexibility for a researcher interested in pursuing lines of inquiry that may emerge serendipitously (Bryman, 2012). These interviews focused on how decisions to support development work were made, the perceptions the interviewees have about the notion of development and development-related issues, and how development-related goals and issues are portrayed to stakeholders.

The interview questions are located in Appendix A1 (ICC) and A2 (MCC). The interviews lasted between 35 minutes and 2 hours. All participants were asked for written consent to the interview and were presented a sheet indicating their rights in accordance with the University of British Columbia ethical research guidelines.

All interviews followed a consistent structure with similar questions being asked of each participant. At the beginning of the interview I asked each participant to say a little bit about themselves and their role in their organization. After getting this background information, I then probed about the development-related work that their organizations are involved in. Once the respondents provided background on the different types of development programs that the ICC and/or the MCC are engaged with, discussions shifted to how decisions were made to start these programs, if there were any debates or disagreements
about creating these initiatives, how they are related to organizational mandates, and how
these programs are promoted in different contexts. Following this, I asked interviewees to
speak to assessments of these initiatives (i.e. how they know these programs are working/not
working) and any challenges they are having with implementing these programs and/or
evaluating them. Through asking these questions I looked to gain an understanding about
how development-related decisions were made, how different perspectives were taken into
account, and how these organizations assess the impact of these programs in their
organizations.

At the end of the interview I outlined some debates among academics studying the
role of sport and international development and asked the participants to respond to these
debates. Specifically, I highlighted that some argue that these programs are leading to
measurable social change in a variety of contexts, where others do not necessarily think that
these programs are beneficial because sport can be as divisive as it is inclusive and that these
programs are, at times, implemented without significant involvement of local groups. The
hope was to open up an opportunity for dialogue about when these sorts of programs might
be a good idea and when they may not be – and to get a sense of the personal perspectives of
interviewees on those topics.

Data Analysis

Each interview was digitally transcribed and recorded verbatim. Each interview was
coded by studying the transcripts and grouping sections of the interview into themes and
subthemes that emerged. In conducting the analysis, I was particularly attentive to how these
decisions are negotiated within and constrained by tensions, conflicts, and contradictions in the institutions and the socio-political context (Neuman, 2003). I paid particular attention to how language was used within the interviews and with what effects, focusing on which narratives of development are privileged and which are excluded.

By using my research questions as a guide, I developed 3 major themes that emerged through repeated readings of interview transcripts. These themes were: 1) how decisions were made; 2) understandings of development; and 3) portrayals of development to stakeholders. Eventually codes were developed under each theme. For example, under ‘how decisions were made’, codes such as ‘organizational mandates’, ‘hierarchical manner’, and ‘rationalization’ were created. For each interview, I used the same three themes to guide my analysis.

My analysis was informed by the work of researchers who use a ‘contextual cultural studies’ approach to data collection and analysis. A key concept for researchers using this approach is ‘articulation’. Articulation is both a theory and a methodological practice – and is described as a way of contextualizing the object of one’s analysis (Slack, 1996). This does not mean that context is something that exists out there and something that shapes practices (Slack, 1996). Rather, articulation within a contextual cultural studies framework suggests that “identities, practices, and effects generally, constitute the very contexts within which they are practices, identities or effects” (Slack, 1996, p. 125).

Therefore, I looked to articulate (i.e., combine and connect) my data as a way of making sense of what sport for development-related decisions are made, how they are made, and what effects these decisions have — with particular attention to links between these
decisions and the contexts that these decisions are impacted by and themselves impact. As Grossberg (1992) describes: “Articulation links this practice to that effect, this text to that meaning, this meaning to that reality, this experience to those politics. And these links are themselves articulated into larger structures” (p. 54). Therefore, for this study I used my data to link the practices of development to the effects that they may have. The perspectives of the decision-makers are linked to one another and to the planned and ongoing development practices. These practices are then linked to the broader politics and structures that allow these decisions to be made in this particular period of time.

**Ethical Considerations**

The Behavioural Research Ethics Board at the University of British Columbia approved this study. All interviewees were informed of the study’s objectives and gave informed consent prior to participating in the study. It was emphasized that participation in the study was completely voluntary and that each participant is able to refuse to partake in any part of the study and/or withdraw at any time, without penalty. All data were stored on a password protected computer and/or a locked filing cabinet. A summary report will be made available to study participants once this thesis is defended.

All participants are anonymous in this study and are only identified by broad organizational titles (i.e. ICC Middle-Level Executive) that do not give away their specific identity. For clarity in the reporting of the results, pseudonyms are used to differentiate these individuals.
Background on Programs Investigated in this Study

The executives interviewed in this study discuss a wide array of cricket-for-development programs that the ICC and MCC are involved in. Four main SDP programs/initiatives promoted and implemented by the ICC and MCC are foregrounded in this study: the ICC Europe Street20 program, the MCC ‘outreach’ work conducted in Sri Lanka and Afghanistan, the partnership between the MCC and an international real estate investment company to build branded cricket-focused communities across India, and ICC global SDP ventures characterized by the Think Wise campaign. These are briefly contextualized here.

In 2013, ICC Europe partnered with NGO Cricket for Change to implement the Street20 program starting in 6 countries across Europe (France, Netherlands, Spain, Finland, Greece, and Germany). Cricket for Change was established in 1981 following the Brixton Riots and employs cricket as a development tool to help provide employment for at-risk youth, promote social integration in favelas and inner cities, and integrate refugees into society through playing cricket (Cricket for Change, 2014a). The goals of the Street20 Program are to increase cricket participation around the continent of Europe, and improve gender equity and social integration in disadvantaged communities (Cricket for Change, 2014b; International Cricket Council, 2014a). The Street20 program uses a simplified version of the sport that can be played with minimal equipment, using limited balls bowled in order to make it fast-paced (games often lasting less than an hour compared to ‘traditional’ cricket of up to 5 days) in order to make it more accessible for groups that have not been exposed to the sport before.
The MCC, through their charitable arm the Foundation for Goodness, uses cricket to support development in slightly different ways in Sri Lanka and Afghanistan. Following the tsunami that hit Sri Lanka in 2004, the MCC helped create a cricket centre called the MCC Centre of Excellence in Seenigama in 2007. The Centre of Excellence has been used to provide rural youth with employment, sport, and educational opportunities in an area devastated by the tsunami, and acts as a centre to cultivate local cricket talent (Marylebone Cricket Club, 2014b). In Afghanistan, the MCC attempt to employ cricket to foster peace in war-torn areas, and promote a positive legacy from the United Kingdom intervention in Afghanistan (Marylebone Cricket Club, 2014a).

In 2011 the MCC entered a partnership with an international real estate investment company named Anglo Indian. Anglo Indian is a privately-owned, British-based corporation. Anglo Indian was founded in 2005 and aims to bring leading international brands in the sport and lifestyle sectors into India (Anglo Indian, 2013). The goal of this partnership is to build twelve MCC/Lord’s branded communities throughout India. These communities will feature a Lord’s cricket ground, MCC exclusive members club and associated recreational facilities, an MCC cricket academy, a Lord’s tavern-themed restaurant, and merchandise outlets, among other things.

Globally, the ICC created the Think Wise campaign. In 2009 the ICC embarked on their Think Wise campaign, partnering with UNAIDS, UNICEF, and the Global Media AIDS initiative to use cricket to help combat key issues around HIV and AIDS (International Cricket Council, 2013b). Through the Think Wise campaign, the ICC is supporting
development programs in multiple locations – focusing particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa that link the sport to messages about HIV/AIDS prevention.
Chapter 4: Results

In the following chapter I outline themes that emerged through interviews with key decision-makers in the ICC and MCC. The results are organized according to three of my research questions. Within each section, I focus on different aspects of the interviewees’ decision-making processes as well as perceptions of development-related issues and concerns.

Although I offer more depth and detail pertaining to my results throughout this chapter, I begin by sketching out the ‘storyline’ of this chapter by outlining key findings that emerged from my analysis. The first finding is that a select group of key executives in the ICC and MCC make decisions in a hierarchical manner, and these decisions reflect organizational mandates. The second and related finding is that high-level decision-makers actively justified their top-down decision-making in sometimes contradictory ways (with varying accounts of input from stakeholders). These same decision-makers, at times, discussed strategies they used to generate consent for sometimes controversial decisions.

Interviewees also tended to dismiss common critiques of sport for development – instead emphasizing the need to support and promote sport for development initiatives as a way to achieve broader organizational goals. Exceptions to this finding are notable, however, as two decision-makers with considerable influence over cricket-related development decisions recognized issues and possible limitations in using sport to achieve development goals. Finally, executives from both the ICC and MCC saw supporting development work as beneficial because it would help to change the image of the sport and their respective organizations, yet recognized challenges in implementing these sport for development
programs. Below, I outline evidence supporting these broad claims, and speak to ways that these findings are interrelated and nuanced.

As a final introductory note, it is important to clarify that although the two main organizations that are examined in this thesis (the ICC and MCC) are separate organizations with different organizational mandates and goals, but members of these organizations often made decisions in a similar manner and were similarly strategic when promoting their development work. That is to say, the MCC and ICC both offered various and sometimes contradictory messages about their development work – messages catered to particular target audiences. The following results section is organized so that it reflects these notable similarities and subtle differences. I do this by discussing responses from ICC and MCC members together in sections where these members shared perspectives and experiences – and treating them separately in the few instances where there were notable distinctions.

How Have Decisions Been Made by Executives at the Highest Levels of the ICC and MCC to Engage in Development-Related Work and How do Key Decision-Makers Explain the Decisions They Have Made?

According to interviews with executives at the ICC and MCC, development-related decisions are made that align with organizational mandates within each organization. The primary mandate of the ICC is to increase cricket participation globally while the MCC is mandated to exert influence on the field, off the field, and overseas. Development-related decisions in both the ICC and MCC are made by a small group of individuals in a top-down manner. Executives justified this approach to decision-making by highlighting that forms of consultation with relevant stakeholders did take place, and illustrating that those who were
initially unsupportive of decisions (that were ultimately made in a top-down fashion) often ‘changed their minds’ once the positive results of the decision became evident. Because interviews with executives at both the ICC and MCC revealed that both organizations make decisions according to organizational mandates, in a top-down manner, and that these individuals often justified these sorts of decisions by explaining consultative processes – the ICC and MCC are treated similarly in this section. I discuss each of these findings in more depth below.

1) **Decisions are made according to organizational mandates**

When discussing decisions to engage in development work, all interviewees within the ICC emphasized that all decisions were made according to mandates that exist within the ICC. In particular, the ICC strategy of increasing cricket participation globally by 1 million people by 2015 was discussed as the basis for all development initiatives that the ICC was engaging in. For example, an ICC Top-Level Executive clearly articulated this aim:

> On the one hand, the ICC is about cricket and therefore the number one goal has to be about growing the game. It’s as simple as that...For us...I believe we should only get involved in social development program if there is also a cricket outcome...because I think we need to be focused on that. We could do huge things in the sport for development. There’s much more we could do. But the purpose around our organization is about cricket. That’s got to be at the forefront. The decisions are made when there’s a good lap over in outcomes I think. (Alex, ICC Top-Level Executive)

Another ICC Top-Level Executive echoed these sentiments:

> I would say that cricket is the most important part if I am honest. Cricket is about what we are...our strategy talks about getting 1 million more participants in cricket by 2015. And in the markets that we are working in you cannot do that by going in and saying, ‘well here’s the ground, here’s some nice
grass, here’s some whites, here are some pads, here are some bats let’s get on and play cricket’. These people need to have a clue where your starting point is. (Daniel, ICC Top-Level Executive)

When discussing the Street20 program, this ICC Top-Level Executive noted that although their intent is to drastically increase cricket participation, in order to reach these ‘new markets’ alternative and creative development-focused programs that modify the traditional game into something more accessible is the key. The idea here is that traditional, exclusive, hardball, long-game cricket is less accessible in this regard. Street20 is different from eleven-a-side, traditional cricket, as it is a flexible, adaptable form of the sport that can be played in any environment, uses a soft ball (such as a tennis ball), is fast-paced (with games often lasting from twenty minutes-one hour instead of multi-day), is mixed gender, and is often comprised of teams of six players – although this number is not fixed (to try to ensure all team members are integrated into the game).

What is important here is that this ICC Top-Level Executive links the Street20 program back to the ICC’s foremost goal of increasing participation. When talking about the Street20 program, both ICC Middle-Level Executives stressed that the number one objective is to get more cricketers, and one way of achieving that goal was supporting the Street20 program:

Across Europe our main development focus is around participation. The key focus is getting the involvement and awareness of the sport across Europe and also creating pathways for players to develop. (David, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

Getting more people playing, it’s brilliant for us regionally, I think, we get more people playing, it’s an easy tool for countries to use, so they can see the benefits in a country (Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)
Interviews with representatives from ICC member countries also reflected that this particular mandate drove decision-making. For example, the Street20 program was a way to demonstrate to the ICC that this country is focused on increasing the number of cricket players:

…As long as mankind exists we are going to have babies and babies are going to become kids and kids are going to go through my system. And I am going to get more and more people…it was such an easy sell that we were quite worried that the government would see through it. (Jake, ICC Country Representative)

A different country representative also suggested that these programs also were reflective of the ICC mandate:

Everything that is good for the cricket, we are going to do…. That’s our project, because in the bottom line we need a number of cricketers. (Aaron, ICC Country Representative)

Both of the examples from interviews with these country representatives illustrate that the development programs that are being carried out in these countries are intended to align with the broader ICC mandate. These findings are important because the Street20 program operating in Europe is being promoted as ‘sport for development programs’ – that is, programs that are seeking to achieve outcomes not directly related to cricket. For example, stated goals of these programs include integration within and between communities, English language education, engaging at-risk/disengaged youth and peace promotion. This apparent contradiction between goals and promotional strategies will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter when I examine how these programs are presented to different stakeholders.

For the member of the MCC that I interviewed, development-related decisions were also made according to the broader mandates of, in this case, the MCC organization. The MCC Executive discussed these mandates in detail:
So our mission is to be the finest cricket club in the world working for the good of the game. So from there, there [are] strategic priorities. Exert influence locally and internationally, working for the good of cricket in the UK and abroad – those are sort of top line strategic missions and goals. But from there, when we come to cricket, what you’ll see is to work for the good of cricket in the UK and abroad. MCC will basically do some things on the field, off the field, and overseas… Help develop elite male and female cricketers, encourage participation in the community. Overseas – use its touring program to help ICC spread the development of the game overseas, build on excellent outreach work in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka… we do a lot there… explore the potential for development the game in other parts of the world in conjunction with ICC. (Mike, MCC Executive)

Pursuing this overseas mission to exert influence, the MCC intends to continue its outreach work in Afghanistan, using cricket as a tool for peace – by rebuilding confidence and providing opportunities in post-tsunami Sri Lanka (Marylebone Cricket Club, 2014b).

Additionally, the partnership with Anglo Indian to build MCC branded communities in India represents another outlet to exert its influence internationally:

Because the MCC brand is strong, especially in India. I’ve been in India a lot. And to see the depth of feeling for the club and I just like the fact that there would be some facilities – facilities with MCC on them – around the world. I mean, it’s an amazing brand and it’s not leveraged at all. And I’m not a brand expert, but I know that this club has amazing strength in brand around the world. (Mike, MCC Executive)

The MCC’s work in India is an especially intriguing example of the MCC’s sophisticated strategy for ‘exerting influence’. In this case, the MCC is selling property off the brand’s perceived power while benefitting economically from Indian locals – who are the target audience for this development project (Waldman, 2013).

Interestingly, and as a concluding point here, the MCC Executive I interviewed also noted that the MCC also make development-related decisions with the ICC mandates in mind. As he states:
And we link up closely with the ICC. So when I go to the ICC Development Committee, I always ask them, where do you want us to tour next? Where would we have most effect? (Mike, MCC Executive)

In this way, and although the ICC and MCC do not share mandates, there is a clear relationship between these two international cricket organizations and their development-related goals.

2) Decisions are made by a select group of people in a top-down manner

While decisions are, according to interviewees, made according to organizational mandates, these mandates are of course interpreted and reinterpreted, in sometimes distinct ways, by a select group of executives at the ICC, MCC, and ICC member countries before development opportunities are pursued. This finding raises key questions about ‘who is interpreting these mandates’ and ‘how these interpretations are then translated in development-related decisions’. These are questions engaged in this section.

First, it is important to note that all but one of the executives interviewed were British men; other was a citizen of the country he represented (also male). While I interviewed a small number of people, I would argue that this sample is in many respects ‘representative’ in the sense that the executive positions in the ICC and MCC are dominated by British men. For example, I observed when attending the ICC Europe Governance Conference — a conference attended by at least one representative from each of the 32 member countries and various ICC managers — that the overwhelming majority of those in attendance were also White, British men. There were few women (less than 5 of over 40 attendees) and there were also a limited number of individuals that were immigrants from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, South Africa, and Australia living in countries that they represented for the ICC. That is to
say, the majority of ICC country representatives were White, British males who had moved
to the countries that they represented as an ICC member. It is these individuals that, generally
speaking, make key decisions about cricket-related development work from throughout the
ICC organization.

Furthermore, according to an interview with the MCC Executive, a select few
members of both the ICC and MCC sit on multiple and important decision-making
committees in both organizations. So, it would seem that a small number of ICC and MCC
members collectively make key development-related decisions as part of their membership
on seemingly exclusive committees. Consider the following comment from the MCC
Executive:

There is a lot of cross-pollination with the committees. You’ve got David Richardson, who’s the Chief
Executive of the ICC; he sits on our MCC World Cricket Committee, which I run. He sits on our Laws
Sub Committee, which is a sub committee to our Cricket Committee, that administers the laws, writes
the laws of cricket, interprets the laws of cricket. We have Simon Taufel, on our Laws Sub Committee,
he works for the ICC. And Andrew Strauss, who sits on both committees… Kumar Sangakkara…when
I say he sits on both committees, he sits on the ICC Cricket Committee and the MCC World
Committee. Kumar Sangakkara does the same…Anil Kumble. who chairs the ICC Cricket
Committee, sits on our World Committee. So as you can see there is a lot of exchange of views
(Mike, MCC Executive)

While the MCC Executive states that different viewpoints on key issues are commonly
exchanged, it would seem more accurate to suggest that a rather a narrow selection of
viewpoints are exchanged amongst a select group of powerful people.

Similarly, within the MCC especially there is a limited exchange of views within and
between the committees. While trying to explain the bureaucratic MCC committee structure,
the MCC Executive discussed the details of how individuals become members of various MCC committees. It was clear from the interviews conducted that this process is ambiguous and lacks transparency:

You’ve got the MCC Committee here, now the chairmen of committees of Principle Committees here Arts and Library, Cricket, Estates, Finance, Membership, and World Cricket. They are on the committee because they are Chairman. So they are not elected…. Then we got the Trustees who are sort of an advisory body. You know, they sort of… they are above the committee in a sense. They are sort of ex-presidents and very, very established MCC people. And then there’s President, Chairman, Treasurer up here. President is nominated by a current president. The club Chairman is nominated by the Nominations committee and the Treasurer is nominated by the Nominations Committee as well…. It’s a bit self-perpetuating really. Being honest. (Mike, MCC Executive)

While the MCC Executive discussed how there are multiple committees within the MCC that focus on different aspects of the club operations, ultimately all decisions are made by the Main Committee:

The normal decision-making processes are basically committees. We have lots of layers of committee. We have the Main Committee which runs the club and makes all the big decisions. So they make the big decisions. But, under the Main Committee, which is chaired by the Chairman of the club, we have the Principle Subcommittees: Cricket, Estates – which I oversee, Membership, Finance, and World Cricket – which I oversee as well. They are the principle committees. And then we have subcommittees that emanate from there. So from Cricket, we have Laws Subcommittee, Women’s Subcommittee, Players and Fixtures Subcommittee, Tours Subcommittee, University subcommittee, you know, every sub committee you can think of. So the decisions go up. (Mike, MCC Executive)

In the end, the Main Committee vets all decisions that involve the MCC. The Main Committee is comprised of 24 individuals, who represent the 18,000 full members of the MCC (Lord’s, 2014). The key point to note is that decisions in the MCC are ultimately made
in a top-down manner, with the Main Committee having veto power over every decision that goes through the club.

I also found evidence to suggest that even the 24 member Main Committee has a few high-powered members/executives that are very influential when making decisions about development-related work that the MCC pursues. For example, when discussing the MCC decision to partner with Anglo Indian to build MCC-branded cricket communities in India, the MCC Executive explained that the most powerful members of the MCC have considerable influence in garnering support for large-scale development initiatives such as this:

It started off – the idea, the concept – is a crossover between estates and cricket, so I was very involved. It just went through various committees and it was sponsored by various members of… When I say sponsored [I mean] it was encouraged and promoted by executives and non-executives and it went through the system. (Mike, MCC Executive)

Additionally, the MCC Executive noted that he was particularly vocal in getting the partnership to come to fruition:

I was very vocal in favour of it…I was really outspoken…it was sort of on my radar because I was very instrumental in promoting the idea in the first place because the bloke brought it to me in the first place as a concept. I thought it was brilliant. And I promoted it a lot in the club, did all the politics for him… navigated. For someone that’s outside the club and come to navigate his way around the politics is impossible. (Mike, MCC Executive)

Discussions with ICC executives revealed that a small number of influential people have considerable power over the development-related decisions that are made in that organization. For example, the creation of the Street20 program – the most extensive large-scale development project conducted by ICC Europe – was decided by only a few executives.
When asked about who decided to start this particular program, an ICC Top-Level Executive noted:

We did here. So I’ve known an agency called Cricket for Change for quite a few years. And I knew them when I used to work for UK Sport. They had a bit of an engagement previously with the office here, but not a great deal. And I just thought it was a natural fit really. (Daniel, ICC Top-Level Executive)

In the excerpt above, “we did here” refers to the team of 6 individuals that work at the ICC Europe office based in London, England.

When the ICC application to the European Union for funding for the project was denied, the ICC decided to fund the project anyway through internal finances. While the ICC Top-Level Executive noted that some individuals throughout ICC member countries questioned why the “ICC is investing that money, or funding into this project when we need better facilities…”, he noted that, in the end, “to be honest, we just got on with it. And it was a classic kind of development process anywhere. Time is time” (Daniel, ICC Top-Level Executive).

The top-down decision-making for the Street20 program was similarly emphasized by both of the ICC Middle-Level Executives that I interviewed, Jed and David. They discussed how the decision to create this development program was spearheaded and executed by an ICC Top-Level Executive, the CEO of their partner company Cricket for Change, and some executives at the ICC offices. Both ICC Middle-Level Executives noted that the decision to engage in this development initiative was made by an ICC Top-Level Executive, even when funding was not awarded by the European Union.
Both ICC and Cricket for Change came together to put a proposal together for a Street20 project in Europe, to get some funding, to kind of, run something quite big. And unfortunately we didn’t get the funding, but it was decided by [an ICC Top-Level Executive] and others that it was something we still wanted to go ahead with. (Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

There’s a [an ICC Top-Level Executive] … who makes those types decisions fundamentally and through a number of us, we advise, suggest different topics (David, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

This finding was affirmed during an interview with a country representative that is implementing the Street20 program:

The way this came about, originally, was [an ICC Top-Level Executive] at ICC-Europe office emailed everyone to say that the ICC… cricket was applying to the European commission with a project regarding street cricket…There was a lot of funding available there which we didn’t receive but the ICC and [an ICC Top-Level Executive] and his team were so impressed by some of the projects that were put forward that they decided to go ahead and find the money from the ICC funds anyway. (Keith, ICC Country Representative)

In sum then, it appeared from interviews with Daniel, an ICC Top-Level Executive, the ICC Middle-Level Executives, and the ICC Country Representative that one of the most prominent development-related decisions was made almost exclusively by an ICC Top-Level Executive, and that the impact of non-executive member input was apparently minimal.

3) Rationalizing hierarchical decision-making and the illusion of consultation

As noted above, it seemed that although consultation with various groups was part of usual decision-making processes in the ICC and MCC, these consultations seemed to have little impact on final decisions. The question I deal with in this section is ‘how did executives rationalize this top-down decision-making, to themselves and others’. The focus in this
section is on members of the ICC – as multiple individuals that have a wide range of perspectives were interviewed on this topic. The answer, as will become evident, is that a range of rationalizations were offered by key decision-makers as to why this system is preferred and effective – and that particular strategies were used to generate consent for this decision-making process.

I begin by providing an example of how the ‘illusion’ of consultation was created by ICC executives as a way of, it would seem, generating support for decisions that are ultimately made at the highest levels of the ICC. In my interview with David, ICC Middle-Level Executive, I was told that although ICC member countries have decision-making power, all decisions are ultimately vetted and ‘guided’ by ICC middle and top-level executives. This apparent ‘illusion of consultation’ was explained the following way:

ICC is a members’ organization, so… I think it’s very different to other organizations. So actually it’s the members who have the power. If the members decide x, y, and z, we have to do it. We can advise and we can guide and in a way it is, if you talk about actual money… It’s a delicate balance of actually listening to people who are fundamentally responsible and make those decisions, but obviously guide them in the right way. (David, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

David helps clarify this point when he says:

Decisions…we take a lot of feedback from our members all the time. It’s that self awareness and listening to people…. Those types of decisions, well we kind of go ‘let’s listen to them a bit’, and then we make the decision… If we need a decision that needs making in terms of cricket decisions and we need to advise, we generally go to [member representatives]. We give them some options and say these are the options. (David, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

So, it would seem that David is acknowledging that ICC top and middle executives provide the illusion of consultation with various members by ‘listening to them a bit’ – before ‘we’ (meaning the ICC executive team) ultimately make the final decision.
Additionally, when the ICC is in a situation where its members are positioned to make a particular decision (through a vote, for example), ICC executives are still deciding what options are on the table for discussion. In this way, ICC executives are retaining decision-making power while appearing to value input on options they consider to be acceptable.

While this and other strategies for inviting ‘acceptable’ input may be effective in many instances, my interview with an ICC Country Representative revealed that at least some less central members of the ICC recognize the hierarchical decision-making structure, and are not always pleased about it:

I don’t know what’s happened there. I know only from the information what I get from the newsletter and something like that. I think what they do and what they doing now the budget to cut the budget for the countries in division two, it’s very bad because you know cricket is not popular in many, many countries, like soccer... But still if they want to promote the cricket I think they must give the money. But you cannot talk with them, I cannot do nothing with them, I’m not sitting there. Therefore somebody from its my boss. Somebody very far from me, not [much] contact.

(ICC Country Representative)

This representative states in no uncertain terms that he feels as though his voice is not considered in ICC decision-making processes. He also goes on to suggest that decisions are made without full consultation with all stakeholders. For example, he recognizes that there are few venues where back and forth discussion on issues and decisions is possible. He also indicates that the ICC is ‘his boss’ and that these executives are far removed from his position within the country. Clearly, there are some tensions associated with attempts by the ICC executive to secure consent and support for particular decisions – although it appears that consent is still ultimately secured.
It seemed from my interview with Daniel, an ICC Top-Level Executive, that executives in the ICC are aware of the perception that input from non-central members of the ICC have little impact on decision-making. In an attempt to show how this is not (always) the case, this interviewee pointed to the decision to start and support the Street20 program, and described efforts to ensure that ICC executives were not exclusively governing the delivery of this program:

What we’ve tried not to do again is kind of be too top heavy with it. And sort of encourage the countries to take their own lead (Daniel, ICC Top-Level Executive)

Jed, an ICC Middle-Level Executive, made a similar point when responding to a question about how decisions were made on programmes like Street20:

We didn’t want to do that [dictate the program from the top down]. We basically said to countries, ‘this is what it is, these are the countries we’re working with, this is how it’s gonna work, this is the funding we’re gonna give you, this is Street20 basically, here it is, you tell us what you can do delivering that in your country and where it’s gonna work.’ So we put a lot of the emphasis on them, we didn’t want to be telling them this is what you’re doing, because they need to own the program and know what their goals are, we’re just there to support them and have it as a resource. (Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

What is especially interesting from the above quote is that this ICC Middle-Level Executive claims that the ICC did not want to explicitly tell the member countries how to operate the Street20 program – yet he also notes how the ICC directly told the participating member countries what the program was, how to implement it, the funding that was available, and how it all was going to work.

To be fair, interviewees recognized that there are country specific differences, such as climate and space available, that need to be taken into account for the Street20 program, and
that a level of standardization in the Street20 curriculum might exist for a variety of reasons. Even with these considerations in mind though, there was evidence that the approach to implementing the Street20 program was mandated ‘from above’.

Despite these attempts by some ICC executives to demonstrate that meaningful consultation with non-central members did take place, other executives (and sometimes these same executives) discussed why the top-down and centralized decision-making approach is necessary and justifiable. For example, some executives of the ICC that I interviewed rationalized the passing of controversial decisions – i.e., decisions made by a select few influential ICC members, following the top-down process described earlier – by explaining that those who were initially unsupportive or resistant are ‘coming around’. For example, when discussing the decision to create the Street20 program, Daniel, an ICC Top-Level Executive, offered this rationale:

And some of those members that were originally skeptical are starting to turn and say ‘well actually you know what I get that. We can see where this can help now. Where as before perhaps we didn’t.’ And they are never to believe, and this is probably culturally, certainly in Western Europe, certainly in this country, people are quite conservative with their approach. Generally quite skeptical will look at the negatives rather then the positives, and were questioning it. (Daniel, ICC Top-Level Executive)

These sentiments are echoed by Jed, one of the ICC Middle-Level Executives:

It could be a really positive tool that we could offer to countries basically, and get them to embrace a new type of cricket, and there still is resistance, definitely, even from people in a country at high-level that was, it was pretty big, I think a lot of that’s been quelled now because they’ve seen how positive it is, but people were saying, it’s not real cricket, it’s not, it’s not proper cricket (Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

The above examples highlight that these two influential individuals rationalize their decision to create and fund the Street20 program, even in the face of resistance, by
suggesting that the resistance has been ‘quelled’ as people have come to see why the controversial decision was ultimately a good decision. The use of the word ‘quelled’ is intriguing in this context because it suggests that dissenting views have been suppressed and/or subdued – a position that seems inconsistent with the view that differing perspectives are important and expected in an organization that values consultation.

**How do Key Decision-Makers Understand the Notion of Development and What are Their Perceptions of Development-Related Issues?**

Three broad themes emerged from discussions with key decision-makers in the ICC and the MCC about their perspectives on development and development-related issues. The first is that decision-makers were in many cases dismissive of critiques and concerns around sport focused development work; the second is that these decision-makers commonly saw the promotion and support of sport for development programs as means to achieve alternative organizational goals; and the third is that development was interpreted as beneficial for business. I elaborate on these findings below, and conclude the section by focusing on some key exceptions to these dominant themes.

1) **Key decision-makers tend to be dismissive of development-related concerns and critiques**

When I asked interviewees about their perspectives on development-related issues and concerns – e.g., concerns that SDP programs are commonly carried out with little local consultation/involvement, and are thus postcolonial projects — many interviewees dismissed such concerns, suggesting that the critiques are not compelling when considered alongside
the overwhelming evidence that sport is a powerful and positive cultural practice. Those who responded this way commonly referred to the ways that sport innately brings people together, and that sport brings with it a sense of discipline and control that sets the groundwork for other development goals to be achieved. For example, the executive of the MCC stated: “I mean, sport brings everyone together.” Relatedly, Andrew, an ICC Country Representative, argues:

For the people you say that are negative about sport, it’s good discipline… so there’s a lot of mental things you need… It’s self-discipline, you need to be committed, there’s lots of things there. (Andrew, ICC Country Representative)

Going into more detail, Jed, an ICC Middle-Level Executive explained:

I think sport has the kind of ability and power to achieve change – you can see that through so many different things – whether that’s, you know, bringing countries together, South Africa and rugby world cup, which helped to unite their country after apartheid. I mean, it doesn’t, I don’t see it with kind of rose, fully rose-tinted glasses, like “look how magical it is!” But the black power salute and Jessie Owens and Hitler’s Olympics, um, football’s abilities kind of transcend other things, like the World Cup, and just, all that of that, it’s just, sport’s so powerful… Like other sports, it takes courage and commitment, but you need all of those kind of buzzwords in terms of leadership and dedication and you learn a lot about yourself… (Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

In the example above, Jed refers back to iconic, and highly romanticized images of instances where sport is believed to have transcended boundaries that exist between classes and races, and where sport has helped achieve ‘development’ goals of many kinds. As with the other interviewees, he does not discuss some of the well-known problems associated with sport and development along with sport’s positive attributes.

More interesting, however, was that interviews with key decisions-makers revealed that these individuals often dismissed critiques of sport for development because they
believe that cricket is different than traditional sports used in sport for development work.

For example, an ICC Top-Level Executive asserted that cricket is able to bring those of different genders and ages together in ways that other sports cannot, which allows particular social development outcomes to happen “naturally”:

I think cricket in itself is a team sport. I think it brings people together, it encourages, it brings different elements, responsibilities, it can bring young people together, it can bring boys and girls, women and men together in a way a lot of other sports can’t. So I think some of those social developments happen quite naturally from the game. (Alex, ICC Top-Level Executive).

Aaron, an ICC Country representative made similar claims:

One more thing in the cricket that I like that is the discipline, wonderful discipline. It gives us how to teach children to carry the discipline and go with the discipline and follow it. Another thing that’s in cricket, everybody can play cricket. Girls, woman, children, Muslim, Jewish, Christian, everybody, that’s good. And if this all coming to the cricket, you can promote to the peace, to the friendship, to everything. (Aaron, ICC Country Representative).

Implied in both of these examples is that cricket is an especially powerful sport for overcoming boundaries between groups of individuals compared to other sports because other sports do not allow for the mixing of groups in the ways they claim cricket can.

Extending this argument, David, one of the ICC Middle-Level Executives, discussed how cricket has a unique set of values that align well with development-related goals:

I think you look at the values of what cricket can offer. And, again, what I referred to earlier where cricket stands for a number of values of integrity, sharing, being honest, playing fair… I think the key word is you play hard but you play fair… (David, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

Following this point, Andrew, an ICC Country Representative, referred specifically and in some depth to differences between cricket and other sports – and suggested that critics of
sport for development programs know little about cricket’s ability to go ‘beyond the normal sport’:

I think cricket is a great sport for breaking down barriers. Especially things like race and stuff is a big thing. It’s broken down a lot of barriers… we have Asian players, we have English players, we have Spanish players, all playing together. Cricket is always good for that. Teams we’re involved with where these clubs wouldn’t mix anywhere else, but they mix on the cricket field. So I think… that’s one of the good things… [I]t’s [cricket’s] very good… for developing personal skills. Developing personal life skills, because it’s not just a team game, it’s an individual. It’s got both components enrolled into one. Football, you make a mistake and 10 other people make up for it, and no one really sees it. In cricket, you can drop the bat, you can get out, you know, anything, you can misfield, and it’s awful. But in football you can do that and someone else is behind you, they’re looking out for you. So I think its good for those things. So any doubters I would say cricket goes a little bit beyond just normal sport. (Andrew, ICC Country Representative)

It is worth highlighting here that at the same time that this respondent claims that cricket can easily break down barriers he is overlooking the frequent and high profile incidents involving racial tensions in international cricket (see for example Malcolm, 2013; Mehta et al., 2009; Sen, 2001).

Furthering his argument that cricket is a unique, positive and powerful development tool – the Andrew, an ICC Country Representative, went on to suggest that cricket differentiates itself from other sports such as soccer because it combines elements of team sports as well as individual sports, which therefore makes it an excellent vehicle for teaching valuable life skills. Jake, a different ICC Country Representative, made a similar argument:

Well then the other thing which is, which… may not apply to other sports… is that cricket is a team sport played by individuals…so this aspect as playing together as a team if you are all individuals, you’ve got to be as concentrated on your own performance as you are on the team performance. That’s a life lesson. We are all together in this world, we’ve got to work together, and we’ve gotta really push
whatever we’re doing and we have to make sure that somebody else is doing the right thing as well.

(Jake, ICC Country Representative)

As evidence of cricket’s pro-development qualities – and as a way of responding to critique sport for development – many interviewees also referred to their own positive experiences either playing or working in cricket environments. The following quotes are typical:

…when I was playing in South Africa in 1995 that was just after apartheid… There was some racial barriers and I was playing for a coloured club and we were playing against a white club, Cape Town Cricket Club…At the end of play usually they come together in one dressing room or the other for a drink. But, even in 1995, Cape Town Cricket Club wouldn’t allow the coloured or black club into their dressing room. Obviously I wanted to change this, so this particular day we went to Cape Town Cricket Club, played this game, thrashed them. And then, you know, I said to the captain of Cape Town – I was captain of Victoria – I said to Cape Town Cricket Club captain, who I knew, played with him before. I said right, we’re coming into your dressing room. He said what? I said we’re coming into your dressing room and we’re going to bring some beer, and you’re going wrap some towels around you and you’re going to create spaces so that we can sit between you and we’re going to talk about cricket. He said that’s never been done before. I said well it’s going to be done today. So it was quite a transformational moment. … They’d felt uncomfortable. I think a lot of them, obviously they’d never been allowed in before… and anyway it happened it was amazing sort of moment, really. I think since then it’s been fine. Obviously now life in South Africa is different. But that gives you an example of how it could work. (Mike, MCC Executive)

That cricket, cricket do the peace … all the good things. Because, see, I’m 16 years umpiring, when I am going to Germany, when I am going to Belgium, a lot of Muslim playing there. You know everybody come to shake my hand, I am Jewish. They shake my hand. They like me, they love me, they invite me to eat in their house. It’s not happen if I’m not playing cricket, if I am not part of cricket. (Aaron, ICC Country Representative)
Well I play in a few matches, cricket matches, where two of the batsman, one has been a millionaire and one has been unemployed. So it’s a great equalizer. You know, cricket, it doesn’t matter what background you’re from… you can play it. (Keith, ICC Country Representative)

As is evident from the above quotations, cricket was considered to be the vehicle that helped break down racial barriers in post-Apartheid South Africa; a way to achieve cross-religious integration; and a path toward common ground between classes because the sport acts as an ‘equalizer’. While the specific content differs in these examples, each interviewee relies on their respective positive personal experience playing/working in cricket to assert the value and utility of using the sport as a tool to address various inequalities between and within different groups of people. Here, positive experiences through participating in cricket extended beyond the sport itself, but also included wider social activities.

Overall and in summary then, in discussing the possibilities of using sport and/or cricket as a development tool, there was a denial of the potential for sport to be divisive, exclusive, and (post)colonial. For this reason, the possibility that sport could be an inappropriate tool to achieve broader ‘development’ outcomes was not considered realistic or worthy of much discussion — with a couple of key exceptions described later.

2) Sport for development is a way to achieve other organizational goals

Key decision-makers in the ICC especially saw the value in supporting sport for development programs as a means to an end – with the end being ‘achieving organizational goals’. The responses by those working in the ICC are featured here because they often tied their development work with specific organizational mandates. While this finding is unsurprising in the sense that interviewees were always straightforward in their claim that
development-related decisions were driven first and foremost by organizational mandates.

What is relevant here is what this pragmatic view of decision-making revealed about the perspectives of decision-makers on the sport for development work itself and on the notion of development more generally.

With this background, we can begin to see how ‘development’ is understood by ICC decision-makers in the following interview excerpt from an ICC Top-Level Executive, who emphasizes the value of sport for development in so far as it helps the growth of cricket:

> So we use cricket as a platform to give HIV messages and from a strategic point of view it works pretty well because cricket is the vehicle so the more it grows the more the messages grow. So cricket is a winner because the vehicle is growing and that’s what cricket is interested in, but the messages and the social development is also growing… Is the ICC the body that’s going to drive cricket to play a more active role in that? To a certain extent yes, but actually it’s not the key aim of ICC and therefore whilst we’ll play a role in that area because I think we should, ultimately if cricket doesn’t grow but it plays a massive role in tackling the HIV pandemic in Africa is that good for ICC? I don’t think it is. It would be brilliant and of course personally, morally that’s fantastic. But the ICC is a cricket organization and wants to grow cricket so I believe that’s first and foremost the cause. But can we play a bigger role in terms of encouraging more work in that area, supporting, funding, resourcing, absolutely. (Alex, ICC Top-Level Executive)

In this way, development works ‘strategically’ for the ICC because, as this SDP program spreads, more individuals are exposed to and are involved in the sport. Ultimately then, development is seen here as helping the ICC achieve its mandate of drastically increasing cricket participation globally. Put another way, while the ICC is invested in promoting the use of cricket to help spread messages about HIV/AIDS awareness, the
ultimate ‘cause’ is growing and spreading the sport and supporting these types programs is one way to achieve this goal.

Similarly, Jed, an ICC Middle-Level Executive saw the Street20 program as a way of bringing cricket to new and potentially ‘untapped’ groups. Note the choice of words by Jed when describing the utility of the Street20 program:

Also to get cricket to a new audience, new markets, so it’s not just street cricket obviously, the cricket factory resource that we have… potentially other things like cage cricket is a really cool concept that could work in Europe, and anything that we’ve got as a resource to go to different European countries and say, you know, these are particular options you’ve got to increase participation and development of cricket in your country (Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

Of interest above is that Jed uses the terms ‘new audience’ and ‘new markets’ when describing the underlying value of the Street20 program. According to Jed, these programs allow the ICC to promote cricket to a variety of groups that have not been involved before, presenting it to the member countries as a way to help increase participation. Here, the ultimate goal is increasing and maintaining numbers – and any other development outcomes come secondary to that.

When specifically asked what ‘development’ meant to him, and how development is pertinent to the goals of the Street20 program, the an ICC Country Representative made a similar point by emphasizing that he is running his country’s cricket organization like a business and, as with any business, the main concern is with the bottom line. In this case, of course, the bottom line is the number of participants. As he states:

[The main goal of the development work is] getting more players… I found that by being too social about trying to help little Pierre become a better person, we got lost in too many social aspects. And one of the things that I am trying to do with [this] is I’ve tried to run it like a business. With business
objectives and business ethics…how do I generate money, how do I generate more… well people? My reasoning is the more and more people that I get on board, the more players … I am going to get, the more volunteers I am going to get, the more press coverage I am going to get, the more money I am going to get, the more pay for the coaches for the more people I am going to get. You know there’s this internal circle… so my first objective is to get people on board. Numbers. Afterwards we can start thinking more socially. (Jake, ICC Country Representative)

Once again, numbers of participants are the focal point and social development outcomes fall to the background – which is to say, focusing too much on ‘social aspects’ is a distraction from the ultimate goal.

3) Sport for development as a business decision

Key decision-makers also described how cricket-focused development might be useful as a business tactic to change the outward images of cricket and the ICC or MCC brands. In particular, supporting various development projects that are based around modified or simplified versions of the game created avenues for new participants – and a rebranding of the sport as ‘open’ and ‘accessible’ instead of exclusive, ‘traditional’, rigid, and a space for the elite. For example, when discussing the Street20 program, Jed, an ICC Middle-Level Executive, notes that this program employs a shortened, fast-paced game, that is more inclusive than the traditional hard-ball form:

So it’s cool, and it’s great for going into countries where they don’t know anything about cricket because it’s way easier to sell, than kind of, guys in whites playing red ball cricket on a massive pitch and it being seen as quite, you know, an elitist kind of sport. (Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

He goes on to say:

So, the Street20 stuff, if you’re able to engage young people, potentially people who might otherwise get into things that perhaps they shouldn’t be doing, or wouldn’t have the opportunity to play sport,
then I see that as a really powerful thing, you know, it’s great to increase performance and um, players who are already good and you know, from the right side of the tracks if you like, and developing a high-performance… all that has its place and is really valuable but that doesn’t really light as many fires in me as potentially giving people an opportunity who wouldn’t have an opportunity otherwise.

(Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

Here, Jed emphasizes that a key benefit of the Street20 program is to be able to get those involved that would not have had the opportunity – either because they would not have been exposed to it, or because it might have been seen as an exclusive sport. Andrew, an ICC Country Representative, also articulates this point:

What we’re trying to do is trying to get kids playing cricket like they used to. It’s a great way to learn cricket. It’s not… you’re not told to do this, you’re not told to do that. You just go out and enjoy and you play how you want to play. You can play with 10, you can play with 2, you can play with 20. It doesn’t really matter. Anyone can join in at any time. It’s just getting kids playing, getting them out… getting them acquainted with the sport. Just reinventing the sport for them to get involved… getting them off the computers, getting them away from the game box, the Xboxes, getting them out in society.

(Andrew, ICC Country Representative)

Additionally, some discussed how the images produced of the Street20 program from participating countries reflect this reinvention of the sport. For example, Daniel, an ICC Top-Level Executive, explains:

They have been sending pictures through to us, we have been using it too, because… the visuals are quite powerful. If you’ve got a picture of a basketball court, and a young person playing with graffiti kind of behind them, shows cricket in a completely different light. (Daniel, ICC Top-Level Executive)

Similarly, Jed, an ICC Middle-Level Executive describes:

We’ve got some awesome images with like graffiti behind in basketball courts and massive high rise flats and kids just playing in kind of, you know, normal kind of street clothes that you’d see kids, you know, boys in the hood… Cricket, often, particularly in the UK, doesn’t look very cool. When I was at
school, people were like, ‘ugh, cricket’s so boring’. Well, it looks… I don’t wanna use horrible clichés and ridiculous words but it looks cool, so that’s kinda nice. (Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

For both these interviewees, a key benefit of the images produced by the Street20 program is that it shows cricket in a “different light” – and introduce audiences and new players to the idea that cricket can be played in any location such as basketball courts, gymnasiums, and alleyways, not just the traditional cricket pitch.

Similarly, the MCC Executive saw supporting development-related work as a way to change perceptions of the club. The MCC Executive recognizes the perception of the club as being highly exclusive and insular and therefore sees sponsoring various community initiatives (like the ones discussed in more detail in other spaces in this chapter, such as the programs in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka) as a way to change this image:

We are looking sort of a little more outwardly in terms of helping the community. The perception being that we are a private member’s club full of snobs and have no concern for the rest of the world. Now that’s not true at all. (Mike, MCC Executive)

Interestingly, when discussing the building of the branded communities in India with Anglo Indian, he mentions how the facilities must be available to the general public — and, at the same time, that these communities are designed to be highly exclusive:

One thing I’ve really tried to emphasize is that once these facilities are in place, the local community have to benefit. It has to pass that test. It can’t just be elite. Obviously, Lord’s membership is only going to be taken up by extremely rich Indians, there’s no doubt. But there’s a burgeoning middle class that will be able to afford the property. But as far as the cricket facilities are concerned, these are not really going to be used unless the local community have the chance of using them properly. So the local community – however disadvantaged they are – have access to them. There’s going to be no arguments about that. That’s just going to be the way it is. It’s not going to be massively revenue generating. We know that. The property will be but the actual operation of the academies and cricket grounds they will be there for the benefit of the community. (Mike, MCC Executive)
Above, the MCC Executive recognizes that while these communities will be highly exclusive, there is a need to combat the image of exclusivity – by ensuring that the facilities will be available to those who are unable to afford to live inside these spaces. It is his position that by being involved in the development of the communities, as well as insuring the accessibility of facilities to those of the ‘general public’, the MCC is able to promote the image that they are more than a private members club that is unconcerned with those who do not have membership to the MCC in London. For the MCC, development work, including outreach work conducted in local communities, programs in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka, and the development of communities in England, is also intended to change perceptions of the club as an inward looking organization to that of one that is more inclusive and outward looking.

**Notable exceptions**

Interestingly, a few notable ‘exceptions’ to the uncritical pro-development narratives offered above emerged during discussions with key executives in the ICC and MCC about their perceptions of international development. I call these ‘exceptions’ because only one or two individuals interviewed discussed international development work in these ways.

These exceptions are especially intriguing and important to foreground here as these individuals hold more power than most when it comes to decisions about development-related work because they are ‘high up’ in their organizational hierarchies. However, and as will be examined in my ‘Discussion’ chapter, it is unclear whether it matters how
development is understood when decisions are ultimately made according to organizational mandates. Examples from these specific conversations are discussed below.

*Development as a moral responsibility*

The MCC Executive conceptualized development work as a moral obligation for the MCC to undertake. This framing of sport for development was discussed by the MCC Executive perhaps because the MCC is a private organization and runs much like a corporation (with associated ‘corporate social responsibility). In this way the MCC and ICC differed as this was not foregrounded in discussions with ICC executives.

He believed that the MCC had a responsibility to do outreach work in various communities, locally and internationally, because the MCC is perceived to be – and should be – the ‘conscience of cricket’:

…people expect the MCC to be the ones to lead on those sort of issues…so, people like to think, although it sounds arrogant, that we’re kind of the conscience of cricket (Mike, MCC Executive).

The MCC Executive elaborated on this idea when discussing development projects in Afghanistan, UK-based programs that the club is involved in, and the future cricket communities in India:

Well, I think with Afghanistan, it sort of became a moral imperative to help. When they sort of got their freedom… newfound freedom in 2002, we went in there and offered to help and they’ve gone from strength to strength over the last 10 years with our help – both practical and financial. (Mike, MCC Executive)

Helping underprivileged children – they can come to Lord’s, enjoy facilities… bringing disadvantaged children in and helping them bake cakes in our pastry kitchen. They’ll have a session in our academy learning about how to coach the game, have a little coaching session themselves, games on the
outfield. You know giving them an experience day. *Bringing them from their terrible existences and showing them a bit of a ray of light.* (Mike, MCC Executive)

Opening up the cricket facilities and making facilities open to local people, however poor they are. So they will have the freedom to access. There will be some controls. *We will have local community programs to go out there... we will have designated people to run those programs.* (Mike, MCC Executive)

In the three examples above, the MCC Executive stresses that the club engaged in development programs because it was the ethical thing to do.

Imbedded in this idea of moral responsibility is the idea that development is something that can be ‘done to’ and ‘for’ others with the help of the MCC – and not something that necessarily includes long-term relationship-building with communities that may already be taking leadership on some of these issues, or may be prioritizing other concerns. In the last example involving the branded cricket communities in India, designated people (i.e. MCC trained and approved) will run community outreach programs. In both cases, the MCC Executive perceives that the MCC controls when and how these programs operate and under what conditions.

While problematic in their own way, these comments are distinct from those reported in other sections – where respondents saw development as a means to an end.

**Development as problematic but necessary**

Interestingly, both ICC Top-Level Executives interviewed in this study offered some critical reflections on the utilization of sport to achieve development objectives. For example, Alex, one of the ICC Top-Level Executives was skeptical of the monitoring and evaluation of
sport for development programs and brought up issues with local engagement in decision-making processes:

In terms of some of the larger challenges faced in the world, can sport play a role? I absolutely think it can, but it has to be applied in the right way and quite specific to that. And I think we have to be better at measuring it and monitoring it… the right way is engaging the local communities and understanding what the needs are, because the needs are not the same in Israel as they are in Northern Uganda. What the issues are and what is more important, while you might be running the same program, it’s how you get there that’s more important, it’s who makes those decisions. It’s not for us to make those decisions in our ivory tower in Dubai. It’s for local people to find their solutions and I think that’s part of the battle is just finding your own solutions to those things, and using cricket as a tool. (Alex, ICC Top-Level Executive)

The other ICC Top-Level Executive, Daniel, was more forthcoming with his critiques of sport for development:

For sport for development programs, you always have to be careful to not to be seen to taking advantage of those groups that are perhaps are being involved in the activity. And I think that’s a real issue for the sport for development probably. I have not seen that in cricket so I am not necessarily saying that it is a cricket-specific problem. But funding agencies that have supported projects that I have seen in different parts of Africa for example that’s the case that Monday you are at Right to Play and on Tuesday UNICEF and on Thursday you are maybe the national government or whatever. And actually you are all counting the numbers you are all counting those young people but it’s essentially repetition of the same thing. And I think that’s something that we need to be a bit careful of and particularly as we are probably exposing numbers to these new areas and these new communities that again it’s not just seen as a tick box to get ICC funding because we are engaged in a new group and that’s led to have many more people taking part… I have seen some really poor practice where people thought that they were doing good and making a difference, but possibly making it worse… One example that springs to mind is a project that we used to run in UK Sport… where students used to go in and basically support, inverted commas, the ‘local organization’ in a southern African country…. You know the students would go great, we are here we are going to take over the world we are going to solve poverty and peace and social conflict problems and goodness knows what else. And we are going
to do that over the 6-8 week period. And then they go back the year after and they are shocked that nothing changed in the year that they have gone. Because what they have not done is work with locals, build their capacity, build their confidence, understanding of what that sport, that activity is. They have not engaged any of the local partners. They maybe have not found local funding to sustain some of the activity over that period of time. They might not respect culture or customs (Daniel, ICC Top-Level Executive)

This ICC Top-Level Executive was unusually explicit in his critiques of sport for development, reflecting on his previous experiences to give specific examples of ‘bad’ practice. It is noteworthy that he is critical of sport for development programs that possibly take advantage of recipients, programs that are small in scale (but claim to be ‘big’ in influence), and problems associated with wealthy Europeans flying in to support international development projects – and shortly flying out again with little achieved.

While these ICC Top-Level Executives focused on big-picture issues in the sport for development movement, some country representatives reflected on some of the challenges they have had conducting sport for development on the ground. The main difference here is that these representatives ignored broader issues of implementing sport as a development tool, but discussed particular technical issues they face in achieving broader development objectives through their programs. For example, Andrew, an ICC Country Representative discussed challenges with the integration of different groups through the Street20 program:

They only thing with the Asian community, they don’t… they are very conscious of what is going on. They don’t want to get involved… or get involved in the way we like to play cricket, they like to keep it for themselves. So that’s very difficult for us to break down some barriers, to get in and help those guys because they don’t really want the help. So sometimes it’s difficult in that way… they just want a bit of sport out of the way and that sort of thing. So we’ve got to break some barriers down with those people. (Andrew, ICC Country Representative)
In addition, he reflects on potential issues of having Europeans going into various Asian communities to implement the Street20 program without adequately considering local context:

Maybe if we target the community leaders, got them coached, and then they can take it back to their communities that might be a way for the future. But the inner city stuff is difficult, especially… Europeans are walking in there, it’s not an easy approach. (Andrew, ICC Country Representative)

Aaron, a different country representative discussed issues with integration between groups due to language barriers and political differences that make the program difficult to run:

ICC Country Representative:

See to me the challenge to the cricket [with integration] is very, very hard because I cannot be there. I must be there physically. I cannot be there. Therefore you are a teacher there he is a teacher there… our language is not the same language. Therefore I am using their teacher. You know you must support me if you are a [a different language-speaking] teacher. You must support.

D.W.

… is it hard to get support sometimes?

ICC Country Representative:

Sometimes yes. Because they bring all the political problems [with them]. (Aaron, ICC Country Representative)

In both discussions, the representatives emphasize that their issues are not necessarily with the program itself, but with the people that the programs are looking to target.
How are Development-Related Goals and Issues Portrayed to Stakeholders and How do These Development Goals Align with Broader Organizational Goals?

When asked about how development goals/issues are portrayed to various stakeholders, interviewees with both the ICC and MCC often discussed how the communication content and strategies for development-focused programs differed depending on the audience.

For example, when discussing the Street20 program, an ICC Top-Level Executive explains how the initiative is promoted as a ‘development first’ initiative outside their organization:

Maybe the only tailoring we have done is when we’ve been speaking to probably some of the non-cricketing organizations if I’m honest. We’re probably more talking about the development outcomes there rather than the cricket outcomes… But in some of the European context… there was the European Summer Sport that was in south London, we didn’t talk so much about the cricket aspect of street cricket, we talked about giving opportunities to young people, we talked about social inclusion, we talked about gender opportunities, we talked about all the other elements of kind of, the other development opportunities of cricket if you like. Then the delivery mechanism is the street aspect… But yes we do tailor it. (Daniel, ICC Top-Level Executive).

While this ICC Top-Level Executive quoted above discusses the promotion of ‘development’ outcomes of the program for the European Union and UN agencies – he also acknowledged that the program is presented differently to the members of the ICC:

…yes we do tailor it. To our members, that’s the other question… I would say we’re still pushing the cricket bit, and the cricket development bit, rather than the development outcomes… And what I am very careful about is when I am speaking to members I am always talking cricket even if in the back of my mind I am thinking ‘god this is great because this is social development through sport’. (Daniel, ICC Top-Level Executive)
These differences between internal and external portrayals of the Street20 program were also highlighted by Jed, one of the ICC Middle-Level Executives:

We focused massively on, ‘this is a great way to get new people playing, and it’s fun, and interactive, and you can use existing facilities, and it doesn’t cost you a load of money, and we’re gonna be supporting you to launch it in your country and work with you to make sure that this is a success.’ Whereas obviously for the application to the EU, we gave it way more context in terms of long term benefits, health, social cohesion, bringing people together, loads and loads of examples, and from CfC [Cricket for Change], from how they’ve used Street20 all over the world, to kind of build bridges and partnerships, so, Israelis and Palestinians playing together… inmates working together in prisons in the Caribbean, like really, kind of dangerous places all over the world where they’ve played it, as a positive kind of tool to get people kind of working together in teams, taking responsibility, having fun, keeping fit, all of that kind of stuff… but yeah, we had to give it way more context and obviously all the financial type of things, long-term plans, short-term plans, where this will be in 3 years, whereas we wanted to steer pretty clear of that for our members. (Jed, ICC Middle-Level Executive)

It is noteworthy that when the ICC promotes this program to the various member countries, they emphasize how this program will increase cricket participation – saying little about other outcomes that might be achieved.

Jake, an ICC Country Representative, also discussed how they use different messages to promote the Street20 program to different audiences. For example, he discussed how he modifies the message of the Street20 program depending on whether he is presenting it to governments, school boards, parents, or teachers. For example, when promoting this program to the governments and school boards he said:

We pitched it on two points: the fair play aspect, the new sport aspect. And the government, they came back on the language aspect. Can you can you teach them English please. So I said yup. A lot of us are English speakers anyways so big deal…There is one other strategy that I use to the government that’s
intellectual… the intellectual aspect… ya language and you know new skills and what have you. And that’s, that’s ok they, they are happy with that. (Jake, ICC Country Representative)

When promoting this program to school boards and governments, this same representative also emphasized its value in teaching children English, teaching them a new sport, as well as ‘fair play’. However, the message to teachers and parents is slightly different:

What is really interesting afterwards is I go see schools or parents, my argument is to say that you can be black or white, big or small, fat or thin, boy or girl, you can play cricket…. There is no physical restriction. Boys can play against girls, that is no problem. And when I say that to teachers they are of course really happy cause half of their class is female obviously. Parents are really happy cause they see another sport that their child can make headway….yes, yes two different strategies. (Jake, ICC Country Representative)

In the case with teachers and parents, the message becomes one that highlights the inclusivity of the program and its ability to integrate those of different genders, sizes, and races.

The MCC Executive was also clear that the club uses different messages to promote their various development work to different audiences. He asserted that externally, the MCC looks to promote itself and the development work it does as philanthropic in nature:

[Playing the game] with the right behaviour, the right decorum, traditions, playing in an entertaining way, smiling at each other but playing it fiercely, competitively…. MCC is about the conscience of the game, the spirit of the game, the laws of the game. It’s about putting international fixtures at the home of cricket, it’s about the balance between bat and ball. It’s about doing what’s right for cricket, with no political, financial, or racial agenda. That’s what you get most of the time. (Mike, MCC Executive)

Again, this is different to the ways in which these programs and initiatives are discussed internally. For example, when discussing Chance to Shine – an outreach program conducted in state schools throughout the UK – he notes:
We contribute 100,000 pounds a year and that’s really the promotion of the spirit of the game in state schools… it’s a good platform to promote our message within state school cricket. We get a lot of publicity out of it… We do an analysis of return on investment and in terms of the publicity we get for it and the message that is promulgated through the classrooms for a 1000 state schools… I mean it’s a powerful message of how to play the game. So I think we get good return on investment there. (Mike, MCC Executive)

Additionally, when asked about outreach work that the club conducts in Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, and other locations, the MCC executive explains:

So, people like to think, although it sounds arrogant, that we’re kind of the conscience of cricket. We’re not perfect, but people will come to us for advice and help… I’ve just been like I’ve said back from Oman, just for one day I was there. But it’s good for our image. You know, it’s good for the club to be seen out there helping the world of cricket. (Mike, MCC Executive)

Moreover, when asked what the goals are of the partnership with Anglo Indian to build branded cricket-communities in India, the MCC Executive states: “revenue generation for the club”. While the MCC asserts that it stands for doing “what is right for cricket, with no political, financial, or racial agenda”, internally they discuss their programs on how best to get returns on their investment, how outreach work will benefit their outward image, and the revenues that they can accrue through various partnerships.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Sport for Development and Peace (SDP)

Sport’s utility in international development

One of the main findings reported in the last chapter is that key decision-makers in both the ICC and MCC tended to – with important exceptions – be dismissive of critiques of sport for development. Instead, the decision-makers chose to emphasize and offer examples of sport’s (and especially cricket’s) overwhelmingly positive and powerful features as an apolitical and pro-social cultural practice. Put another way, at the same time that most interviewees were asserting the positive potential for sport, they were also disregarding the potentially negative, divisive, and politically/socially contested aspects of sport that may make it an ineffective tool for achieving development objectives.

In fact, descriptions of sport’s positive features offered by the MCC Executive, various ICC Country Representatives, and the ICC Middle-Level Executives – such as ‘sport brings everyone together’, ‘it requires discipline and cooperation’, and ‘it’s a universal language’ — were almost identical to statements commonly used by representatives for pro-SDP organizations such as the UN and IOC. Consider the following public statements:

Adolf Ogi (former advisor on Sport for Development and Peace at the United Nations):

Sport teaches young people… values such as respect for one’s opponents… Team sports moreover teach the players to become integrated and that they must be able to rely on each other… These are essential and universal values and principles that can contribute to development and peace. (United Nations, 2004)

Sadako Ogata (United Nations High Commission for Refugees):
Sports and recreation are vital for all children. For a refugee child they are irreplaceable in helping rebuild a destroyed world. (as cited Giulianotti, 2004, p. 356)

The Red Cross in Indo-China:

Sport transforms men and women by endowing them with strength, endurance, vivacity and courage. (as cited in Giulianotti, 2004, p. 356).

The crucial point here is that the comments offered by those I interviewed are open to the same critiques as the statements offered by the UN and Red Cross representatives referred to above – critiques offered by scholars such as Giulianotti (2004), Darnell (2007), and Hayhurst (2009) in their respective investigations into the goals and implications of the sport for development movement. The critique, as discussed in detail in the literature review, is that these one-sided depictions of sport-related development efforts are deceptive, ideological and potentially dangerous (Wilson, 2012). In this way, my findings generally confirm the arguments offered by Giulianotti (2004), Darnell (2007), Hayhurst (2009) and others.

Having said this, there is a subtle but not unimportant difference between my research and the work of these scholars. The difference is this – my study was based on interviews with executives who were asked directly about problems associated with sport for development and peace. These other scholars analyzed what were, in many cases, public relations documents produced by sport for development organizations (or organizations invested in sport for development programs) such as the United Nations at the Sport and Development Conference in 2003 (Giulianotti, 2004), published testimonials on the Right to Play website (Darnell, 2007), and United Nations sport for development policy documents (Hayhurst, 2009). While this may seem like a small difference, I suggest that this research
demonstrates in a unique way that unnuanced understandings of the ‘power of sport’ is pervasive within these organizations. Such a finding might tell us something about the potential that exists (and does not exist) within the ICC and MCC for more reflexive decision-making when it comes to sport-related development work. As I note later, though, there are exceptions to this finding that are equally relevant in this context.

The particular power of cricket

Along with the more general comments that were made pertaining to sport’s potential as a development tool, these key decision-makers made specific arguments for the utility of cricket to support development goals on the basis that cricket had innate and unique characteristics that lends itself to achieving development objectives in ways that other sports do not. These assertions were similar to arguments made by Armstrong (2004) in his study investigating the possibilities of using soccer to promote peace and child rights in Liberia. Armstrong (2004) describes the uses of soccer by organizations such as the Bosco Project (an organization that provided shelter to orphans up to the to age of 19) to provide opportunities to young people. While Armstrong (2004) does note that soccer has not changed problematic political and social structures throughout Liberia, he also contends that the sport may provide a ‘neutral arena’ where ex-combatants and citizens may begin “re-forming Liberian social identities and social understandings” (p. 495) and act as ,“an avenue to better health, lessons on morality, the sacrifices teamwork requires, the need for charity and selflessness, and generally offer itself as a workable metaphor” (p.495). While the difference between Armstrong’s (2004) arguments and the discussions in this study is that the interviewees in my
study were arguing for cricket’s potential (instead of soccer’s potential) to achieve development goals, the parallel between these sentiments can be found with respect to the depoliticizing, romanticizing, and positive outlook about the potential of these respective sports for development.

**Personal experiences justifying SDP interventions**

Discussions with executives in the ICC and MCC also revealed that these individuals often relied on their own positive personal experience playing/working in cricket (including personal ‘success stories’ where cricket was able to break down barriers) to assert the value and utility of using the sport as a development tool. These findings are similar to results reported by Darnell (2009, 2010a) in his study of perspectives of volunteers in the Canadian Sport Leadership Corps program organized by Commonwealth Games Canada. For example, Darnell found that SDP volunteers who were asked to reflect on the possibilities and utility of sport to achieve international development goals offered responses that were firmly grounded in their own positive experiences and histories in sport (Darnell, 2009). Additionally, he found that the interns he interviewed described how sport, as an institution that embodies meritocratic values and rewards hard work, is a useful tool for promoting individual responsibility, economic prosperity, and personal success (Darnell, 2010a).

The findings from my study are akin to those outlined by Darnell in the sense that the individuals I interviewed also highlighted the value of sport for changing individuals and/or communities. My findings were also similar in that most of those I spoke with did not seem reflective about the postcolonial context for current SDP programs or about how these
interventions may play a role in sustaining particular barriers and inequalities. Like Darnell (2010a), I also found that those I interviewed focused on the role of sport (in my case, cricket) in the socialization of individuals who are presumably better able to integrate between and within different groups.

While the respondents in Darnell’s (2009) study often discussed positive experiences in sport in vague terms, describing ‘how they always enjoyed sport’ and that ‘sport and physical activity contributed greatly to the (positive, well adjusted, and successful) individuals they had become’, the individuals in my study often discussed highly specific and quite large-scale examples in which they personally experienced the transformational power of the sport. A particular example came from the executive from the MCC who discussed how he spearheaded the first racial integration of two cricket clubs in post-apartheid South Africa as a professional cricket player, captain for the team, and the only White player at the club. Common with responses on Darnell’s (2010a) study, the example put forward by the MCC Executive demonstrates the complex and contradictory aspects of SDP, as the incidents he describes were peace-promoting at the same time as they were reflective of transnational hierarchies and notions of superiority. In this case, the MCC Executive alludes to the fact that his position as captain, professional player, and only British, White athlete at his club left him well-positioned to initiate change.

*Reflexive decision-makers?*

Although my results confirm that, overall, sport-related development goals were justified without much thought given to the prominent critiques that have been lodged at such
work – there were key exceptions to this. These sorts of exceptions are rarely reported in research on SDP because studies on these topics generally focus on promotional materials for SDP organizations. For this reason, the complexities and contradictions that may be part of decision-making are generally invisible in such studies.

The exceptions I refer to here include the two ICC Top-Level Executives interviewed in this study. Both of these individuals hold more power than most within their organization. Each was unusually explicit in their critiques of the SDP movement, citing issues with lack of local consultation and local involvement in decision-making processes and ‘bad practice’. This included ‘taking advantage’ of recipients, lack of breadth and scope in programs, and controversial North/South relations where wealthy Europeans fly in for short periods of time to ‘do’ development. I am also referring to exceptional comments offered by the ICC Country Representatives, who discussed specific challenges they have had in implementing the Street20 program and achieving some of the broader development objectives.

Although the ICC Top-Level Executives broader critiques of development-related work differ from those offered Country Representatives (who focused more on the technical problems associated with implementation), all of these findings are pertinent in the sense that they represent views on SDP that diverge from the usual pro-SDP rhetoric – and may suggest that decision-makers who are supportive of SDP are not necessarily ‘dupes’ who are simply following economics-driven mandates and are unaware of problems with development work. Such a finding is relevant when it comes to theorizing how the incentive systems that underlie SDP-related work guide organizational agenda-setting, sometimes in spite of the critical reflexivity of some decision-makers.
Darnell (2009, 2010a), in his interviews with interns in the sport for development field, also found that some offered critical reflections on the movement. For example, he found that particular interns suggested that their positive experiences in sport and physical activity may have clouded their ability to objectively assess whether these programs were beneficial, and some reconsidered (due to postsecondary education) the assumptions made about sport being inherently good (Darnell, 2010a). He found that some sport for development interns spoke of frustrations or challenges encountered through their participation in sport for development programs, although they continued to stand by the notion of the utilization of sport to redress various inequalities. As a result, Darnell (2009) argues that, despite these more reflexive views on SDP, “… the discursive hegemony of neo-liberal notions of differential inclusion, combined with the ‘universality’ of sport that usurped histories of subordination, contributed to the discursive production of sport as a means of capitalist success” (p. 143).

My results are similar to Darnell’s (2010a) as a few individuals recognized the exclusions and inequalities that remain in spaces where sport for development programs operate. There is an important distinction between the responses of the ICC Country Representatives in my study and the interns in Darnell’s (2009) study however. Darnell (2009) found that some interns recognized and tried to negotiate the exclusions and inequalities that existed in the spaces where they were working (i.e. access to water and food, health care, education, and recreation facilities) and recognized the potential divisive characteristics of sport that might complicate its viability to achieve development objectives. In contrast, the ICC Country Representatives reduced their challenges to ‘technical issues’ in
program operations, simultaneously dismissing the potential controversial nature of these programs and depoliticizing the work they were doing. Still, what is similar in my study and Darnell’s is that the value of sport and development objectives remain unquestioned, and central issues of justice and the contexts in which inequalities were/are produced remains unexamined (Darnell, 2009).

The exceptional results emerging from my interviews with the ICC Top-Level Executives diverge further from Darnell’s findings in this case, since these two individuals engaged with the sorts of highly specific critiques often brought up by scholars investigating sport for development programs. In contrast, respondents in Darnell’s (2010a) study reflected on broad limitations of the movement (i.e. positive sporting experiences may not be universal, and sport may be as divisive as it is inclusive). By engaging in these more specific critiques, the executives I interviewed acknowledged the political and potential controversial nature of their development programs – unlike the ICC Country Representatives and the individuals in Darnell’s study.

In reflection, it would seem from the comments offered by these individuals that it should not be assumed that (all) top-level decision-makers are naïve about the controversial nature of international development and its potential implications, or simply do not care. At the same time, these findings raise questions about why or if it matters whether decision-makers recognize the complexities of doing SDP work since, after all, these individuals (whether skeptical of international development or not) made the seemingly unreflexive decisions to support these programs.
Of course, these decisions ultimately reflect the stated goals and objectives of the various development focused programs that the ICC and MCC are involved in – goals and objectives that I found to be reflective of market-centred, neoliberal approaches to development. In particular, the ICC and MCC prioritized organizational mandates that reflect neoliberal (and arguably neocolonial) ideologies of ‘growing the game’ and reaching ‘untapped markets’ of potential cricket-playing youth. In this way ‘development’ of cricket was tied directly to the opening of new markets and the commodification of the sport in different cultures – reflecting what Maguire (2006) contends is a hallmark form of capitalism.

Additionally, the nature of the programs that the ICC and MCC are spearheading are reflective of neoliberal policies of self-determination (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011; Spaaij, 2009). In particular, when asserting the power of cricket generally, representatives from the ICC discussed how the sport inherently teaches leadership, teamwork, and discipline. When they discussed the promotion of the Street20 program specifically, they spoke of it as a way to foster social integration and inclusion between different races, classes, and genders – and as a way to increase health, problem solving skills, and personal social and physical development. In this way, the discussions by ICC Executives are akin to findings by Darnell (2010a) in his study of volunteers’ experiences within sport for development programs. He found that interns understood sport as a useful method to promote individual responsibility, leadership, and personal accountability – which he argues is reflective of hegemonic notions of competitive sport and capitalist achievement (Darnell, 2010a). The findings of my study
are also reminiscent of Darnell’s (2010a) in that the reliance on sport as a tool for leadership and responsibility suggests a form of neoliberal citizenship through which sport may play a role. Specifically, these programs are premised upon the creation of individuals who possess the particular characteristics required to be ‘successful’ in a world largely governed by neoliberal practices and policies.

Moreover, those interviewed about the Street20 program emphasized that these programs look to target various ‘marginalized’ or ‘isolated’ groups and that they work hard to ensure that their program (and their associated values, objectives, and curricula) is consistent in different regions. These findings are comparable to Spaaij’s (2009) research on the ‘Sport Steward Program’ in Rotterdam, Netherlands. The Sport Steward Program looks to use sport to improve the socioeconomic status and position of marginalized youth by providing employment training and opportunities and life-skills development (Spaaij, 2009). In his evaluation of this program, he found that the goals and expectations of the Street Steward Program are inextricably linked to neoliberal policies in the Netherlands, and are thought to help the country control and normalize behaviours of ethnic minority youths under wider claims of ‘social integration’ (Spaaij, 2009).

Similar to Spaaij’s (2009) conclusions about the Sport Steward Program in the Netherlands, it seemed in my study that the Street20 program is designed to preserve privilege and power in some groups and normalize behaviours and sporting practices of those that are targeted for these programs. By positioning those participating in these programs as passive recipients, the Street20 program (as designed and implemented by those in the ICC) could be interpreted as what Hayhurst (2009) argues is developmental assimilation. In this
case, this means assimilation into a standardized and normalized way of playing cricket and an attempt to normalize the behaviours of those that are marginalized and targeted through these programs (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011; Spaaij, 2009).

Relatedly, the various outreach work conducted by the MCC can be interpreted as a method of (re)inscribing geopolitical privilege, imperial relations, racial/colonial hierarchies, and global relations of inequality (Black, 2010; Darnell, 2012; Guest, 2009; Hayhurst, 2009; Spaaij, 2009). I am referring especially to the MCC Executive’s portrayal of his organization as the generous and benevolent provider of development through the community engagement work with ‘underprivileged’ children who needed to be “brought out of their terrible existences and shown a ray of light” – work he considered to be a ‘moral imperative’.

This is comparable to Darnell’s (2007) finding in his analysis of published testimonials from volunteers on the Right to Play website. He found that the White subject position of the volunteers was constructed as generous and benevolent compared to the participants who were positioned as automatically grateful recipients of development. Following Darnell (2007), the understandings of development as a moral responsibility positions the MCC as the authoritative voice to “represent the Other… based on the perception of the Other’s inability to do so for themselves” (p. 569-570).

Comments by the MCC Executive in this regard could also be subjected to broad critiques of SDP programs as they (re)inforce and legitimize (neo)colonial hierarchies, where Northern/Western organizations have the power to define and conduct development (Black, 2010; Darnell, 2007; Guest, 2009).
Hegemonic Decision-Making and Impression Management

One of the key findings from this study is that the SDP-related decisions that were made — decisions that generally align with the neoliberal development principles that guide the ICC and MCC programs — reflected a hierarchical power structure within these organizations.

This finding could be considered an example of how development-related decision-making is designed to empower some (in this case, the key decision-makers based in England and Dubai) and not others (Black, 2010). In this way, the decision-making processes identified in my study would be open to the sorts of critiques offered by scholars such as McEwan (2009) and Parpart (2002), who describe how those in the Global North continue to essentialize, define, and prescribe ‘solutions’ on behalf of those who ‘require developing’. In fact, decision-making by top executives in the ICC and MCC could be seen as colonial – since the marginalized groups (often those receiving development programs) in the ICC and MCC-driven programs continue to struggle for representation, and their voices are absent in decision-making dialogue (Crabbe, 2009; Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011; McEwan, 2001, 2009).

These findings are also reminiscent of Nicholls’ (2009) study of the contributions of peer educators and youth leaders within the SDP movement. Nicholls (2009) notes that colonial relations are sustained through the preservation of hierarchies of power and knowledge. She argues that sport for development initiatives are often dominated by a ‘vertical hierarchy’. By this she means that although the focus of these programs is on youth development, youth are often denied the opportunity to actively participate in their own social change. While Nicholls’ (2009) argument centres on issues around lack of youth voice,
leadership, and agency in development practices and policies, my results are comparable because those who are the target of ICC and MCC development programs (as expressed through the frustrations of one of the ICC Country Representatives) are also “rarely involved in the policy or programme development process and [are] far removed from financial or long term planning” (Nicholls, 2009, p. 158).

Finally, my finding that the ICC and MCC adopted particular impression management strategies to generate consent for the hierarchical and postcolonial arrangements is reminiscent of Hayhurst’s (2009) study of the development policies of six key SDP documents drawn from the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group and the United Nations. She found that SDP interventions are not driven by the needs of the participants as much as they are driven by the interests of donors, UN agencies and NGOs. She also found that the vague metaphors that are embedded in various SDP policies to describe the targets, outcomes, goals, and strategies of SDP organizations make it difficult to see the ideological differences that exist between more and less powerful partners (e.g., aid providers and recipients) (Hayhurst, 2009).

Globalization of Cricket through International Development

As previously mentioned, discussions with executives in the ICC and MCC revealed that key decision-makers in both organizations are almost exclusively a select group of British men, whose top priority is to grow the game of cricket. However, it is important to note that the ICC and MCC were concerned with growing a particular form of cricket,
placing emphasis on diffusing particular characteristics assumed to be inherent to the sport as
a way of achieving broader development goals.

These findings align with Malcolm’s (2013) discussion of ‘imperial nationalism’ as it relates to colonial and post-colonial cricket. He notes that despite the significant shift from colonial to post-colonial relations, and the shift in the power centre of the sport out of England to India, notions of cricket as the ‘quintessential English game’ and a hallmark of British Imperialism remain deeply connected (Malcolm, 2013). Malcolm (2013) specifically discusses ‘imperial nationalism’ as the ways that imperial nations create very specific kinds of nationalism that are distinct from non-imperial nations, as an Empire is comprised of many ethnicities. Thus, imperialists must define their difference and/or superiority in terms of the imperial mission rather than the individuals that created it (Malcolm, 2013). As he notes, inequality was essential to imperialism, and cricket and British imperialism were made possible because they were promoted with a veneer of equity (Malcolm, 2013).

The development programs that the ICC and MCC are supporting could be interpreted as ‘imperial nationalism’ in three key ways. First, these programs are decided on and promoted by a select group of British males – regardless of where they work and where these programs operate. Second, and especially in the case of the MCC outreach work and the ICC Street20 Program, both organizations emphasize their particular interest in promoting specific ‘assumed’ characteristics of cricket such integrity, honesty, fair play, teamwork, and responsibility through international development work. Combined, these two factors would support Malcolm’s (2013) view that the British continue to play an active role “in reproducing the enigmatic, ineffable character of cricket” (p.163).
Thirdly, and as discussed earlier, the development-related decisions, plans and programs produced by the ICC and MCC provide an illusion of equality in decision-making. The hegemonic decision-making practices and impression management strategies of both organizations preserve and privilege imperial hierarchical relations between these organizations (and, by extension, the men who make these decisions) and those that these programs target. As executives in both the ICC and MCC discussed, the passing of development-related decisions was reliant on the presentation of an image of inclusivity, transparency, and participation of multiple groups in decision-making processes. This pretense of inclusivity when it comes to dealing with external groups sits interestingly beside the apparently unreflexive acknowledgment and acceptance of ongoing inequalities that continue to exist within cricket-related governance structures (James, 1963; Malcolm, 2013). While the net result in both cases seems to be the same – unequal and hierarchal power relations are reinforced – I suggest that my finding that the ICC and MCC claim to value inclusivity in the one instance, and embrace inequality in the other instance (e.g., the impetus to ‘quell’ the resistance from non-central decision-makers), is akin to findings offered by James (1963) and Malcolm (2013). That is to say, James and Malcolm both noted, like I am, that inequality within cricket-related governance structures was actively promoted by dominant groups and consented to by marginalized groups, with little obvious tension.

However, Malcolm (2013) also asserts that the active role that the English play in reproducing particular understandings of the sport are complicated by the fact that cricket is subject to an intentional obfuscation. This obfuscation results in boundaries being erected and maintained between those who ‘understand’ and those ‘who do not’ (as explained by it being...
rarely understood by those in places such as Canada, Europe, and South America that do not have cricket cultures. He argues that this deliberate obscuring of the game by the English is one way to maintain hierarchies between those who belong and those who do not.

In contrast, my results suggest that the decision to support international development programs by the ICC and MCC might be reflective of an attempt to break down these boundaries. This was emphasized when executives from the ICC discussed how the Street20 program deliberately employs a simplified version of the sport that can be played in almost any location in order to help make it more accessible to those who are unfamiliar to the game. Indeed, the ICC executives highlighted that another goal of the Street20 program was to help change the image of cricket to something that is more inclusive, exciting, and fun. The MCC had similar objectives with local community outreach projects, as well as future outreach with the cricket communities in India with the idea being that these initiatives would help change the image of the MCC as being exclusive and unconcerned with those unable to afford membership. Of course, these comments made by ICC and MCC executives must be understood alongside these organizations’ problematic neoliberal and neocolonial organizational mandates. Put simply, this highlights that these processes are rather complicated and messy. Even if these programs do reflect an attempt to break down barriers and make the sport more inclusive, these programs are still intended to assimilate individuals in the ‘English’ game, and its associations with morality, fair play, cooperation, and integrity (Malcolm, 2013).
Cricket and globalization

This study also contributes to the literature on cricket and globalization. Contemporary literature on sociology of cricket has focused almost exclusively on international test cricket. While there is significant breadth in this literature – including work looking at portrayals of race in sport media, power relations between the cricketing super-powers, resistance to colonialism and (post)colonial relations, and ways in which populations are “Othered” in different cricket contexts – the scope still remains limited (Carrington, 2002; Gupta, 2009; Mehta et al., 2009; Malcolm, 2009, 2013; Nandy, 1989; Sen, 2001). Conversations with key executives in both the ICC and MCC revealed that supporting international development was a way through which these organizations could achieve external organizational goals of globalizing the sport. Specifically, this study highlights a new facet of globalization – that is, international development as a form of globalization – that is not addressed in the existing literature on cricket. Ultimately, the findings of this thesis raise questions about the ways in which cricket is implicated in the SDP movement, how the relationship between cricket and development is shaped by (post)colonial relationships and imperialism, and the implications of this method of globalizing the sport for both the ‘globalizers’ and the recipients.

The literature on sport and urban (re)development is also pertinent to this study as the MCC is looking to build branded, cricket-focused communities across India. Although it was not something that was featured as prominently, this is certainly another way in which the globalization of the sport is being promoted as ‘international development’. In fact, and following Silk (2004), the building of these communities is an example of the adoption of an
entrepreneurial stance to redevelop spaces around very specific ideologies and identities. In this particular case, it is possible that the MCC and their real estate development partner will be refurbishing the communities around a specific British ideology, history, and vision (Silk, 2004). Assumed here is the ‘legitimacy’ of the MCC to develop communities, cricket grounds and clubs within India, which also further reinforces neocolonial sensibilities that position Britain as the ‘home’ and standard of the sport. The underlying assumption that the MCC would bring a ‘superior’ standard of cricket to these developments – a rather questionable and spurious assumption based on the popularity of cricket within India and current cricket world rankings that place India above England in two of three categories (International Cricket Council, 2014b) – becomes even more pronounced as the MCC has the power to control the symbolic meanings and interpretations of these spaces (Silk, 2004). This also highlights how these (post)colonial branded communities are bound within an ‘imagined geography’ (Said, 1978) that is manifest in vocabularies and images of people and places that position the global North as the highest stage of civilization and the standard to which other societies should strive to attain (Hall, 1992; McEwan, 2009).

Relatedly, the MCC Executive spoke about “opening up the cricket facilities and making facilities open to local people, however poor they are” while having “some controls” and having “designated people to run those programs.” Interesting here is that the MCC Executive was specific about there ‘being controls’ (meaning only some will be granted access), and that the MCC will have ‘designated people’ (MCC trained and approved) to run these specific ‘inclusion’ programs. In this way, the moral compass that drives this neoliberal and neocolonial development includes a focus on allowing those who would not necessarily
have the purchasing power to access these facilities — yet, at the same time, allowing only a select few to be included, and to subject those who are included to particular ‘controls’. Thus, those granted access (including those approved to run these programs) may have to ensure that acceptable British, upper/middle class standards of being and behaviours are being portrayed and that markers of “Otherness” (i.e. markers of difference, traditionalism, and poverty) are left behind.

Further, this fortified, exclusive development project, like other new build gentrification/gated community developments, could, albeit perversely, be premised upon a fear of the ‘Other’ leading to the exclusion of those who are unable/unwilling to afford to consume (England & Simon, 2010). This results in the maintenance of (post)colonial hierarchies in which the MCC — as one of the most venerated colonial institutions (Stoddart & Sandiford, 1998) — repositions the Indian ‘Other’ as in need of development. This ‘Other’ is excluded from development practices and processes, yet selectively ‘invited in’ through assimilation.
Chapter 6: Conclusion and Future Recommendations

This study examined how and why decisions are made by executives at the highest institutional levels in international cricket organizations to support international development work. Interviews with executives in the ICC and MCC were used as a departure point for exploring development-related decision-making practices, how development initiatives are portrayed to intra and extra-organizational stakeholders, and how top-level decision-makers perceive the concept of ‘development’ and development-related issues. A postcolonial theoretical approach, informed by literatures on sport for development and peace, cricket and globalization, and sport and urban (re)development helped me to illuminate how (neo)colonial hierarchies are maintained in decision-making around development initiatives, how neoliberal sensibilities are privileged in the development projects that these organizations are involved in, and how international development is used as a form of globalization of cricket.

Contributions

This study contributed to key literatures in a few ways. First, by interviewing key executives within the ICC, this study offers a different perspective that is not offered presently in the SDP literature. Scholars have investigated a wide range of perspectives in studies on the SDP movement that included volunteers that are working on the ground (Darnell, 2010a, 2010b, 2012), recipients in communities where these programs are being
conducted (Guest, 2009; Hayhurst, 2011), individuals representing community-based organizations and NGOs (Giulianotti, 2011; Hayhurst, 2011), and executives of corporate transnational corporations that are financing various SDP programs (Hayhurst, 2011). In having discussions with executives of the international cricket organizations that are implementing development work, I attempt to complement and offer nuance to this existing research.

This study also contributes to the literature on cricket and globalization by investigating the multiple ways that cricket is being utilized as a development tool by the two most influential international cricket organizations. The majority of studies on the sociology of cricket consider the changing meanings of the sport through formal decolonization, (post)colonial assertions of power and the rise of Indian dominance in international fixtures, and the ways in which cricket is bound with various forms of colonial and postcolonial national identities (Gupta, 2009; James, 1963; Majumdar, 2007; Malcolm 2013). While I found that the ways in which cricket for development programs implemented by the ICC and MCC may be a form of ‘imperial nationalism’ (Malcolm, 2013), this study also illuminates forms of the globalization of cricket that exist outside elite, international cricket matches — and how these forms of globalization continue to be implicated in and constrained by (post)colonial tensions.

Furthermore, through interviews with key executives in both the ICC and MCC, this study highlights the variety of ways that cricket is being used in development. This included SDP programs (like the Street20 program by the ICC and charity work in Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, and Rwanda by the MCC) and also international urban developments, such as the
building of branded communities in India by the MCC. Thus, this study bridged SDP, cricket and globalization, and sport and urban (re)development literatures together – literatures often considered separately. While most studies focus on particular case studies of singular programs/initiatives that various organizations are involved in (see Armstrong, 2004; Guest, 2009; among others), I draw attention to the idea that ‘international development’ means different things in different contexts, and that international sport organizations such as the ICC and MCC have multifaceted conceptions of development. Drawing together these literatures in my analysis also illuminated ways that institutions like the ICC and MCC are connected to broader political discourses of international development, space, and globalization.

**Future directions**

As previously mentioned, by interviewing executives of the ICC and MCC, this study provides a perspective not foregrounded in current literature on SDP. However, a sample of 9 key executives is not representative of all perspectives of decision-makers who influence SDP programs and their implementation. Even within this study there was a wide variety of perspectives and experiences, which make it challenging to make claims about any kind of unified perceptions of SDP by top-level executives implementing such initiatives. While this study attempted to fill a gap in the literature by engaging in conversations with key decision-makers in the ICC and MCC, top-level executives remain an underrepresented group in research on SDP. Future studies should pursue discussions with this population (including those involved with different organizations, using different sports, and in different contexts)
to continue to build understandings of the ways in which sport is being implemented as a
development tool, and with what understandings — and assess whether there are, in fact,
contexts where elites who acknowledge problems with SDP have been able to act on these
perspectives on an organizational level. This would also serve as a jumping off point to
engage in dialogue with these key decision-makers about these sorts of programs and
potential implications.

Second, this study also explored how these programs are promoted and explained to
various stakeholders in different contexts. While interviews with executives provided
answers to this question, future research could look to combine interview data with document
analysis as a way of further exploring and tracing how development-related decisions are
made, and how these decisions are then translated into diverse ‘marketable’ meanings. As
Darnell (2009) notes, diversity in data and perspectives add depth to studies in this area, and
allows researchers to more readily question how the SDP sector fits broadly into global sport
industries. In this way, combining different types of data (from interviews, to public
documents, and information disseminated through social media platforms) would provide a
means to offer more nuanced and multi-perspectival understandings of sport for development
practices and policies – and the fluid and rapidly changing contexts that these sorts of
programs operate within.

Finally, by only interviewing top-level decision-makers in the ICC and MCC about
their development-related perceptions and practices, this is still only ‘one’ perspective (elite)
of many involved in sport and international development. As Hayhurst (2011) argues, studies
– such as this one – that analyze perceptions of those representing NGOs or international
sport organizations say little about the details of the delivery, implementation, and reception of sport for development programs and seldom recognize transnational and cross-cultural dynamics that influence these programs. Scholars such as Kidd (2008), Giulianotti (2011) and Hayhurst (2011) have become increasingly concerned about the relationships between SDP and the sport-industrial complex and as such have advocated for research that investigates the multiple groups involved. A way to address these questions is to use a multi-sited, multi-level global ethnography (e.g. Burawoy et al. (2000)), an approach to future research that would allow for the foregrounding of perspectives from individuals in different positions in the ‘development chain’.

An overarching question from this study is why or if it matters if top-level executives are reflexive, critical, skeptical, or recognize complexities of doing SDP work since they make decisions to support these programs anyway. In this way, I do not have specific recommendations directed at key decision-makers working in SDP, as my findings suggest that such recommendations would be ineffective — since key decision-makers, even if they are reflexive and critical, rarely, if ever, make decisions diverge from organizational mandates. This is not to say that it is pointless to have reflexive individuals that are in-tune with critiques of SDP working in sport organizations, but rather, it suggests that there are larger structures that prevent these critiques from being prioritized in decision-making processes.

Perhaps instead of directing suggestions at decision-makers, attention should be focused upon organizational structures and incentive systems that impact SDP agenda-setting. This becomes most clear when considering different ways that the development
programs were portrayed within and outside the ICC and MCC. The current incentive system for these organizations is such that it makes sense to externally “sell” these programs as social development initiatives, even when these organizations are operating as neoliberal, capital-driven enterprises — that are ultimately concerned about profit and survival, and less about the social concerns that they choose to pursue. My point is that the system governing SDP programs (as designed and implemented by multinational sport organizations) must change or we should not expect international sport organizations to be up-front or straightforward about their development programs and the ‘true’ motivations that underlie them.
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Appendix A1 — Interview Protocol for ICC

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself? What is your role in the ICC and how did you come to be in this role?

2. Tell me about the work you and your organization is doing around ‘development’
   
   *What does development mean to the ICC/your organization?*

4. Can you tell me about any development projects that you are aware of?
   
   *How did you come to do these programs?*
   
   *Who decided to do this?*
   
   *How was the decision made?*
   
   *Were these easy decisions to make?*
   
   *Were there any debates between different stakeholders?*
   
   *If there was disagreements could you offer any insight into what factors were taken into account?*
   
   *Are these related to the any ICC mandates? Which ones? Is this a particular focus of the ICC?*
   
   *How are these programs promoted?*
   
   *Are there different strategies for different audiences?*

5. How do you assess whether these programs are working?
   
   *Have there been any challenges in operating/assessing these programs?*
   
   *How have your organization responded to these challenges?*

6. In the field I work within, there are debates whether these sorts of programs work. Some think these leading to measurable social change in some contexts, but not everyone thinks this is a good idea because sport can be as divisive as it is inclusive and these programs are, at times, implemented with little local consultation. Any thoughts on these debates?

7. Do you have any suggestions or ideas that might be helpful for me to continue my research?
Appendix A2 — Interview Protocol for MCC

1. Can you tell me a little bit about yourself? What is your role in the MCC and how did you come to this role?

2. Can you tell me a little bit about the work that you and your organization are doing around development?
   *What does development mean to you and the MCC?*

3. Can you tell me about any development projects that you are aware of?
   *How did you come to do these programs?*
   *How was the decision made?*
   *Were these easy decisions to make?*
   *Were there any debates between different stakeholders?*
   *If there was disagreements could you offer any insight into what factors were taken into account?*
   *Are these related to the any MCC/ICC Mandates?*
   *How are these programs promoted?*
   *Are there different strategies for different audiences?*

4. What about the partnership with Anglo Indian?
   *What are the goals of this partnership?*
   *How and why did you come to create this partnership?*
   *Were there debates between different stakeholders about forming this partnership and its goals?*
   *If there was disagreements could you offer any insight into what factors were taken into account*
   *Is this related to any mandates of the MCC? Which ones?*
   *How is this partnership promoted?*
   *Are there different strategies for different audiences?*

5. How are these programs/the partnership going?
   *What is going well and what isn’t going well?*
   *Have there been any challenges?*
   *How has your organization responded to these challenges?*

6. In the field I work within, there are debates about these sorts of programs. Some think these leading to measurable social change in some contexts, but not everyone thinks this is a good idea because sport can be as divisive as it is inclusive and these programs are, at times, implemented with little local consultation. Any thoughts on these debates?

7. Do you have any suggestions or ideas that might be helpful for my research?
Appendix B1 — Letter of Contact

Date ***

Dear ***

My name is Devra Waldman and I am a master’s student in the school of Kinesiology at the University of British Columbia. I am specializing in the study of sport and international development. I am conducting a study for my master’s thesis that is intended to find out more about how decisions are made by executives of the International Cricket Council or the International Cricket Council’s supported development-focused programs to support international development work. I also hope to learn more about the perspectives of key decision-makers about development-related issues.

The goal of this letter is to request an interview with you to discuss topics related to decisions to support and engage in cricket-focused international development programs. Your involvement in this study would be most helpful and appreciated as I try to learn more about how decisions are made to support cricket-focused international development programs and how these development goals are portrayed to different stakeholders. While this study will be the focus of my master’s thesis, it is my hope that the information attained from this study would extend current understandings about the role that cricket is playing in international development and expand on limited knowledge concerning how decisions are made by executives in prominent sporting organizations (such as yourself) regarding development work. I also hope to inspire balanced thinking about the benefits of and potential problems associated with sport-for-development work among policy-makers, funders and corporate philanthropists who also support these programs.

I have attached an information and consent sheet that gives you more information about the study and about the guidelines that this study will follow regarding confidentiality and research ethics.

After you have had a chance to look over the information and consent sheet, please let me know if you are interested in being involved in the study by email. If you are interested, we can work out a time and location for an interview that is convenient for you.

Thank you very much for time and considering this request. I look forward to being in touch.

Sincerely
Devra Waldman.
Appendix B2 — Information and Consent Form

INFORMATION AND CONSENT SHEET: FOR A STUDY OF CRICKET AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Study Title: Cricket and International Development: Perceptions of Key Decision-Makers

Brief Description of the Study: It is well known that many international sporting organizations (such as the International Olympic Committee, and FIFA) and non-sporting organizations (such as the United Nations) are increasingly supporting sport-focused programs that have broader goals of improving the health of vulnerable groups, combating HIV/AIDS, achieving gender equity, and/or reducing poverty. I am also aware that the International Cricket Council is involved with many cricket-focused development programs of these kinds in many different geographic regions. For example, through the Think Wise Campaign, the ICC has partnered with UNICEF and UNAIDS and is supporting programs that link cricket to broader messages of HIV/AIDS prevention.

To date, however, researchers have focused little attention on cricket-related international development work, with most studies in this topic area concentrating on development programs that use football, martial arts, or basketball. Since each sport is used differently in different international development contexts, and sports may have different meanings for participants in these contexts, a study of cricket-focused international development programs is timely and relevant. Also, most of the studies on sport-related international development focus on how programs are monitored and evaluated, strategies for program delivery and the potential impacts of these programs. Little is known, however, about how decisions are made at the highest institutional levels to support sport-focused development work and the perspectives of these key decision-makers on development.

With these concerns in mind, I have developed a study of the International Cricket Council that is guided by three broad goals. The first is to find out more about how decisions are made by executives of the International Cricket Council or the International Cricket Council’s supported development-focused programs to engage in international development work. The second is to learn more about the perspectives of the key decision-makers about cricket-focused development work and development-related issues. The third is to find out about how development-related goals and issues are conveyed to different groups both within and outside the International Cricket Council.

The Researcher and Project Funding: This study is conducted through the School of Kinesiology at the University of British Columbia. Devra Waldman is the primary researcher for the study. Devra Waldman is a Master’s student at the University of British Columbia in Kinesiology and is specializing in the study of sport and development. This study is the focus of her master’s thesis. Dr. Brian Wilson is Devra’s thesis supervisor and is a Professor in Kinesiology. This project is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and through the Vice President, Research and International Office at the University of British Columbia.
The Interview and Your Participation: Your experiences in and perspectives on how and why decisions are made to support cricket-focused development programs would be extremely helpful and much appreciated as I try to learn more about the topics mentioned above. The interview would take approximately one hour, depending on your availability. Most of the questions are fairly general. The interview will be recorded on a digital recorder.

Confidentiality. Your identity will be kept anonymous. All identifying information will be removed from any data and your name will not be referred to in any documents that emerge from the study. The recordings of the interview will be stored in a locked cabinet and all transcripts from the interview will stored on a password-protected computer.

Your Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to not answer any question and you may withdraw from the interview at any time. If you have any concerns about your rights as a research subject, feel free to telephone the Office of Research Services at the University of British Columbia, at 604-822-8598.

How the Study Findings Will be Helpful: The information attained from this study is intended to extend understandings of the role that cricket is playing in international development. It is also hoped that this study will expand on limited research concerning how decisions are made by prominent sporting organizations regarding development work. The ultimate goal of this study is to inspire further thinking about the benefits of and potential problems with sport-for-development work. The hope also is that study findings will be useful for those who promote, design and implement these programs, as well as for policy-makers, funders and the corporate philanthropists who support these programs. The work would also be published in academic journals and/or as a report. All published material would be made available to study participants on request.

Further Contact Information or Concerns: If you have questions or would like further information about the study, please contact Devra Waldman. You can also contact Devra Waldman’s thesis supervisor, Dr. Brian Wilson.

CONSENT

I have read the above information and understand the nature of the study. I understand that participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate in or withdraw from the study at any time.

I hereby agree to the above stated conditions and consent to participate in the study.

Your signature below indicates that you have received an information consent sheet for your own records. Your signature also indicates that you consent to participate in this study.

Signed: ____________________________

Dated: ________________