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ABSTRACT

The bicycle has been hailed by The United Nations and various non-governmental organizations for its use in environmentally-friendly forms of social and economic development (Yang & Wu, 2015). Despite these claims, there remains a lacuna of research exploring the value of bicycles outside of Europe and America (Sengers, 2016). Specifically, there is a lack of research on: the structure and goals of ‘bicycles for development’ (BFD) organizations; how bicycles are used for development purposes; the perspectives of those involved in BFD; and the politics and complexities of bicycle-driven development work related to globalization.

Responding to these shortcomings, the overarching goal of this study was to better understand how bicycles are being used as an international development tool. This research was guided by pertinent literature on ‘sport for development and peace’ (Darnell, 2012), neoliberal approaches to development (Wilson & Hayhurst, 2009) post/colonialism (Carrington, 2015), and globalization (Tsing, 2005). In order to bring focus to this study of the global BFD movement—and how it is understood and experienced in relation to particular contexts where BFD is prominent—I conducted semi-structured interviews in various regions of Uganda with 19 individuals associated with 10 BFD organizations.

Research results included that: (1) BFD organizations exist along a spectrum, with some being ‘top down’, international, and economics-focused – and others being ‘bottom-up’, domestic, and community-focused (and most having features of both); (2) meanings ascribed to the bicycle are unstable and context dependent, which impacts how bicycles are used as a development tool; and, (3) as bicycles move to and within Uganda, various forms of ‘friction’ (Tsing, 2005) are encountered, that lead to challenges for BFD providers and recipients. I conclude by suggesting that while bicycles are considered useful for a range of development purposes, perspectives on their usefulness varies. It is also clear that inequalities commonly
associated with sport for development are evident in the BFD movement too, although there are some unique features of BFD in this regard. I recommend further research on how local populations understand the bicycle, with a focus on the extent to which local interests and needs are taken up.
LAY SUMMARY

The United Nations and various non-governmental organizations have shipped bicycles globally to reduce poverty, gender inequality and provide people with mobility, creating the ‘bicycles for development’ (BFD) movement. In order to study the global BFD movement, and bring focus to my study, I traveled to Uganda and conducted semi-structured interviews with 19 individuals associated to 10 BFD organizations. Results of the research found that there are a range of features across the BFD organizations and that the meaning of the bicycle is context dependent. I also found that bicycles in the BFD movement travel around the world in complex ways, and encounter friction that either facilitate or impede global movement. I conclude by suggesting that while bicycles are considered useful (and for many, crucial) for a range of development purposes, perspectives varied on just how useful they are, and on the ways that bicycles are useful.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“[Bicycles] provide crucial mobility access to markets, healthcare, schools... [and] employment opportunities” (Starkey & Hine, 2014, p. 3) commissioned by UN Habitat and Overseas Development Institute.

Bicycles have been hailed by The United Nations and various non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as an innovative and effective response to socioeconomic barriers (Yang & Wu, 2015), with reports highlighting that bicycles can be used as a sustainable mode of transportation (Dora, Hosking, Mudu, & Fletcher, n.d.). Bicycles have also been employed to increase access to education\(^1\), have been given to health care workers\(^2\) and have been used as entrepreneurial tools\(^3\) to contribute to individual and community economic growth. Additionally, cycling has been discussed as directly linked to delivering on 11 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) (European Cyclists’ Federation, 2016).

Although the bicycle has been valorized as a transformative object, there is limited literature that has explored the bicycle as an international development tool. In this thesis, I describe and provide background for my study that was designed to explore how bicycles were utilized as a tool to ‘develop’ communities socially, economically and environmentally—the triple-bottom line of sustainability (Chernushenko, van der Kamp & Stubbs, 2001). While remaining cognizant of the colonial history of Africa and the deployment of international aid, through neoliberal globalization—which Hayhurst, Wilson and Frisby (2010) discussed as “fostering an environment where various non-state actors congregate to promote market-oriented approaches to development” (p. 319)—I examined the various ways that bicycles have been

---

\(^1\) Organizations such as Coop Africa, Bicycles Against Poverty, Bicycles for Humanity (B4H) and Ride 4 Women have donated bicycles for education initiatives.


\(^3\) Bicycles have been donated for job development, microfinancing and entrepreneurialism from B4H, Bikes Not Bombs, Coop Africa, Ride4Women and World Bicycle Relief.
utilized, the perceptions of people involved, and the structure of organizations and processes of globalization within the network of Bicycles for Development (BFD).

1.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this section, I discuss and justify the research questions that guided my research. See below.

1) What are the characteristics of the various organizations involved in BFD (e.g. how are they structured and what are the goals and missions of these organizations)?

This question explored the relative similarities and differences between various organizations in an attempt to illuminate and understand their origin (e.g., is the organization grassroots?), their mission/ goals, who was involved, funding and how they were structured (i.e. top-down or bottom-up) in order to gain a deeper understanding of what the BFD movement was, as well as the range of features, strengths and issues of the movement, in the national context of Uganda.

2) How is the bicycle being used as an international ‘development’ tool (what assumptions about bicycles underlie their utilization for development purposes)?

Coupled with the first question, the exploration of the bicycle as an international development tool involved looking at the goals and mission statements of the various organizations involved, specifically exploring assumptions about the bicycle, the intended/ unintended usages of the bike, and who did/ did not have access. Moreover, this question probed at the various applications of the bicycle as a tool aimed at targeting a range of social and economic problems—with the intention of addressing the potential hegemony, defined as “power relations and social processes that underlie inequality” (Wilson, 2012, p. 32) and how consent is generated for unequal arrangements—within relationships in the BFD movement, by locating an individual’s actions “within relations of dominance and subordination […] to expose the workings of power, but also to change inequalities” (Thorpe & Olive, 2016, p. 128). The first two research questions explored how these organizations represented themselves on their
websites, media and publicly available documents, as well as what those individuals interviewed in this research, who were associated with the BFD organizations, chose to say to me about their mission statements, goals and experiences within the movement.

3) What are the perspectives of those involved in such bicycle-driven development on their work and industry?

By conversing with BFD representatives (founders, employees and volunteers), as well as beneficiary organizations, this question explored the complexities and tensions embedded within this movement. Participants, who occupied different social positions, shared their perspectives on BFD, which unearthed some contradictions in how the bicycle was talked about. In this sense, I explored taken-for-granted assumptions about the bicycle by discussing the ways that it was (and was not) useful as a means to intervene and ‘solve’ social and economic problems.

4) What can be learned about globalization processes and the impacts of technologies traveling to and within the Two-Thirds World?

Lastly, as the BFD movement involved the transfer of capital, media, bikes, ideologies and bodies within a network of actors situated in various locales around the world, this research contributed to the literature that explores various forms of globalization as activities at the micro-level that influence, and are influenced by, the macro global community (Wilson, 2012). In order to do this, I attended to the multi-layered and multi-faceted experiences of individuals involved in BFD in Uganda. I connected my research to literature on international development and sport for development and peace (SDP), as a way of aiding my attempts to theorize how the bicycle (re)produced and reflected forms of globalization.
1.2 JUSTIFICATION AND RATIONALE

As noted earlier, bicycles have been hailed by the UN and NGOs as a technology to support various forms of development. Although there is a growing body of literature examining SDP (Darnell, 2007; Forde, 2015; Hayhurst, 2014a/b, and many more), to my knowledge, there has been no research that has explored how the bicycle might be understood in relation to this literature. This research was designed to fill this gap.

Theoretically speaking, this research contributed to a deeper understanding of globalization by exploring the multi-layered experiences of people in an interconnected “world as a whole” (p. 20, Robertson, 1990) by attending to the transfer of capital, media, bodies, bicycles (as a technology) and ideas that move to and from the One-Thirds World and the Two-Thirds World. The process of globalization—as it pertains in this case to NGOs, locals and bicycles—is highly political, and known to operate along a global chain of connections, disconnections and reconnections (Burawoy, 2001). Additionally, globalization processes occur through different features (objects, people, ideas, etc.) interacting across distance, creating friction and shaping global forces (Tsing, 2005). Although there has been research that has explored the intended and unintended consequences of globalization (Giulianotti, 2004; Thibault, 2009), there has been little in-depth research on BFD as a form of globalization.

In addition to contributing to the literature, this research had practical implications. By conversing with representatives of BFD organizations, I considered the common assumptions made about bicycles and the experiences of those involved in the BFD movement. Throughout this thesis, I elaborate on how inequalities were both addressed through and reflected in the BFD

---

4 Throughout this thesis, I will use the terminology of ‘One-Third World’ and ‘Two-Thirds World’ to refer to the Global North and Global South, respectively. I do this in line with Hayhurst (2013), who also employed this terminology in solidarity with Esteva and Prakash (1998), suggesting that these “terms represent the social minorities and majorities in both the North and South while attempting to remove ideological and geographical binaries as found in other terms (e.g. North/South)” (p. 9).
movement. I also highlight field notes and provide embodied reflections on being a White Canadian female conducting research in Uganda. Lastly, I compiled some recommended ‘best-practices’ based off what people involved in the movement told me about what does and doesn’t work (e.g. information about the factors that facilitate and impede the movement of bicycles across borders and information about gender and class-related barriers to participation in BFD in local settings) that may lead to improvements in the work of these various organizations and other stakeholders in the movement.

1.3 THEORETICAL APPROACH AND KEY CONCEPTS

This research was situated within a critical interpretivist paradigm – meaning that the research was rooted in the assumption that social reality is entrenched in tensions and conflicts that are bound by material, cultural and historical contexts – all of which influence how individuals make and assign meaning (Neuman, 2003), and, in turn, how knowledge is constructed and reconstructed (Burke, 2016). I note this as background for my research as I contextually analyzed the BFD movement in Uganda and attended to the meanings that those working in the BFD movement ascribed to their own situations and activities.

Working from this position, I will spend the rest of this section outlining a set of key concepts and perspectives that, in a more specific way, guided and underpinned the research I conducted, focused on BFD.

Globalization

As previously mentioned, globalization is a highly politicized, complex and contested term. Robertson (1992) offered a working definition of globalization as a “compression of the world and intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (as cited in Thibault, 2009, p. 2). In viewing the world as an interconnected whole, Harvey, Horne and Safai (2009) further discussed how globalization encompasses intertwining cultural, social, technological, political
and economic dimensions—with the last two variables arguably dominating attention and driving changes in the other categories. In order to think through these interacting variables, I used Appadurai’s (1996) five ‘scapes’ to conceptualize how globalization occurred within and across the following areas: “ideoscapes (referring to the ways that ideas are transmitted across borders); finescapes (referring to the transfer of capital across borders); mediascapes (referring to the global reach of mass media); technoscapes (referring to the global movement of technologies); [and] ethnoscapes (referring to the movement of people across borders)” (as cited in Wilson, 2012, p. 64).

In recognition of the contention around globalization, Burawoy (2001) highlighted how “globalization is produced and consumed not in thin air, not in some virtual reality but in real organizations, institutions, communities” (p. 148) which allowed me to think through how global forces influence culture. Burawoy (2001) further advocated for the need to look at “the standpoint of participants located at the intersection of the most remote forces, connections and imaginations” (p. 148), because these perspectives illuminate how the ‘global’ is taken up ‘locally’, highlighting how the two are highly interwoven processes that cannot be disconnected.

More specifically, a goal of this research was to think about how what happened locally can be extended to enable understandings of globalization processes more broadly. In order to theorize my research in this way, I followed the three tenets of Burawoy’s (2001) global ethnography. First, he acknowledged the reception and contestation of the global as (re)produced in the local, specifically encouraging the restoration of agency to the local. Second, he regarded the “‘local’ [as] no longer oppos[ing] but constitute[ing] the global”, as the global is produced in the local through processes of globalization, which he argued can occur through the “production of (dis)connections” (pp. 157-158). Lastly, he highlighted how within “the process of production there is a politics of production” (p. 158). Using this framework as a guiding theoretical
approach, I attended to the politics of BFD production and distribution that took place to, and within, the Two-Thirds Worlds.

In recognizing the range of ways that different parts of the world are interconnected – and different approaches to understanding such interconnections – there have been especially heated debates about economic globalization and neoliberalism as the “dominant approaches to governance and international relations in the current historical moment” (Wilson, 2012, p. 71). For example, scholars like Cohen (2014) have argued that, over decades, globalization has redistributed wealth between and within nations through “the uneven spread of economic development and consumption” (as cited in Lafferty, 2016, p. 140). Thibault (2009) also acknowledged that “the globalization of sport has been achieved at the expense of individuals, organizations, and countries with limited resources” (p. 4) reiterating the argument made by others that “globalization has not been favourable for all” (p. 4).

As previously alluded to, global forces impact the movement of objects around the world. Tsing (2005) highlighted how ‘friction’ keeps global power in motion—and emphasized the importance of interacting variables that define movement, cultural form and agency. She elaborated that:

Friction inflects historical trajectories, enabling, excluding, and particularizing […] Friction makes global connection powerful and effective. Meanwhile, without even trying, friction gets in the way of the smooth operation of global power. Difference can disrupt, causing everyday malfunctions as well as unexpected cataclysms. Friction refuses the lie that global power operates as a well-oiled machine (p. 6)

Tsing described how the flow of global movement increased in the 1990s, with the assumption that goods, ideas, money, people, and objects moved with ease around the world. Fatimah and Arora (2016) built upon the concept of friction, proposing that agency is not just “the capacity of a human being to change a state of affairs, but rather as an effect of actor’s relations with each other” (p. 32). This relational approach accounts for the interaction between humans and non-
humans (such as a bicycle, as explored in this research) that work together to determine motion, development and globalization processes. Therefore, as the environment, objects, people and ideas coalesce in a network of friction, unexpected barriers to movement can arise and impede travel.

**Post/colonialism**

When thinking about the global distribution of aid, and the Global North ‘developing’ the Global South⁵, there are implicit understandings of “who is, and who is not, developed” (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011, p. 185). The implementation of development projects in Africa by those outside of the continent has oftentimes been understood as a neo-colonial endeavor – which was why a postcolonial analytic lens would benefit any study of BFD, like this one. My usage of the term post/colonialism follows Carrington (2015), who employed this terminology—and the use of the ‘/’ between ‘post’ and ‘colonialism’—to signal the “ambivalent tension between the surpassing of formal colonial governance and the continuance of neocolonial relations” (p. 113). Carrington (2015) further explained how post/colonial theory can be used to critically unpack and rethink the “‘the West’ from the inside” (p. 107), by scrutinizing the “self-professed claims of Western superiority and universal progress” (p. 107). Carrington (2015) described colonialism as a series of encounters, ideologies and plural phenomena that structure multiple overlapping and interacting histories. Therefore, the application of post/colonial theory to development work is crucial for illuminating embedded power imbalances.

SDP scholars have examined how sport has been employed from the First-Third World to ‘improve’ the Two-Thirds-World. Forde (2015) effectively summarized the issues of concern

---

⁵ Global North and Global South will be used when referring to articles and authors, such as Darnell & Hayhurst (2011) in this case, who have employed this terminology.
when he noted that SDP “projects typically position the Global North as a benevolent and civilizing force, and the Global South as the passive, deficient, and grateful recipient of aid” (p. 960). By referring to the growing body of literature that examined SDP as a potential neocolonial endeavor (e.g., Darnell, 2007; Forde, 2015; Hayhurst, 2014b; Giulianotti, 2004; Wilson, 2012 and many others) I concentrated on (inter)national relations and the distribution of power within the networks of individuals involved in the BFD movement. I also remained attentive to the post/colonial history of Uganda in an attempt to better ‘see’ and understand embedded power imbalances—a history which I will elaborate on later in this thesis.

1.4 LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, and building on my previous discussion of key concepts and theories, I outline and identify gaps in the literature that were most pertinent to my research questions.

**International Development and Sport**

Wilson (2012), drawing on Kidd (2007) and Black (2010), offered a working definition of international development as processes designed with the stated intention of ‘improving’ the life chances and well-being of populations throughout the world, but particularly in countries considered to be low-income. These interventions have been known to come in the form of large scale and top-down development efforts and/or small scale and bottom-up ones. Black (2017) discussed how top-down and bottom-up organizations “refer to the actors and the level of analysis emphasized by development thought and practice” (p. 9) that have been known to be co-dependent and integrative, within an implicit organizational hierarchy of “‘bottom-up’ development typically subordinate to the ‘top-down’ assumptions and practices” (p. 7). Moreover, development discourses have commonly portrayed the One-Third World as superior and dominant, and the Two-Thirds World as somehow inferior (Nicholls, Giles & Sethna, 2010, p. 250).
Lindsey (2016) acknowledged that there has been a lack of research that has sought to understand how development projects play out and how they are perceived differently by people. He further addressed how sport for development (SfD) has been unevenly distributed and subject to contextual influences across different localities within countries, recognizing the need to explore macro-level issues in conjunction with local perspectives. Furthermore, the discrepancy in SfD distribution across localities is nested in power relations that are representative of global inequalities (Darnell, 2012) “and international development more widely” (McEwan, 2009, as cited in Lindsey, 2016). Relatedly, Darnell (2010) “suggest[ed] that while sport does offer a new and unique tool that successfully aligns with a development mandate, the logic of sport is also compatible with the hegemony of neo-liberal development philosophy” (p. 54). He discussed how hegemony, in this sense, provided a framework to re-inscribe social relations and experiences, that can contribute to the understanding of sport as a neo-colonial endeavour.

**Neoliberalism and Non-Governmental-Organizations**

Continuing with, and building upon, the discussion of un-even power relations, neoliberalism, in this thesis, refers to policies and ideologies that were based around the use of market rationality and private business approaches for social, cultural and political matters. Embedded in this discourse, individuals have been viewed as, and encouraged to be, ‘rational actors’— “the assumption here is that such responsibility will promote ‘efficiencies’ in the system, since citizens will be motivated to be productive to maximize personal benefits” (Wilson, 2012, p. 76).

Ong (2006) discussed how neoliberalism has impacted the relationship between the governing and governed, which through market force friction, has changed cultures. She described how political strategies, that regulate society to increase productivity and engagement with market forces, has promoted self-governing to optimize choice, efficiency, competitiveness
and the accumulation of capital. Ong (2006) also explored how neoliberalism has been enacted through ‘exceptions to neoliberalism’, which has been based on socio-economic status and the ability (or lack thereof) to contribute to the economy. A result of these exceptions to neoliberalism is that certain categories of subjects are protected, while others are not. Those left unprotected are often, both, lacking access to social resources at the same time that they are denied the ability to participate in the market. In such cases, Ong (2006) argues that individuals need to look beyond the state for protection of their rights.

Relatedly, Wilson and Hayhurst (2009) discussed how NGOs have come to operate as a trojan horse for global neoliberalism, by opening global flows of information and commodities through new circuits of cooperation and collaboration that stretch across nations and continents. Connecting these global flows to international development, Lindsey (2016) noted that “global neoliberal policies have forced the rolling back of African states, [as] national governments commonly lack the resource capacity to directly provide universal services” (pp. 9-10). Wilson (2011) elaborated on this and discussed how this has resulted through, and in, the privatization of aid – aid that was based on an ideology of ‘individual agency’ and the substitution of NGOs for the state in social provision. Similarly, Coalter (2010) noted that the ‘new paradigm for development’—carried out by organizations, such as NGOs, that pick up where the state is weak in order to increase community participation, strengthen democracy and facilitate social development—has occurred through the linking of sport to the politics of civil society and the development of social capital.

By aligning with neo-liberal systems of governance, some SfD NGOs have been criticized for applying market-solutions that do not effectively target historical and social inequalities (Wilson & Hayhurst, 2009). Darnell (2010) noted that SDP projects are sites that
“take place within hegemonic relations in which privileged groups (nations, citizens, corporations) maintain a position of benefit and accruement over others through social negotiations, making development a key site of political practice and critical inquiry” (p. 57). For this research, I attended to how BFD organizations applied market-solutions to their projects. My aim was to contribute to knowledge about the relationship between neoliberalism and SfD NGOs, and thus contribute to the literature outlined above.

**Sport for Development and Bicycles**

Sport has become a world language, a common denominator that breaks down all the walls, all the barriers. It is a worldwide industry whose practices can have a widespread impact. Most of all, it is a powerful tool for progress and development (UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, 2011 as cited in Schinke & Cole, 2011)

Sport for development was promoted in 2003 when the General Assembly of the United Nations placed sport on the global agenda for Development and Peace (Burnett, 2015) – and was invigorated in 2005, when the UN’s International Year of Sport and Physical Education took place (Giulianotti, 2012). Since this time, and especially in recent years, sociologists of sport scholars have studied a range of issues related to SDP. This includes the research noted above concerning neoliberal marketing approaches to SDP (Hayhurst et al., 2010; Wilson & Hayhurst, 2009), along with other work on heteronormativity in SDP (Chawansky, 2015; Carney & Chawansky, 2016), race, post/colonialism and SDP (Darnell, 2007), gender and SDP (Hayhurst 2014a; 2014b), and SDP’s geopolitics (Darnell, 2007; Hayhurst, 2014a; 2014b).

Specifically, for my research that attended to globalization and the local experience of BFD, I refer to Lindsey, Kay, Jeanes & Banda’s (2017) work on ‘localizing global sport for development’ to aid my efforts to think through how the local and global are multi-layered. For their research, Lindsey et al. (2017) took a wide lens approach and performed multiple studies on SfD in Zambia. They found that: (a) the international features of the broader SfD movement
impacted the local experiences of SfD participants in Zambia, and; (b) that the UN goals were reflected in the projects that were implemented by SfD organizations. Additionally, in order to understand how the local is influenced by, and influences, the global – the researchers took a methodological approach whereby they spoke to people on the ground with varied social positions and regional locations about their participation in SfD projects in order to gain an understanding of the local experience. These researchers highlighted how an analysis of global influences needs to be complemented by attention to local specifics.

Specific to the Ugandan context, Hayhurst, MacNeil, Kidd and Knoppers (2014) explored how an SDP NGO disseminated a gender-based violence program that taught young women martial arts skills while increasing their education and health literacy. This program focused on “improving the economic, community, cultural and political conditions – both locally, and globally that intersect to prevent young women from having [the] ability to exercise and make safe decisions to improve their lives” (p. 160). Although this program challenged gender roles—i.e., one participant began to ride a bicycle (challenging the stereotype of the region that females should not ride bikes)—and taught the participants discipline, the females were targeted in the community and sometimes experienced verbal and physical abuse. Additionally, some family members disapproved of martial arts because of it was thought of as masculine and culturally inappropriate. The exclusion of boys from these programs was also thought to (re)produce gender segregation. Therefore, it is important for SDP organizations to attend to historical and cultural nuances when attempting to address social structuring in order to ensure that participants of their programs do not become a target in their communities and that gender differences are not perpetuated.

Despite these strides in SDP-related scholarship, aside from the brief mention above, work on the bicycle within the movement has been conspicuously absent, as there is not a lot
about where bicycles go and come from and how power relations circulate within this global network. Interestingly, I note that the language used to describe the ‘power of sport’ is akin to the language commonly used to describe the bicycle – recognizing that the bicycle has been valorized for its contributions to society and the economy, including claims about the bicycles role in decreasing transport-related social exclusions, enhancing health and increasing an individual’s access to employment opportunities and participation in social life (Kenyon et al., 2002, as cited in Van der Kloof, et al., 2014).

This is not to suggest that there was not some evidence to stand behind such claims. For example, Morrow (2015) addressed the history of the bicycle, stating that “the real impact of the bicycle was in its widespread use for transportation and recreation across social classes and across gender lines and social conventions” (p. 53). Additionally, bicycles have been studied as a mode of transportation that can increase access to key services and markets, and there has been evidence that the bicycle can be “vital for poverty reduction and rural economic and social development” (Starkey, n.d., para. 1).

However, the relationship that individuals have with bicycles is considerably dependent upon, and highly influenced by, cultural context. In recent years, many countries in Europe have promoted bicycle usage through the construction of bicycle lanes, bike sharing schemes and traffic management measures, whereas many countries in Africa have not received the same support for non-motorized transportation (Starkey & Hine, 2014). Pojani and Stead (2015) discussed how politicians hold stereotypes that cycling is “a sign of backwardness and not commensurate with their goals and aspirations” (p. 7792), which has prompted them to encourage city planning for motorized modes of transport. Oke, Bhalla, Love and Siddiqui (2015) further discussed global bicycle ownership and explored how ownership varied across nations and within regions and noted that societal perceptions of bicycles (attitudes, safety and
infrastructure) and socio-spatial factors (physical environment, etc.) impacted bicycle usage. These authors described how there were cultural nuances to the utilization of the bicycle, and that ownership cannot simply imply usage.

I also note that there has been a long history on bicycles and the medicalization of women’s bodies that’s importance context for thinking about gender implications/exclusions (Vertinsky, 1994), such that women’s transport has been constrained by gender related roles, gender related financial and economic situations, and gender related access to transport technologies (Seedhouse, Johnson, & Newbery, 2016). For example, local gender-based constraints may discourage women from personal mobility and the utilization of a bicycle as a means of transportation (Starkey & Hine, 2014). These findings were echoed in Porter’s (2011) transportation study of Sub-Saharan Africa, which discussed cultural discourses that constrained the use of bicycles by women due to gendered stereotypes associated with promiscuity, vulnerability of sexual and other attacks, and the division of labour. She noted that “ownership and use is widely male dominated as a result of economic and/or sociocultural factors” (p. 75). Relatedly, Howe (2003) addressed how bicycle taxis—known locally as boda bodas—“has mainly benefited poorly educated male breadwinners who have few other employment opportunities” (p. 175), again, highlighting the gendered use of bicycles.

I acknowledge how this was relevant to my study in order to gain a deeper understanding of the ways that the bicycle has been talked about in the literature, and ‘on the ground’. Specifically, it was crucial to keep these arguments in mind when thinking about how class and gender influenced why BFD NGOs in Uganda distributed bicycles to specific populations and how this impacted people’s opportunity to utilize the bicycles in the community. However, instead of focusing explicitly and only on gender, I chose to focus on macro-level issues and the socio-political environment in which BFD took place. It is also important to note here that
although there has been a growing body of literature on gender-related restrictions for transport in Africa, there has been little political action (Porter, 2014). Moreover, through a critical lens, the utilization of bicycles to employ individuals and to motivate community members to ‘cycle out of poverty’ aligned with an individual-driven neoliberal approach to development and therefore required an exploration of perspectives held by individuals who occupied different social positions in order to unearth complexities and contradictions within the BFD network.

**Gaps in the Literature**

As I noted earlier, bicycle-related research has primarily been performed in the One-Third World (Sengers, 2016), which is why it was important to respond to this gap and situate this research in the context of Uganda, which is in the Two-Thirds World. This research also responded to Kuhn and Woog’s (2011) call for SDP research to address “the complexity and wedged reality of social issues within the locality of manifested existence” (as cited in Burnett, 2015, p. 388). Additionally, by speaking to those doing BFD-related work in Uganda, and following the tenets of Burawoy’s (2001) global ethnography, I explored the local experience of participants as connected to, and influenced by, global forces within the BFD movement.

Furthermore, most SDP research has focused on community or national-level projects, with only 10% of studies analyzing global or international projects (Schulenkorf, Sherry & Rowe, 2016). This encouraged me to converse with a variety of individuals involved with BFD NGOs to ‘theorize the transnational’ (Henry, 2007) as NGOs tend to be “located and positioned between the international development sector and local recipient populations” (Collison, Giulianotti, Howe & Darnell, 2016). Building on this, Hayhurst (2016) acknowledged the need to remain accountable to place when studying global networks—as it remains unclear how social relations among multiple actors involved in SDP are situated in a variety of geopolitical contexts, and how through the coupling of SDP and international development, the very essence of sport
has been shaped as a transnational force. In doing so, I extended my research into an analysis of globalization, to respond to “the importance of connecting SDP to broader issues and contexts of sport, politics and international development” (p. 15) by addressing transnational trends and policies sustained “within the structures and discourses of the global political economy” (Darnell, Chawansky, Marchesseault, Holmes & Hayhurst, 2016a, p.7).

Finally, and at the same time, Wilson and Hayhurst (2009) addressed how there has been a lack of research that has explored the structuring, organization and perspectives of SDP NGOs, and have called for further research to understand:

…the strategies and viewpoints of those NGOs based within the SFD spectrum with particular attention to: the size, prominence, and activist tradition of NGOs; the mandate of NGOs (i.e., are they locally/community focused or more concerned with global issues and international development); the organizational culture of NGOs […] the influence/perspectives of key leadership figures, and the specific contexts where activist-oriented work is taking place (p. 176).

In order to gain an understanding of the BFD movement in Uganda, I explored these variables. In the results section, I will discuss the organizational similarities and differences that I found, in relation to characteristics of the broader global movement.

**CHAPTER 2: METHOD(OLOGY)**

This research is a small slice of a larger SSHRC-funded grant between the University of British Columbia, York University and the University of Bath, with Dr. Lyndsay Hayhurst as the principal investigator (P.I.), Dr. Brian Wilson as the Co-Investigator and Janet Otte as the PI on the Uganda-focused portion of the study. As a way of bringing focus to my thesis – while remaining attentive to the cultural and historical forces that have positioned many countries in Africa on the periphery of the global capital system (Omobowale, 2016), and recognizing that
geographical, political and social contexts matter when it comes to understanding the features and perspectives of organizations – I concentrated on BFD organizations in Uganda. Through the BFD SSHRC grant, ethical approval was received by the Behavioural Research Ethics Board at the University of British Columbia, York University’s Ethics Board and the Research Ethics Committee in Mbale, Uganda, in addition to research licenses that were obtained in Uganda. In order to conduct this research, I travelled to Uganda from the end of October to the end of November 2017 and spoke to individuals involved in the BFD movement to gather data for the grant. I took a ‘slice’ of this data as my thesis, which will be elaborated on throughout the remainder of this document.

For my research, I interviewed 19 individuals associated with 10 organizations involved in the BFD movement in Uganda (see Table 1 below). Prior to my arrival, I directed Janet to various BFD organizations, which she contacted to confirm willingness to participate, while concurrently establishing and confirming the dates and locations of the interviews. Additionally, I explored the websites and documents of these and other NGOs doing work in Uganda in order to obtain a deeper contextual understanding of the BFD movement and the national landscape. Before elaborating on my methods, I will provide a brief history of Uganda relevant to the work I conducted here, while recognizing the limitations of depth in this document.

Table 1: Participant chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Participant’s Gender</th>
<th>Organization Affiliation</th>
<th>Global positioning</th>
<th>Organizational positioning</th>
<th>Enculturated Informant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alum Geto</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Union of Hope (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local (Apach-Lira)</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Bikes 4 Life (Australia), Wheels 4 Life &amp; Bicycles 4 Humanity (both Canadian).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Role/Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Odoch</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Amuru VHT (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local</td>
<td>Amuru</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Bikes 4 Life (Australia) and Bikes Not Bomb (USA). Received training from FABIO and has conversed with Bicycles 4 Humanity (Canada).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoli Joyce</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Union of Hope (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local</td>
<td>Apach-Lira</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Bikes 4 Life (Australia), Wheels 4 Life &amp; Bicycles 4 Humanity (both Canadian).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Ocen</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Amuru VHT (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local</td>
<td>Amuru</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Bikes 4 Life (Australia) and Bikes Not Bomb (Boston, USA). Received training from FABIO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Fassett</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>BAP (International organization)</td>
<td>American, living in</td>
<td>Gulu, Uganda</td>
<td>Employee-Operations Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Ventura</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bikes 4 Life (International organization)</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer/ Co-founder of Union of Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Schweidenback</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>P4P (International organization)</td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Kawanguzi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FABIO (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local</td>
<td>Jinja</td>
<td>Employee: Programs Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazura Odong</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Amuru VHT (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local</td>
<td>Amuru</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Bikes 4 Life (Australia) and Bikes Not Bomb (Boston, USA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgette*</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>BAP (International organization)</td>
<td>American, living in</td>
<td>Gulu, Uganda</td>
<td>Co-founder and CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najjiba Katesi</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>FABIO (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local</td>
<td>Jinja</td>
<td>Employee: Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namugoya Margaret</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Kadama Widows Association (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local</td>
<td>Kadama</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Comic Relief (World Bicycle Relief)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyole Tarisa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Kadama Widows Association (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local (Kadama)</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Comic Relief (World Bicycle Relief)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Yawe</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>MOTF (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local (Mityana)</td>
<td>Beneficiary of P4P</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocen Bernard</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Union of Hope (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local (Lira)</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Union of Hope/ contracted bicycle mechanic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogwal Moses Fred</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Union of Hope (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local (Lira)</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojok Walter Nyeko</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Hope for Humans (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local (Gulu)</td>
<td>Beneficiary of Bikes 4 Life (Australia).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Omia</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Hope for Human (CBO)</td>
<td>Ugandan local (Gulu)</td>
<td>Employee- Project Officer</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo Vos</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Kara-Tunga Tours (CBO)</td>
<td>Dutch/ Ugandan family background</td>
<td>Founding Director, Marketing and Sales</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*pseudonym*

### 2.1 History of Uganda

Throughout my time in Uganda, I obtained historical accounts of the nation as people shared about their region and tribal lineage, highlighting how pre-colonial structuring continued to impact identities in current post/colonial times. Matthew, the founder of MOTF, explained how tribes varied in structure and size, with Buganda as the largest tribe located in Central Uganda (Field note, 21-11-2017). He elaborated how in present day the government has power over tribal leaders, which stemmed from colonialism—demonstrating how colonialism has been structured by multiple overlapping and interacting histories (Carrington, 2015). Bøas (2004) further explained that Uganda “remains a deeply troubled and divided country in which cultural, political and economic divisions from the pre-colonial past, exacerbated by colonial and post-colonial projects, still have to be overcome” (p. 285).
In 1894 Uganda underwent colonization by the British (Tushabe, 2008, as cited in Hayhurst, 2014b). The Bugandan’s interacted with the colonial government and coordinated settlement areas for the British in Entebbe, which proliferated the growth and development of Southern and Central Uganda (Field note, 11-26-2017). Furthermore, the colonial government strengthened the construction of difference between the regions in the nation by recruiting the central and southern ‘elite’ from Buganda and regarding the North “as a reservoir of labour from which the colonial administration recruited men to the army and the police force” (Bøas, 2004, p. 285). Bøas (2004) elaborated how Northern Acholiland was marginal before colonial rule, and colonialism perpetuated these existing divisions. In this context, the regional and ethnic division of labour deepened the construction of difference between northern and southern Ugandans and reinforced social class divides. Additionally, the colonial government deepened the construction and embodiment of gender roles by “promot[ing] and adopt[ing] policies and practices that encourage[d] men to join the military, obtain an education, and locate work outside the home, which has resulted in women and girls being solely focused on domestic responsibilities” (Tushabe, 2008, as cited in Hayhurst, 2014b, p. 52). These social constructs created, perpetuated, and deepened by the colonial government continue to impact people’s interactions and understandings of various regions within the nation in present day.

Although Uganda came into independence in 1962 (Atkinson, 1994 as cited in Gauvin, 2013), political turmoil remains and persists throughout the country. In the 1960s, Uganda saw “border closures and economic crises” (p. 4) followed by a lack of employment and economic liberalization in the 1990s, which prompted individuals to take part in informal boda boda transport (Chilembwe, 2017), which, as noted above, was typically taken up by poorly educated men. Additionally, Museveni, the current president of Uganda’s leading National Resistance Movement (NRM) party, altered the constitution and dubbed himself ‘president for life’, aligning
with the political party’s slogan ‘no change’ and highlighting how “the current Ugandan government is failing to practice a democracy” (Guma, 2015, p. 22).

Guma (2015) elaborated how democracy “could potentially protect women from burdens of family, social and economic responsibilities” (p. 22) by altering historical social constructs that have continued to persist throughout the country. Furthermore, “Museveni [has labelled] globalization as a form of oppression, and urged Africans to resist the process by all means necessary” (Njoh, 2006, p. 25). Njoh (2006) noted how this resistance is embedded in the belief that globalization has brought prosperity to the “already rich West” (p. 25) and continued enslavement, economic and political detriment to the Third World. However, regardless of Museveni’s resistance, multiple insurgencies throughout the country have brought a proliferation of international aid into Uganda, which Hanebrink (2012) spoke about as connected to the lack of government protection.

Although there is some evidence to suggest that Uganda is ‘on its way’ to halt poverty by 2040, and that the poverty and inequality ratio has decreased from 2009-10 to 2013-14 (Economic Development Policy and Research Department, 2014), this does not undermine the point that “Africa’s position in the international economic arena was significantly diminished by […] European colonization and the […] neglect of transportation infrastructure by post-colonial authorities” (Njoh, 2006, p. 28). From my experience in Uganda, the transportation infrastructure varied drastically throughout the country—such that, the Northern and Eastern roads had large pot holes and were deemed ‘impassable’ when it rained; the Central region had paved roads and the construction of a new highway from Entebbe; and the Western region (Museveni’s birthplace) had paved roads and signage stating partnerships with the UN and UNAID to develop highways (Field notes, 11-24-2017). These variations in development demonstrated the unequal distribution of wealth across the nation.
Specific to this research, bicycles were introduced in Uganda by the colonial government in 1903 and were originally a marker of prestige. However, with the introduction of the automobile, the upper class rapidly abandoned the bicycle – as the bike came to be seen by some as a “tool for the poor” (Kayemba, 2013, para. 46). Additionally, the stereotypes that some people hold about the bicycle have impacted the lack of development for cycling infrastructure in Kampala (Auchapt, 2013). The neglect of transportation infrastructure and the influence of colonialism continues to perpetuate regional divides and wealth disparities. These divides also influence the perspectives people have about the utilization of the bicycle across the nation, which will be explored in more depth throughout the results.

2.2 Overview of Organizations

As a way of understanding the global movement of BFD, I found it crucial to explore the relative differences between (and shared features of) the organizations involved in this movement. Table 2 below demonstrates how some organizations were domestic whereas others were international, and some donated bicycles while others received bicycles. It also shows how many individuals from each organization were interviewed. In total, I spoke to 19 people who occupied various roles in 10 BFD organizations (founders, employees, volunteers and mechanics).

Table 2: Overview of organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>International vs. Domestic CBO</th>
<th>Distribution method</th>
<th>N of people interviewed= 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amuru Village Health Team</td>
<td>Domestic CBO</td>
<td>Freely received bicycles (Bikes Not Bombs &amp; Bikes 4 Life)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycles Against Poverty (BAP)</td>
<td>International (donor) /Domestic (distributor)</td>
<td>Sold bicycles (micro-financing)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes Not Bombs</td>
<td>International (donor)</td>
<td>Freely distributed bicycles</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycles 4 Humanity</td>
<td>International (donor)</td>
<td>Freely distributed bicycles</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes 4 Life</td>
<td>International (donor)</td>
<td>Donated recycled bikes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Type of BCO</td>
<td>Bikes Received Observations</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABIO</td>
<td>Domestic CBO and local distributor</td>
<td>Switched to co-founding in 2010</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope for Humans</td>
<td>Domestic CBO</td>
<td>Freely received bicycles (Bikes Not Bombs/UOH)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadama Widows Association (KWA)</td>
<td>Domestic CBO</td>
<td>Freely received bicycles (Comic Relief/World Bicycle Relief)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara-Tunga</td>
<td>Domestic CBO</td>
<td>Purchased bicycles for rental/tourism (Bicycles 4 Humanity [B4H])</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mityana Open Troops Foundation (MOTF)</td>
<td>Domestic CBO</td>
<td>Bicycles to be Sold (P4P)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedals 4 Progress (P4P)</td>
<td>International (donor)</td>
<td>Bicycles sold globally to ‘developing’ nations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Hope (UOH)</td>
<td>Domestic CBO and local distributor</td>
<td>Received donated bicycles and money (Wheels 4 Life, Bikes 4 Life, B4H), and distributed bicycles to local organizations.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For clarification, the community-based-organizations (CBOs) I refer to were beneficiary organizations. Specifically, I spoke to some employees and volunteers from these CBOs who have received bicycles, as well as some who have not received a bicycle – but have helped to distribute bicycles. Therefore, in this research, the term ‘beneficiaries’ can refer to employees and volunteers from CBOs (i.e., beneficiary can refer to multiple roles). Additionally, there were some organizations, such as FABIO and Union of Hope, that were beneficiary organizations that donated the bikes they received to smaller local organizations, such as village saving and loan associations (VSLAs). In sum, these organizations in Uganda (and most likely elsewhere) had a range of features, and varied in structure—as some were grassroots-oriented, while others operated in a more top-down fashion, which will be explored in more depth in the results—and they promoted a range of initiatives that utilized bicycles as a development tool.

By speaking to different organizations, and individuals who occupied different positions within the organizations, I gathered a variety of perspectives that contextualized the BFD movement – as I obtained information about how the bicycle moved on the ground and the
various ways they were utilized as a development tool. Throughout the remainder of this section, I will discuss semi-structured interviews as the method employed to gather data that helped me answer my research questions and I will then proceed to outline my data analysis techniques.

2.3 Semi Structured Interviews

Smith and Sparkes (2016) highlighted how “interview talk can reveal the sociocultural dynamics of human life” while illuminating “the ways in which societies and cultures shape personal experience, meaning, decisions, values, motivations […] and generate insights into the context in which people live” (p. 108). They further discussed how “people draw on discourses from society or culture to build and understand conversations […] Talk therefore needs treating as socially created, and experience and meaning as inherently shaped by our sociocultural landscape” (p. 108). Therefore, by interviewing individuals involved in BFD in Uganda, I attended to how social and cultural factors shape (and are shaped by) history that influenced the experiences with, and the meanings prescribed to, the bicycle.

I used semi-structured interviews with a flexible guide that asked participants about the bicycle’s utilization as an international development tool, their involvement with BFD, the structure of their associated BFD organization and the successes/barriers they have faced in relation to BFD (see Appendix A: Interview guide). The interviews took place in a variety of locations that were contextually specific to the individual/associated organization, such as in office spaces or outside people’s homes. The two vignettes below elaborate on a couple of the interview settings and the interview dynamics:

We sat on plastic blue chairs surrounding a short wooden table with a white crocheted cloth. We were under the shade of a wide canopy tree that provided us with protection from the sun. I was angled on one corner, Janet was on the next and Judith [our encultured informant] was between us, opposite her was Alum [the interviewee] who had all of our attention for the interview (Field notes, 10-30-2017)

During the interview I was leaning in to close the gap, I was sitting on my own individual seat while Janet, Kazura [the interviewee] and our encultured informant were sharing a
wooden bench. Our seats were placed on the dusty dirt ground in the village under a tree outside of Kazura’s home (Field notes, 11-03-2017)

The interviews ranged from 30 minutes to 2 hours and 20 minutes in length. The duration varied based on the participants availability and willingness to share information.

For 8 interviews, an encultured informant was present. The interview would begin by reading the consent forms (see Appendix B and Appendix C)—and when there were language barriers, the encultured informant would be present and translate the consent forms—to ensure that the interviewees (who were all over the age of 18) understood the purpose of the research, that participation was voluntary, and what the interview would look like (i.e., what methods were to be used). Following the consent form, the interviews would commence with me and/or Janet (when present) asking the interview questions, the encultured informant translating them, the participant answering, and the encultured informant translating back the answer to me and Janet. Before proceeding to the next question, we would ask if anyone needed clarification on what was just spoken before continuing the interview. All of the interviews were recorded, and participants were given the option to have a pseudonym. Almost all of the participants, except one interviewee, checked the box to have their name and their organizations name used in the research (instead of a pseudonym).

Collison et al. (2016) distinguished between an encultured informant and translator, explaining how “[t]ranslators may also find themselves strategically positioned to relay, edit or manipulate questions and answers” (p. 416). However, Janet, and the ‘translators’—who spoke the regional language—occupied the position of ‘encultured informant’ because they understood the needs of the research, were not connected to the BFD organizations and were therefore less likely to tamper with the questions/ answers. The encultured informant always assisted with multiple interviews, which meant that we spent multiple days together and developed a relationship with each other, which allowed us to approach the research more collaboratively. In
addition to facilitating conversations and addressing language barriers during the interviews, Janet and the encultured informants (see Table 3 below) provided me with cultural and historical information while traveling to the interview, on the drive back or during the interview.

**Table 3: Encultured informants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Interviews assisted with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angetta Judith Bua</td>
<td>Lira, Northern Uganda</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Eveline Mamajja</td>
<td>Kadama, Eastern Uganda</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emejy Aron</td>
<td>Gulu, Northern Uganda</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to interviews, the content of the various BFD organizations’ websites and publicly available documents were reviewed. Bryman (2015) discussed that “documents cannot be regarded as providing objective accounts of a state of affairs. They have to be interrogated and examined in the context of other sources of data” (p. 554) as they “need to be recognized for what they are—namely, texts written with distinctive purposes in mind, and not as simply reflecting reality” (p. 561). Keeping this in mind, I used the organizations’ websites and publicly available documents as a means to: a) acquire a preliminary understanding of the organizations goals, mission, structure, etc., to act as foundation for the subsequent interviews, and; b) to act as supplemental data to cross-reference and corroborate information provided in the interview. The interviews, documents and field notes were then analyzed.

**2.4 Transcription**

Once all of the interviews were conducted, I transcribed them. The majority of the interviews were conducted in English, however, as previously mentioned, there were 8 that required an encultured informant who knew the local language. For the interviews with an encultured informant, transcription was a messier process because of the various voices that were included in the recording. In saying so, I referred to literature that had explored the complexity of using translators in research (see: Edwards, 1998 and/or Temple, 2002). I experienced some
challenges when documenting the recorded interviews that involved encultured informants—knowing that once they were written, the document would be a reference for the interview and would need to distinguish between all of the voices of those involved—therefore, I had to come up with a process that differentiated between when the encultured informant was translating for the participant or when they were expanding on what was said and/or providing their own knowledge in relation to the topic. In order to work through the multiple voices in the written document, I would use [P] to demonstrate that the statement was a translation for the participant and would use [T] to indicate that the translator was voicing their own knowledge. Doing so allowed me to attend to the multiple individuals that were included in the interview—and who were crucial for the interview to take place and for the co-construction of knowledge.

2.5 Data Analysis

All of the transcribed documents were sent out to the interviewees for member-checking, with the intention of allowing for reflexive elaboration and enhanced understanding of co-constructed findings. Palmer (2016) highlighted how member-checking “engages [in] a process of iterative consent and speaks to the self-reflexive nature of culturally responsive relational ethics” (p. 322). I sent the transcribed interviews to the interviewees, whereby they had two weeks to review (or more if they requested) to respond with any edits or further questions. Although I attempted to member-check the interviews, only 3 participants responded with their reviewed transcript. This was the result of poor internet communication and/or email addresses that failed to receive the delivered transcripts leading to a lack of responses from the participants.

To receive more input, Janet and the encultured informant (when involved in the interview) reviewed the respective transcripts. They ensured that my transcription was correct, that I was properly captured the translation and inputted cultural information when applicable. There were only a few instances where I received multiple edited transcripts back for the same
interview. When this took place, I reviewed all of the documents, merged them together with the new edits, and used the new transcript for the data analysis process. The process of transcription and member-checking meant that there was a temporal break between participating in the interviews and receiving the transcribed document. Kirby and McKenna (1989) elaborated how “living with the data” (p. 275) throughout the member-checking process allows all those involved—myself, Janet, the enculture informants and participants—the chance to distance and reflect upon the interview and analytic process (as cited in Potts & Brown, 2005).

The data collected throughout this research was analyzed through thematic analysis, which Braun, Clarke and Weate, (2016) discussed as an analysis of “people’s experiences in relation to an issue” to “identify patterns in people’s (reported) practices or behaviors related to, or their views on, a certain issue” (p. 193) to determine common ways an issue or topic is represented. NVivo was used to organize and store the collected data. However, I ultimately moved out of NVivo and conducted thematic analysis by hand. This analytic process occurred iteratively as I familiarized myself with the data, created codes, developed themes, re-familiarized myself with the data, refined themes, referred to the literature, created themes, refined them again and finally named them. Kirby, Greaves and Reid (2006) explain “analysis as an iterative or ‘back and forth’ process in which researchers make sense of new data, information, or knowledge and, in the creation of theory, constantly refer back to the data” (p. 219). This aligns with Braun et al. (2016), who discussed thematic analysis as an active process, involving “recursive, reflexive process of moving forwards (and sometimes backwards) through data familiarization, coding, theme development, revision, naming and write up” (p. 196). Thematic analysis allowed me to explore patterns that emerged in relation to: a) the relative differences and similarities of the NGOs involved in the movement and interviewed in this
research; b) how the bicycle was used as a development tool; c) the perspectives of people involved in the movement; and, d) the experiences and processes of globalization within BFD.

Throughout the research process I kept field notes—of settings, reflections on interviews and interactions, and my own reflexive observations—to interrogate and acknowledge how my experiences and social position influenced my analysis. This was pertinent to explore because as a researcher, I was an integral part of the data gathering process. In saying so, my gender, age, nationality, race and sexual orientation played a role and influenced my interactions, relationships and observations because “subjectivities inform all stages of the research process, including the gathering [and analysis] of ‘data’ from the field” (Thorpe & Olive, 2016, p. 133). Before elaborating on the results of this research, I am going to address some of these reflections and how they (may) have informed my theme development, refinement and results.

2.6 Reflexivity

Within the SDP literature, scholars have advocated for highly reflexive work that considers transnational processes. We, as researchers, are often critical of unreflexive work – at the same time that we commonly find ourselves struggling to be ‘reflexive enough’. Hayhurst (2016) acknowledged how we are unable to “fully sever [our] own subjectivity and the ways that [our] benevolence, intentions, [and] language choices” (p. 439) impact the research that we conduct. In light of my focus on the post/colonial dynamics that influence societal inequalities of ‘development’, I performed on-the-ground situated research in an attempt to be accountable to place, following Hayhurst (2016). I explored this through Charania’s (2011) argument that the “global is everywhere and nowhere all at once” (p. 354) to reflect on the politics and relations of power when “channeled into a particular set of practices in order to respond to oppression” (p. 362). I begin this process by acknowledging how through my attendance at UBC, I have accrued material privileges from my locality and geographic position as a Canadian graduate student.
hired on a SSHRC-funded Insight grant. Through this, I have participated in globalization processes and reflect below on my time in Uganda.

Through a critical lens, I explored my ‘sociocultural baggage’ that I brought into the field as a researcher (Collison, et al., 2016) by keeping field notes about my interactions in space, with individuals and communities, while remaining aware of the colonial history of Uganda. In this section I will demonstrate how I’ve started to\(^6\) interrogate my “personal values, beliefs and preferences by interrogating where these have originated from and why” (Schinke & Blodgett, 2016, p. 89).

My white, cis-gendered female, able-body influenced my interactions in the field and made me conscious of my corporeity. Prior to my arrival, I had conversations with Janet about my tattoos, which she recommended I kept covered, especially in the North. I also often looked for reassurance from Janet to confirm that I was dressed appropriately. The first time I saw her, she exclaimed that ‘I looked African!’, which made me feel accepted, especially considering that clothing was an aspect of my appearance that I could control to determine how I represented myself. I also contemplated questioning difference and privilege aloud to those who I interacted with. For example:

I contemplated telling Moses my inner racialized thoughts and decided to do so, ‘it’s weird to be a scene because of my skin colour’ I said aloud. ‘It is because you are so different from them, they grow up with one colour around and you are something new. They can either be extremely happy or fearful because it’s so different’ he responded as we rode on his motor bike to his village home (Field notes, 10-29-2017)

My skin colour put me on display and ‘othered’ me as I moved within various environments, oftentimes accompanied by locals. Specifically, these field notes, and others like these, had me

\(^6\) I say ‘started to’ here in quotations as this is an ongoing process of continual interrogation because there is no specific end point to how my interactions and interpretations influenced the research conducted here. Even during writing, I reflexively thought about my time in the field and how my white, female, able-bodiedness influenced the interactions I had with others and whether my positionality continued to influence the data analysis process.
reflect upon whether sharing my racialized thoughts brought forth or re-inscribed power relations.

Throughout my time in Uganda, people stared and yelled ‘Mzungu!’ at me, which disrupted the feeling of comfort that I had developed from the locals who welcomed me, and prompted an instant corporeal awareness. ‘Mzungo’ is a word that means ‘white person’ but in Swahili also means ‘a person who moves a lot and does not settle’ (Field notes, 11-20-2017). The term Mzungo defined me and my privilege (of being able to travel to and from Uganda and to have been able to move throughout the country, more than some of the locals I interacted with had moved within their own nation). Knowing this definition of the term had me constantly reflect upon understandings of race as compounded with the privilege to move and travel, and global wealth disparities more broadly. The challenge that I experienced was to “interrogate whiteness and white privilege while simultaneously working with the complexities of racialization and social identities” (Charina, 2011, p. 367).

One of the environments that power relations were evident was during interviews. The first interview provided me with the opportunity to appraise how a group of local females perceived me, compared to the Ugandan locals who were just as central in conducting and facilitating the interviews. As we were driving on the bumpy dirt road from Lira to the village of Apach in Northern Uganda all of a sudden, I heard ‘EKK-EKK-EKK’, branches scraping against the car and saw that a large group of women were standing on the side of the road, cheering and dancing as we approached.

As soon as I opened the door, I had enough space to step out of the car and stand, but then the women came and started to hug me. They were going for my lower body and then I realized that they were trying to pick me up, backpack and all! I didn’t really know how to react and tried to resist it at first, as my heart was racing in my chest, but they lifted me and before I knew it, I was being carried in a crowd of over 300 women. They brought me towards the tree and placed me on a blue plastic chair, preventing my feet from touching the ground until I was seated (Field notes, 10-30-2017)
I note this encounter specifically because it was contrasted by the greeting Janet, the encultured informant and Moses (the founder of Union of Hope) had received—as they exited the car and found their way to their respective seats. This differential treatment had me reflect upon how my white body conducting BFD research may have been misunderstood as one distributing bicycles, which prompted me to consider the praise that donors must receive when they visit and distribute bicycles. Although I tried to mitigate power relations by constantly addressing how the work was a collaboration, and how my being there would not be possible without local assistance, the interaction above reflected understandings of race—as related to prosperity and opportunity that contribute to perpetuating the discourse of the benevolent white humanitarian that has the ability to travel and passive black bodies as grateful recipients of aid.

Lastly, gendered reflections emerged, as male beneficiaries often concluded their interviews by asking if I could ride a bicycle, whereby I would inform them that I was able to because I was taught how to cycle at a young age. This often opposed the experience of most women in Uganda, as the female participants reported that they were taught how to cycle when they received a bike from a BFD organization. I highlight this not to construct difference between me and female Ugandans, who were BFD beneficiaries, but because these interactions demonstrated the gendered assumption of bicycle usage—such that the understanding was because I was a woman, I would not know how to cycle.

Additionally, throughout the writing process, I have been reflecting on offering ‘recommended best practices’ to these organizations. While these recommendations are based on the information provided by the people directly involved in the BFD movement, ultimately, my way of ‘seeing’ has constructed the recommended best practices that will be disseminated. I acknowledge that I am still an outsider of the BFD movement, who has only captured a small glimpse of this broad global movement. Charina (2011) questioned how we can stand in
solidarity with others, not in place of them—a question that has resonated with me throughout my writing. Although my recommendations are based off of the words of the research participants, I hope that my summary aptly captured their recommendations—which will be discussed in the conclusion. It is with this that I acknowledge how it was not be possible for me to know the “fine grained nuances of various cultures” (p. 319), but, by remaining open and engaged, and with the assistance of Janet and the encultured informants who provided cultural and historical information, I attempted to understand the issues I studied by keeping the perspectives of the participants in mind (Palmer, 2016).

**CHAPTER 3: RESULTS**

In this section I outline key findings that emerged from my fieldwork as they pertain to my research questions. What will become evident is that the findings were highly interrelated. That is to say, I found that once I learned about the characteristics of the BFD organizations and the contexts for their work, I was better positioned to understand how and why bicycles were being used in particular ways (as a development tool), the reasons for some of the perspectives of interviewees on the BFD industry, and the relevance of all of this for understanding globalization processes around BFD. In general terms then, my findings shed light on how ‘context mattered’ when it came to understanding the themes that emerged across the quite diverse set of organizations I spent time with in Uganda – and that the view of the bicycle as positive, negative, useful, exclusive, a ‘tool of the poor’ and so on, can be at least partially explained by attending to the features/contexts associated with these organizations and their locations.

With this in mind I begin this section by reporting on the characteristics of the BFD organizations that were part of the study (RQ1), with particular attention to how they were structured and their ‘goals and missions’. This is followed by an outline of ways that the bicycle appeared to be used as an (international) development tool (RQ2), perspectives of members of
BFD organizations on their work and industry (RQ3) and a report of findings pertinent to a consideration of what the BFD movement reveals about globalization processes and the impacts of technologies traveling to and within the Two-Thirds World (RQ4).

3.1 RQ (1) What are the characteristics of the various organizations involved in BFD (e.g., how are they structured; what are the goals and missions of these organizations)?

The organizations had similarities and differences in the ways that they were structured (e.g., top-down and bottom-up; domestic or international), where they were located (e.g., urban and rural, environmental variables or their regional location—north, east, west, mountainous, etc.), and their goals (e.g., community-focused, health-focused, equity-focused, and/or economic focused). I also saw patterns across the categories noted above – which is to say, certain organizations, with particular sets of goals, seemed to be more likely to have particular structures, and exist in certain locations, and so on. Having said this, I will also show that some organizations were complex and multi-featured – and not as easily categorized. Finally, since I interviewed people with a wide range of perspectives, locations, organizational positions (founders, employees and beneficiaries) and backgrounds – from organizations that don’t always sit neatly in particular categories – some of the messiness of the movement, in relation to the features often used to define organizations, was evident as well. Of course, the one element that all of the organizations had in common was the vision of the bicycle as a tool or catalyst for a development aim of some sort – whether it be gender equity, education, economic development, transportation, sustainability, or some combination of these.

Structure

The organizations involved in this research were structured in bottom-up or top-down fashions. As stated above, Black (2017) discussed how there is a hierarchical relationship between top-down and bottom-up organizations. My findings were generally consistent with this,
as I found that it mattered whether organizations were domestically or internationally located and that the relationship between these differently positioned organizations interacted and shaped the BFD movement.

*Domestic, Bottom-up, Community-Focused: The Community-Based BFD Organization*

All seven of the domestic organizations involved in this study were bottom-up in orientation. In all cases these were organizations that described themselves as ‘community-based’ – meaning that they began as a response to community-specific needs, and most oftentimes originated in their communities. In this context I defined bottom-up as organizations that were local, community-based, small scale and grassroots— with an approach that was focused on working with and “privilege[ing] the perspective of the historically subaltern groups” (Black, 2017, p.9) to address poverty, inequality and marginalization. The following organizations existed within this category: Union of Hope (UOH), Amuru Village Health Team (VHT), Kadama Widows Association (KWA), Mityana Open Troops Foundation (MOTF), Hope 4 Humans, First African Bicycle Information Organization (FABIO) and Kara-Tunga.

None of these organizations distributed bicycles without assistance from established partnerships with actors in the One-Third-World (i.e., all projects had multiple stakeholders). Therefore, these organizations – what I will refer to hereafter as community-based organizations (or CBOs) – distributed bicycles either on behalf of international organizations (using their connections in the community to enable distribution), or ‘in their own name’ – while still enabled by donations from international donors. Although, as we will see later, the relationships between donor and recipient organizations varied in quality and type, these recipient groups were always somewhat reliant on aid in this hierarchical relationship.
Some of the variations between these organizations can be described through their origin, or the relationship that they had with their donor organizations. For example, all of the CBOs originated domestically, except for Kara-Tunga, which was created by a native Ugandan who resided in the Netherlands for most of his life. Yet, the organization was still bottom-up because it started and worked with (in) the local community to change the local, national and international perception of the Karamoja region. UOH was also connected to multiple international organizations, while most of the other CBOs had only one international partner. Additionally, FABIO was the only CBO that did not rely so heavily on international organizations—as it was the oldest BFD organization in Uganda, was established across the nation and was domestically based. FABIO was an interesting case as well because they work with policy makers, and therefore sometimes the organizations took a top-down approach.

Between these CBOs, there was also a range of organizational sizes. For example, FABIO and UOH worked with multiple communities and at times held more power in their relationships with their international partners, as they had local knowledge and determined where and how their bicycle projects played out on the ground (compared to other smaller scale CBOs whose projects were often chosen, initiated and facilitated by international organizations). These variations demonstrated how BFD organizations are in many ways similar to one another, but that there are differences too. Therefore, and although I created an overarching category for a number of organizations, these variations demonstrate the complexity of dividing these organizations into discrete silos, as their variables place them along a spectrum.

**Other Key Features of CBOs**

These CBOs typically shared the objectives of making a more equitable society by addressing poverty, gender inequality, and marginalization— as compared to the international organizations, that often had a broader mandate, and also focused on economic development,
education and health. As these organizations were more community-focused, it typically resulted in them having a smaller staff and volunteer base (especially when compared to the international BFDs). Although the CBOs had few official staff members, the community connections these organizations had were critical for their projects. For example, the CBOs often connected with VSLAs—self-organized groups of individuals who acted as a community bank for their group’s members—as project beneficiaries who became actors in their communities that challenged the local perceptions of bicycle usage.

Importantly, as much as these organizations originated in their communities, they were also sustained by their communities – which was a key difference between CBOs compared to international BFD organizations. Moses, the founder of UOH, highlighted how the project “has become something for people that is owned by people” (Moses, UOH). UOH facilitated and gave BFD projects to the community to lead—i.e., UOH partnered with 15 VSLAs, each made up of 30 women, in the rural community of Apach. Moses believed that through participation and a sense of ownership, community members would feel motivated to sustain the projects. In this sense, UOH focused on the ‘depth of impact’ rather than the ‘spread of impact’. Similarly, FABIO had a small office staff but worked with established community structures (i.e. VSLAs, VHT groups, schools, etc.) in various regions—for community activism and engagement. A characteristic of these organizations was that they worked with(in) local communities and ensured the involvement of local people, with the aim of inspiring a shared sense of ownership. In this more participatory model, the aim was to make sure that community members were in a position to carry out the projects and have input throughout.

As these organizations were domestically based, respondents also discussed how they worked with(in) local government structures. These CBOs discussed how they filled a gap by addressing a social need that was thought to be the responsibility of the government, but that was
not being addressed by the government. This resulted in some organizations receiving government support. For example, MOTF received funding from the government to support the organization’s objective of helping vulnerable youth with their education—a investment that was seen and justified as an indirect way of also supporting the economy of the country. Other organizations in rural Lira, UOH and BAP (which will be discussed later), have signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the government that stipulates the organization’s role (to raise money and gather bicycles for distribution) and the government’s role in the project (to provide monitoring, supervising, reporting, and connections to communities and beneficiaries who are active patients at the health centre).

Along with these local government relations, these organizations also, as noted earlier, often relied on international funders too. For example, funding came through interorganizational signed MOUs (such as UOH and Wheels 4 Life), international partnerships (FABIO and their European connections) and successful grant applications (KWA and Comic Relief for their bicycle project; Hope 4 Humans for organizational sustainability).

**The Role of Bicycle Workshops for CBOs: Funding and Community-Building**

Other financial considerations at the local level came in the form of co-funding—namely, selling the bicycle and setting up bicycle workshops. For example, FABIO used to distribute bicycles freely, but switched to co-funding, where the beneficiaries now pay a percentage of the bicycle, and the organization subsidizes the rest (or they offer bicycle credit schemes where the bicycle is paid over time). Additionally, some of the local organizations had a bicycle maintenance workshop set up or were in the process of establishing one—to help finance their organizations/projects, and/or to economically support the community by providing some employment opportunities.
For example, Amuru VHT’s bicycle workshop was set up to economically support the VHT members by selling spare parts and providing employment to the beneficiaries who were chosen by the donor organizations to be trained as bicycle mechanics. It also provided the members an opportunity to financially save together as a group (and create a VSLA). As Anthony explained:

[T]hey try to give out the money that they raise as loans. To support the different families for within the members eh? […] So, it’s not really a profit-making organization, but they try to give out the money so that it is support them and they just ensure that the people give back the money. They borrow, and they turn back the money to the association (Anthony, Amuru VHT)

Additionally, the bicycle workshops were also a means for organizational independence. According to Najjiba at FABIO:

[O]ne of the reasons we are establishing a bicycle centre, we want to find a more sustainable way of making money, other than depending. That’s why we are going to do it very independent from this organization, it will be purely profit making, but it will be also supplementing the work of this organization (Najjiba, FABIO)

The organizations created bicycle workshops to financially support the community, their organization and their ongoing projects—in order to decrease reliance on international funding, which at times was transient, inconsistent or short-term.

Relatedly, some of the organizations discussed setting up bicycle workshops that would also become bicycle distribution centres. These distribution centres would become ‘hubs’ for the local organizations to distribute the bicycles that were received through their various international partnerships.

[T]his workshop will be now a distribution centre for Bicycles 4 Humanity, for Bikes 4 Life and for Wheels 4 Life, in one centre […] Bikes 4 Life will be sending their bikes to this centre. Bicycles 4 Humanity will also be sending bikes to this same centre. Wheels 4 Life will also be giving money (Moses, UOH)

As well, the centres would become learning centres for the community youth. UOH and MOTF discussed how the bicycle workshop would provide an opportunity for youth to be employed as
bicycle mechanics. Matthew explained that “[w]e are going to get our trainees, those boys as you have seen them. If he graduates, you employ him directly. That whatever you, you, you repair a bicycle here you are going to get a percentage” (Matthew, MOTF). This speaks to ‘sustainable strategies’ encouraged through interorganizational partnerships to economically support the community and sustain the project – as well as involving community members and providing youth with opportunities for education and employment. An important finding in this section then is that interviewee representatives of the CBOs consistently referred to ‘sustainability’ as a key priority.

*International, Top-down and Economics-focused: The International BFD Organization*

The other overarching structural category I will discuss – that is interconnected with, but distinct from the BFD CBO – is the ‘international BFD organization’. In this study, the organizations that fell into this category were: Bikes 4 Life, Pedals 4 Progress (P4P), Bicycles Against Poverty (BAP), Bikes Not Bombs, Wheels 4 Life and Bicycles 4 Humanity. The first three organizations were interviewed, whereas the latter three organizations exist in Uganda—and were spoken about by CBOs or other international organizations as partner organizations—but were not interviewed during this research. Typically, these international BFD organizations were structured in a hierarchy, beginning with the founder of the organization, a board of directors, a few main employees and a large number of volunteers that helped with the packaging and distribution of bicycles to ship to ‘developing nations’.

The key feature of this type of organization then was its operation in a ‘top-down’ fashion. In this case, what this meant for the BFD organizations I studied, was that wealthier (i.e., a large donor base) and more globally powerful organizations that were based in the One-Third-World, set up projects or established partnerships to distribute bicycles for less powerful
recipients in the Two-Thirds-World. To be clear, I am not suggesting that there was any – or any uniform kinds of – exploitation that took place as a result of this top-down way of doing BFD. Indeed, in many cases these international organizations collaborated with and were also highly integrated with local organizations, and the support offered in local contexts would not be possible without these international BFD organizations. Having said this, in later parts of this results section I outline perspectives of organizations on the BFD industry and note viewpoints on sometimes disconcerting relationships in this top-down structure.

**Business and Economics-Focus**

Although the CBOs were concerned with sustainability, they differed from the international organizations referred to here in the sense that the international organizations were guided by a business model on multiple fronts – an approach that respondents from these organizations suggested was a requirement for them, given the nature of the work they are doing.

David from P4P highlighted how “I had a very free market approach, that I find someone who’s gonna be in charge, this is your program, you’re gonna be responsible if you’re gonna be successful. It’s gonna be up to you to be successful”. David elaborated how his organization distributed bicycle containers “to people who are responsible with ‘em” (David, P4P). Similarly, BAP also highlighted how they created their own bicycle market in Gulu by importing bicycles and bringing them into communities to sell through micro-financing.

Just as the CBOs varied in structure, BAP was an interesting case for the international organizations, as it was started by a Ugandan local who studied in the US. Brian, who I interviewed from BAP, indicated that the organization switched from a CBO to a non-profit/social enterprise because:

[R]epayment rates are impacted when it’s [a] CBO, you know sometimes people feel like ah, I can pay back, but I don’t have to. So, we’re taken more seriously as an organization operating as a company, like other micro finance organizations in the same market (Brian, BAP)
This perspective on the importance of repayment aligned with other priorities of these organizations, including a focus on management structures and distributing the bicycles through sales (whether micro-financing or full purchase).

The international BFD organizations also attended more to the global economy and seemed to embrace principles commonly associated with neoliberalism and free market ideologies, as alluded to above. Interviewees commented about how the BFD organizations were helping the poor by providing the beneficiaries with an opportunity to participate in the economy. For example, David from P4P highlighted that “[w]hen you can go into a small town and put 500 people on a bike you can fundamentally change the movement of goods and services”. They believed that the bicycle could change society, increase individual productivity and kick start the economy of the community, something they speculated was not taking place otherwise. In this way, the organizations had a business-oriented approach in how they ran their organization as well as an economic focus in their objectives on the ground. Interestingly, there seemed to be limited or no reflection on the idea that such organizations may be (re)producing the reduction of state responsibility by doing the work of the government.

**Cross-border Connections and Structure**

Within the BFD movement, there were various ways that we can see how relationships between the domestic and international organizations, and their stakeholders, operated across national borders. For example, BAP had an interesting organizational structure as they worked in a couple of national contexts. The main office, workshop and distribution centre was in Gulu, and a new office was opened in Lira—both in Northern Uganda—while the manufacturer was in India (which will be elaborated on later), and the CEO/Board of directors was in the United States. Brian highlighted some of the complexities that the organization experienced because of this:
[T]here’s things that they have to deal with working in two different time zones, in two different countries […] you have to understand the laws of two different countries and how they interact, there’s some financial issues where we’re dealing with exchange rate difference on a daily basis, you know tracking the financial activity of the organization in two different countries. Right? We have a part-time bookkeeper in CPA in the US, we have a fulltime finance manager here, so making sure that all of the finances matchup is an important function (Brian, BAP)

It was often these larger international organizations that worked across borders, in various contexts. Additionally, and because of this multi-faceted work environment, the international organizations may struggle to address the social, political and environmental aspects of their recipient nation—an issue I return to later.

**Organizational Goals**

Although I have just highlighted various differences between the CBOs and the international BFD organizations, they often had similar overarching goals – at least as stated in their formal mission and visions statements, and as discussed in interviews. Typically, these included a focus on some combination of health, social, community and economic development. As seen below, there were some organizations that had direct and specific organizational goals through the projects that they created and carried out, whereas other organizations indirectly contributed to specific goals through interorganizational partnerships (i.e., international organizations who donated bicycles or money to domestic CBOs). The specificities of how these goals ‘came to life’ through the actions of the organizations will be elaborated on in research question 2, which explored how the bicycle was used as an international tool – since disparities between stated goals and actual outcomes can exist. In this section, though, Table 4 provides a superficial overview of the goals of these organizations connected explicitly to the UN’s 2015 SDGs—that could have influenced the projects set up by these organizations to help individuals in Uganda.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational goal</th>
<th>SDG</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminating HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>(3) Good health and well-being</td>
<td>Direct: Amuru VHT, Hope 4 Humans, UOH, FABIO, KWA and BAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect: Bikes Not Bombs, Bikes 4 Life, Wheels 4 Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>(4) Quality education</td>
<td>Direct: Amuru VHT, BAP, FABIO, Bikes Not Bombs, UOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect: Comic Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic participation</td>
<td>(8) Decent work and economic growth</td>
<td>All of the BFD organizations included in this research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>(5) Gender equality &amp; (10) reduced inequality</td>
<td>Direct: FABIO, UOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect: Wheels 4 Life, Bikes 4 Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>(10) Reduced inequality &amp; (9) industry, innovation and infrastructure</td>
<td>FABIO, Kara-Tunga, Bicycles 4 Humanity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 outlined the overarching goals of the organizations. However, this brief summary above does not unearth the complexity of ‘what it looked like’ when projects were carried out in order to achieve these goals, and how this process may be messier than stated and/or advertised. The following section will begin to explore the process of how goals are enacted and how the bicycle was actually used as an international development tool.

3.2 RQ (2) How is the bicycle being used as an international ‘development’ tool (what assumptions about bicycles underlie their utilization for development purposes)?

This research question contributed to the overview of these organizations and the BFD movement by further interrogating what the landscape of BFD is, and what the BFD organizations actually do—not just what their stated goals are. In order to get at this, I had conversations with people who were directly involved in BFD and explored what they said they were doing.
As background to this section, and the remainder of the results chapter, attention to geographic location will be an important feature that will be considered and explored. The organizations and projects location, as either urban or rural, seemed to be related to ways the bicycle was (or was not) used as a development tool, the perspectives of individuals involved, and interorganizational partnerships. When speaking about urban and rural location, I am specifically referring to the communities the organizations sought to serve, and not necessarily where the organizations themselves were located. It is worth noting here that there was a higher concentration of BFD organizations in rural Northern Uganda— i.e., the organizations that served rural communities (BAP, Bikes 4 Life, Bikes Not Bombs, Bicycles 4 Humanity, Wheels 4 Life, Comic Relief/ World Bicycle Relief [WBR]) and CBOs located in rural communities that received bicycles (Amuru VHT, Kara-Tunga, KWA, UOH) were in Northern Uganda. Also, it is important to highlight that FABIO worked in both urban and rural communities, with an office in Jinja and Kampala, and that the organization served communities in various regions throughout the country.

**Bicycles Filled a Gap**

As a result of the recent history of Northern Uganda—with insurgencies having ended in 2006, just over a decade ago—some individuals still reside in internally displaced persons (IDP) camp structures, which are located far from resources, such as hospitals and schools. This socio-political landscape has contributed to BFD organizations locating themselves in this rural region. Therefore, it is perhaps unsurprising then that Northern Uganda has the highest concentration of BFD organizations in the country.

The BFD organizations I studied, according to interviewees, believed that they were filling a societal gap by providing people with mobility, and thus providing access to resources
by decreasing the physical distance in the rural regions and helping people move through infrastructure related barriers. I discuss some of these gaps below.

Addressing Health Gaps

One of the main goals for the organizations was to decrease health-related transport barriers. The bicycle was spoken about as a tool that was able to increase access to the hospital and health centres, which was the reason that the founder of BAP created the organization in the first place. Additionally, bicycles were often donated to increase the outreach of VHTs and Community Health Teams (CHTs) to sensitize communities about HIV/AIDS, to decrease stigma and marginalization, and to encourage HIV/AIDS testing and health checks. Bicycles were also used to increase access to health care centres. Initiatives such as these included constructing bicycle ambulances.

Fifteen of the participants discussed how the bicycle facilitated community health by ‘closing the gap’. Eight of the participants highlighted that the bicycles promoted HIV sensitization—also known as de-stigmatization—and encouraged testing. BAP provided a statistic stating, “bikes increase access to health clinics by 38 percent, so they were able to go to, to clinics over a third more frequently, close to 40 percent” (Bridgette*, BAP). Additionally, FABIO created their Bike 4 Care project to “bridge the existing gap between the local man accessing government health services” (Joy, FABIO) by giving bicycles to VHTs to improve health service accessibility. In this way, bikes were discussed as promoting community health, encouraging HIV/AIDS testing and increasing health access.

Moses from UOH spoke about the high levels of HIV transmission in Northern Uganda. These high rates were a product of the insurgencies, because girls were raped by the rebels who left the region in “a very devastated state” (Moses, UOH). This prompted the organization to have HIV positive females as the targeted beneficiary group of their donated bicycles. Therefore,
it was unsurprising when Cameron, a volunteer of Bikes 4 Life who has worked closely with UOH, said that in Uganda, Bikes 4 Life donated bicycles to women and children affected by HIV. This highlighted how the CBO chose the project beneficiaries and addressed the marginalization of those with HIV/AIDS, influencing how the project supported by an international organization played out on the ground.

It is important to highlight here that there were nine interviewed individuals who received bicycles through BFD projects and that most of them worked in the health field (as a VHT, CHT, or ART support agent—individuals who support people in the village who have HIV/AIDS). These participants mentioned that with a bicycle “you can save time like, you can monitor like 10 family in a day rather than moving on foot and then you cover only 2 household” (Robert, H4H). Additionally, Anthony of the CBO Amuru VHT, highlighted that:

[B]ecause of the bikes it is also very easy to make follow-up on patients and then even identify new patients that really need urgent help. Then to also go in communities and sensitize them about specific illnesses and specific problems, which he says he is so much attributing to the development and to the improvement of health within Amuru (translated by encultured informant for Anthony, Amuru VHT)

The bicycle increased the ease of movement for these VHTs, spreading the benefit of the bicycle into the community.

Additionally, the bicycles were not only given to health workers but also patients—or parents whose child was a patient at the hospital. For example, Hope for Humans gave bicycles to the parents of children with Nodding disease who were staying at the health facility. Similarly, Amuru VHT also:

[G]ave them [the bicycle] to the patients because we realize, we, we, we want to really learn to encourage the HIV/ AIDS patients, so we gave them to the patients so that someone can see and say ya we are supported at least (Alfred, Amuru)
Due to the fact that various organizations disseminated their goal of improving health online, it was unsurprising when a lot of the participants spoke about, and provided examples of, the bicycle facilitating access to health resources.

**Addressing Education Gaps**

The bicycle was also discussed as a catalyst for education development by reducing the length of travel to school and thus increasing school attendance, educational accessibility and longevity. Some of the bicycle donations were meant to provide children with transportation to school or for parents to transport their children to school—in recognition that without bicycles there was a lack of transportation available and that long-distance acted as a barrier to accessing education. For example, Joy described FABIO’s Cycle to School initiative below:

> [T]he stakeholders are the students themselves who are the immediate beneficiaries and then their parents because they help them to maintain the bikes and all those things but also this bike is used at home to do some other stuff. This is why we consider parents to be also a beneficiary. But third also the teachers are, we are considering them as main stakeholders. Because we are looking at reducing school drops outs and one of the issues that come out is the long distances that the students move, the teacher is supposed to help us in evaluation, how are the students fairing after receiving the bikes, is there any improvement? (Joy, FABIO)

Joy highlighted how a bicycle was a tool that facilitated access to education for youth, and how there were multiple stakeholders involved in a project, thus demonstrating one of the ways that this CBO worked with the community.

Additionally, through bicycle centres and workshops, BFD organizations provided youth with education about the bicycle, in conjunction with other forms of vocational skills training. Moses highlighted that two objectives of UOH was to facilitate transporting school going children and to “provide formal and informal education to families, to children, and to adult” (Moses, UOH). On a personal level, Ocen acknowledged how the education he gained through the bicycle, made him respected in the community.
People used to look at him as being somebody who is not going to school, or not educated, but from the work of this bicycle, now people have started respecting him (translated for Ocen, UOH)

Specifically, MOTF hopes to set up a workshop to hire the youth from their vocational school, which would most likely mirror Ocen’s experience above.

The organizations sometimes highlighted education as a goal and the beneficiaries discussed transporting youth to school as a way that their bicycle was utilized (also evident here is one of the communal aspects of the bicycle). An important finding from this research though is that other forms of education, such as becoming a mechanic, were discussed quite heavily as an opportunity provided through the bicycles arriving in and moving within communities in Uganda.

**Bicycles Create a More Equitable Society and Improve Living Standards**

Bicycles, across the board, were discussed as tools employed to improve the standard of living and create an equitable society by providing (as we’ve seen above) access to health and education, as well as economic (agricultural) participation, and social integration through community development. Below, the vignette illuminates how these organizations attempted to make the bicycle more affordable and accessible by bringing them to the communities.

[A] bike, going to the garden, to such, going to the market, same bike takes the children to school, the same bike goes to the health centre, the same bike brings to back home after doing all those things. I mean, a bike is doing everything. But this bike is not expensive to, to afford because if you’re doing co-funding, it’s very little money to get it. And now that FABIO takes these bikes to the local people, they’re easily accessible. It doesn’t require someone to go to Kampala to get a bike. Though the bike actually finds them in their villages, so many we’ve reduced on accessibility and actually life is changing when you look at it, it is just rotating but changing actually. Somehow reducing the vicious circle of poverty (Najjiba, FABIO)

It is noted that not only do the bicycles themselves become more accessible, but they make resources more accessible by providing the beneficiaries with mobility.
**Bicycles Decreased Barriers to Participating in the Economy**

As previously highlighted, the organizations had the goal of promoting economic development—as bicycles were donated with the intention of making individuals entrepreneurs, so they could contribute to the national economy. This was implicit in the mission statements of the BFD organizations that referred to “cycling out of poverty”, which insinuated that the bicycle could help to economically develop beneficiaries to change their social and financial position—perhaps, without considering other societal barriers that they may be experiencing. These organizations disseminated messages about economic development as the bicycle was intended to increase productivity for household duties, create employment opportunities, and be distributed through microfinance efforts. All of these were thought to improve the economic well-being and quality of life for individuals, groups, and/or communities.

The bicycle also supposedly ‘kick-started’ economic participation for the beneficiaries as it allowed them to access markets and become players in the economy.

> [W]hat we see is households who have bikes and who didn’t in the past see about a 35% increase in their income. Areas where there weren’t bikes before but now there are, we see about a 30% increase in market attendance and participation and our basic metric is you know with a bicycle someone can carry 5 times as much and travel 4 times as far (Brian, BAP)

The clients of BAP could apply for a loan and invest in a bicycle that could then contribute to their own economic growth.

Economic development was often connected to agricultural development, as agriculture was the main source of income for many of the beneficiaries in rural Uganda. Above, Brian highlighted that bicycles provided mobility to transport goods to sell at the market. Cameron from Bikes 4 Life also noted that travelling to the market allowed people to sell their crops at a higher price, which would increase their income. Cameron described his belief that through participation in VSLAs, people would have “some degree of financial stability”—because the
extra money the beneficiaries earned could provide them with the opportunity to save, and create
a group bank and an “emergency fund”. He speculated that this could positively impact the
beneficiary’s long-term health and wealth. However, these conversations highlight how the onus
remained on the individuals to take responsibility for their financial position.

Alternatively, a more national approach was found in the projects of the CBOs FABIO
and Kara-Tunga, who have been using the bicycle to promote tourism. The organizations
focused on social interactions between tourists, as well as among and between communities. The
bicycle in this context was discussed as an equalizer—as a mode of transportation that everyone
could afford and use—for people of various classes to ride together in an activity that would
financially support the organizations, and contribute to the national economy and the
community’s economic growth.

These results highlighted how bicycles were donated to prompt economic development
on the individual and community level, and that beneficiaries were encouraged to cycle out of
poverty, work hard and alter their impoverished state. Additionally, by creating an opportunity
for social interaction surrounding the bicycle, the perspectives that people hold about the bicycle
could be challenged, and perhaps changed.

**Bicycles for Community Development**

The majority of the participants believed that the bicycle was not just for the chosen
beneficiary, but that a bicycle was for a group. Brian aptly described the community aspect of the
bicycle through his observation:

Last week I went for repayment in one of the local villages […] so a young boy who I
think was the child of one of our loan clients came riding up on a bike and he went with
somebody on a motorcycle, left the bike there and then someone who was there where I
was sitting, got on the bike and went somewhere else and came back with it so there’s
kind of a communal element to whose using them (Brian, BAP)
Bridgette* from BAP quantified how bikes are shared with at least 5 people on a weekly basis. The beneficiaries also spoke about sharing their bicycle with family members and trusted friends to help them develop their own business. For example, Tarisa, a beneficiary from the CBO KWA, shared her bicycle twice a week with a lady to help her sell her crops at the market. Therefore, although there was a sense of ownership around the bicycle, this did not prevent others, such as family or friends, from using the bicycle to benefit socially and economically.

Additionally, bicycles were talked about as objects that permitted and facilitated social interactions among and across community members. Moses (UOH) discussed how a bicycle allowed him “to access my relatives, I will be able to access sporting events, I will be able to be in position to do a lot of recreational activities”. Moreover, it was often acknowledged how people in rural areas walked if they didn’t have a bicycle, and that the bicycle provided mobility and allowed the beneficiaries to become integrated in their community.

Pertinent to note here, is that the rural areas of Uganda were rooted in traditional values and structured patriarchally—especially in the rural North (Branch, 2013). The result of this was that the BFD organizations were motivated to provide bicycles to women for social integration and participation; specifically, with the objective of creating a more gender equitable society.

Both CBOs, FABIO and UOH, discussed community cycling events that they have hosted and/or were planning to host in the near future. The goals of these events were to promote cycling, create a space for community interactions, and encourage positive perceptions about the bicycle. Najjiba, from FABIO, spoke about their bicycle rallies as spaces to show women that cycling is a sport “everyone should enjoy it and it has nothing to do with men or women, it is everything that someone is supposed to enjoy”. Moses explained how events were part of the CBOs “social programming so that even their trauma, as much as they are HIV positive but when we do sporting, in HIV they forget about their status and they will live so freely and be able to speak”
(Moses, UOH). These organizations hoped that by creating the opportunity for people to interact, they would reduce inequality and alter the perceptions of the community (i.e., change the mindset that women should be relegated to domestic chores and/or should not ride bicycles).

However, the new presence of bicycles in the communities did not come without problems. Some of the beneficiaries highlighted that being chosen to receive a bicycle became a signifier of illness (which will be discussed in more depth later) or caused tension in the community between those who were beneficiaries and those who were not included in the BFD projects. Walter, a volunteer of Hope for Humans who received a bicycle through the organization’s BFD project, discussed how people in his community did not understand why he was chosen to receive the bicycle—and they were angry with him for the opportunity he received, that they did not. Similarly, Amoli below highlighted how

These days now for her when she is going to church, they are scared because in church there are wrong people who target them when they go to church saying, ‘these bicycles they get it for free’ (Amoli, UOH)

Although bicycle access was associated with people becoming active members in their communities, there were certain contexts that people would and would not use their bicycles – and there were community members who were disappointed and irritated at their exclusion from BFD projects.

3.3 RQ (3) What are the perspectives of those involved in such bicycle-driven development on their work and industry?

[T]he image of the bicycle really changes when you go from the rural areas into town where people really aren’t farmers and A might look down on farmers but also B the bikes that we provide it’s really kind of like, oh that’s a village bike, and it really is I mean that is really instrumental for being able to carry your crops and so well people in town will either want a sports bike, it’s like once you move to town you either get a sports bike or you look down upon bikes in general (Brigette*, BAP)
The Meaning of the Bicycle: Unstable and Contextual

One of my key findings was that people’s perspectives on BFD were situated in, and shaped by, their social and geographic positioning. Put another way, I discovered that the meaning of the bicycle was unstable, as different people had different views on the bicycle’s utility as a BFD tool – and on the status of the bicycle more generally – in different places and different contexts (as the opening quotation from Brigette* suggests), and that these meanings/perspectives also changed overtime.

In the following section I consider the range of perspectives on BFD with particular attention to how ‘context mattered’ when assessing how BFD was understood – especially the urban and rural context, as well as differences between the various regions of Uganda.

Views on the Origin, Brand and Type of Bicycle

The historical context of Uganda and its regions needed to be considered when thinking through the meaning(s) of the bicycle. I found it intriguing that the ‘local’ bicycle in Uganda actually referred to bicycles imported from India. This was especially interesting because of the large Indian population in the nation, and how in the 1970s during Idi Amin’s presidency, he ordered that the Indian population was expelled from Uganda under his order.

Presently, many of the bicycle shops are owned by Indian men, and these ‘local’ bicycles were discussed as readily available in central Uganda. However, as I moved out of the central region, the bicycle shops sold fewer bicycles (because of the difficultly transporting the bicycles to rural areas, a point which will be visited later), and instead were more focused on repairs and/or spare parts. Therefore, there were fewer bicycles available for purchase in the Northern or Eastern regions.

The lack of opportunity to purchase a bicycle in the Northern region was one of the reasons why these organizations situated themselves in this region of the country, and another
way that these organizations responded to a local need. However, due to the high concentration of BFD organizations in one region of the country, the organizations thought it was important to brand their bicycles, so that people would recognize the organization once the bikes entered and moved within the communities. BAP discussed an example:

[F]ocusing specifically on Northern Uganda, this new bike that we’re bringing in called Oteka Yoo is something that is very regional right. Uganda has about 31 or 32 different languages spoken in the country and so that name would not resonate with anybody outside of Acholiland. So, if they are not speaking Luo, or Langi, then they wouldn’t be meaningful (Brian, BAP)

Bicycle branding was discussed as a marketing opportunity for potential clients to recognize the organization, which could increase the number of individuals applying for loans. However, through branding, additional meanings were attached to the bicycle. For example, the Oteka Yoo bicycle is known in Northern Gulu and Lira communities as a village bike for farmers.

It is also relevant here that interviewees suggested that people had preferences for what type of bicycle would be most useful in their local environment. In Kadama, a district in Eastern Uganda, the participants talked about how “sports bicycle, it can’t work in, with our community since our community the roads you can see, they are rough” (Margaret, KWA). Instead, they spoke highly about the Buffalo bikes (which were donated and constructed specifically by WBR), because they could transport people or heavy weights for agriculture and permit movement through the poor infrastructure of their environment. Additionally, according to Ocen of UOH, in Northern Lira, the Avon brand (imported from India) or Chinese imported bicycles were the most attractive:

[B]ecause they feel that type of bicycle is very strong because for people who does businesses and more especially the women that you can find them carrying a whole sack of cassava. […] Those are the types, it’s there but that one is for leisure [referring to the mountain bike] people fear that one because getting their spares is not easy (Ocen, UOH)

In contrast to Ocen, Theo acknowledged how mountain bikes would facilitate tourism in Eastern Karamoja, however, “at the moment, the mountain bikes are very scarce” (Theo, Kara-Tunga).
Similarly, due to the lack of mountain bikes in central Mityana, Matthew from MOTF said that mountain bikes are known as luxurious and that they would “uplift…the status of living”. With these different perspectives in mind, it was unsurprising that interviewees of CBOs discussed specific variables of various bicycles that did or did not align with their community’s environmental and social needs, which contributed to how they spoke about the donated bicycles as a success, or not.

**The Social and Symbolic Meaning of the Bicycle**

One of the most striking findings of this research had to do with the social meanings associated with the bicycle. Below, I report findings on this topic – referring specifically to the range of meanings associated with bicycles across different contexts. Specifically, I will talk to the bicycle as a sign of wealth; the challenges associated to people’s perspectives; how there were conflicting meanings of the bicycle in the context of health development; how the bicycle could be a tool for empowerment (and not) – and how there was a gendered component to this.

**The Bicycle as a ‘Sign of Wealth’ and ‘Tool for the Poor’: Regional Differences**

The bicycle was a signifier of having wealth and prestige – and, in other contexts, was known as ‘a tool for the poor’. In rural areas, it was generally accepted that the bicycle provided access to resources, was a sign of wealth/ prestige, and was a tool that built respect from community members. For example, the VHTs (which in this research were all male) discussed how the bicycle built their status, made them “a person of class” (Anthony, Amuru) and a community leader. The males in these cases (but not the females, interestingly) discussed how the bicycle was associated to ‘strength’ in the home and in the community. This was perhaps connected to conceptualizations of ‘masculinity’ related to the perception that the male should be the breadwinner, which the bicycle facilitated by providing mobility and increasing productivity.
In contrast, it was noted that in urban areas the bicycle often had a negative association as it was known as a ‘tool for the poor’ (Kayemba, 2013). Najjiba from FABIO noted this when she explained that she “grew up in the central part of Uganda, which is looking at cycling, especially for women differently [i.e., not as positively] as compared to this [Jinja/ Eastern] part of Uganda [which is more rural, and lower income]” (Najjiba, FABIO). This understanding spoke to the distribution of wealth throughout the country as people in the central region had cars, whereas in the rural areas the bicycle was one of the only modes of transportation (as it was not as common for people to own vehicles).

Other Contextual Factors Impacting Views on the Utility of The Bicycle: Road Infrastructure and Bike Facilities in Urban and Rural Areas

There were also differences in road infrastructure that impacted how the bicycle was understood in different regions. The more urban areas in Central and Western Uganda had better infrastructure—i.e., constructed roads, with fewer pot holes—so it was easier for a car to move. In the rural regions, though, many roads were decrepit because of a lack of funds towards their infrastructure and the rural villages mainly consisted of dirt roads that were known to become impassable with rain. In these rural environments, bicycles were more common and especially useful, as they may have been able to move with more ease than a car.

However, throughout the country, there was a lack of bicycle parking or distinguished bicycle lanes—which could make cycling dangerous, especially in areas that are busy with cars:

[W]e worked with UNEP on this process we had realized we’ve given out so many bicycles, we’ve given out but we’ve not appreciated the safety of the people we are giving bicycles to and we realized the people that are appreciating the bicycles are only the people this side [Eastern Uganda]. So why aren’t people in central Uganda for example appreciating the bicycle? And some of the challenges were there are no facilities. So, someone is not comfortable to ride a bicycle because there are no facilities. Some of them feel like the technology itself is a problem, how can I ride that Indian bike? (Najjiba, FABIO)
Therefore, it was not only the perception of the bicycle as a tool for the poor, but also the lack of bicycle facilities. This, along with the congestion of Kampala, contributed to the perspective of cycling as unsafe. It also highlights the issue that people in the central region have power to influence perspectives and determine the infrastructure of more rural regions. It is notable here also that FABIO as a CBO altered their goals based on the needs of communities across the nation, and also approached their projects from a macro-level perspective at the same time.

**Varying Perspectives on the Bicycle’s Role in Health Development**

Similar to bicycles as a signifier of wealth/status (or lack of wealth/status), there were unstable perspectives associated with the utilization of bicycles for health development. As we’ve already seen, the bicycle was most commonly talked about as positively impacting the health of people within communities—i.e., it made health-related work easier, increased community outreach, eased transportation for health care workers to follow-up on patients and/or sensitize the community to various health issues and was shared amongst community members to access health facilities. Bicycles also began to change people’s negative perspectives of HIV/AIDS because the opportunity to potentially receive a bicycle motivated them to get checked for the virus (because when bicycles were donated to that specific population, hospital records were checked to verify that the beneficiaries had HIV/AIDS), and if they were positive, to take their medication. Margaret from KWA explained that the bicycle really helped men to get tested for HIV/AIDS because they too wanted a bicycle—and men had more stigma towards the virus than woman. Therefore, these initiatives could work to decrease stigma in the community, encourage individuals to get checked and normalize the experiences of those with HIV/AIDS.

However, at the same time that the bicycle was described as positive for individuals and the community, the bicycle was also discussed as a signifier of HIV/AIDS for individuals,
children and families – i.e., that owning bicycles known to be donated to those with HIV/AIDS could be stigmatizing. Consider the following comment from Amoli of UOH:

The challenge they have is the community member now knows that those that have the bicycles, are these ones affected by HIV? Eh? Those are the ones within the community who have the disease. Now one day there’s a child who was born HIV positive. [...] she was playing with the rest of the children, her friends within the community, when those children started telling, ‘eh you’re HIV positive, now your home is people who have bicycles. Those bicycles are for the sick people, eh?’ (Amoli, UOH)

This issue of stigma was especially evident when the bicycles were branded, and the community knew that those bicycles were donated to that specific population. A specific example is from the beneficiaries of KWA who received the Buffalo Bicycles from WBR, “they talk bad words on us, whom got the bicycles. Sometimes they say eh, at first, they were saying those people who got those bicycles, they’re the ones having AIDS” (Tarisa, KWA). Therefore, although the bicycle was donated with good intentions, the beneficiaries illuminated the challenges they faced once the bicycles were donated. Without gathering the experiences of people who received bicycles, these organizations may have not been aware, or able, to consider these challenges. This highlights the importance of following-up and keeping in communication with beneficiaries to determine how BFD projects play out in the local context.

**Various Discourses on how Bicycles can be a Tool for Empowerment**

Although interviewees generally shared the belief that bicycles could ‘empower people’ – empowerment was understood in a variety of ways. While there was general agreement that empowerment was facilitated by access to mobility and the freedom to be mobile – there was also a gendered aspect to empowerment. Organizations that donated bicycles to groups of females discussed how the bicycles gave them ‘freedom’ to move and access transportation, which allowed them to participate in society, move to their gardens and the market, and attend social events—a perspective that was also shared by female beneficiaries. Another empowerment discourse was associated to neoliberalism, in the sense that the *individuals* were empowered to
become autonomous actors in their own lives to ‘cycle out of poverty’ by becoming entrepreneurs and participating in the economy. Each of these empowerment modes will be discussed in more depth throughout this section.

**Female Empowerment and the Bicycle**

Some organizations specifically chose females as their target beneficiaries and created projects with implicit goals of empowering females. The programs focused on issues of women’s (im)mobility with(in) the gendered structures of society that these BFD organizations sought to respond to or change.

Most of the organizations were aware of females’ positions (i.e. domestic roles) in the contexts where the bikes were being distributed – which was why they donated bicycles to females in the first place. Najjiba of the CBO FABIO explained the underlying assumption that bicycles would ease work for females:

[B]ecause the women are responsible for most of the work, especially in communities in these rural communities. Women are supposed to take children to school, women are supposed to fetch water, women are the ones that go to the garden. Although it is the men to sell the output from the garden, but it is the women to go to the garden and grow this plant and whatever crops! (Najjiba, FABIO)

The multiple domestic roles that are relegated to the women, in the context that Najjiba refers to above, is part of the patriarchal structuring. So, by donating bicycles, these organizations were orienting their work around the belief that bikes may make work easier and more equitable for women in rural Uganda, and that the bicycles may alter this societal structuring.

As previously outlined, bicycles were donated to groups of women because of their ‘vulnerable’ position in society. Below, Moses highlighted why he chose to work with women:

I had to choose to work with women because I feel like a women has many major primary role in a home. Where you find a home is empowered that means the women is the one who is strong and taking lead, in businesses, in organizations (Moses, UOH)
Moses noted that the bicycle allowed women to access core facilities faster and easier – and through these opportunities, women were to be empowered, active members of society.

The female beneficiaries that I interviewed also highlighted how the bicycle ‘empowered’ them. For example:

Another development I can see in those bicycles, the way these, these ladies are using them in their businesses, now some are, they carry their basket, tomato baskets take to the markets, they carry their sweet potatoes, their food to the markets. That is development (Margaret, KWA)

Additionally, Amoli, a beneficiary of UOH, acknowledged how the bicycle allowed her to mobilize groups of women (including older women) to meet for their VSLA meetings, which highlighted individual and community empowerment for these women.

As alluded to, the female participants spoke about empowerment transcending to others in their communities – because they shared their bicycles with other females and because women who used the bicycles challenged and changed the perception of women in their communities. Alum, a beneficiary at UOH, elaborated on this idea – noting that within the group of women that she is involved with, collective female empowerment contributed to changing the perceptions of females in her community to be perceived as resourceful.

Additionally, FABIO discussed a documentary that they were planning to create based off of their cycling events, in order to demonstrate the difference a bicycle can make for women. Najjiba explained: “[it’s] about how the bicycles are helping women in communities, what women go through in communities [and…] how bicycles are helping to empower women, how at the end of the day, a women is happy to have 2000 shillings” (Najjiba, FABIO). Najjiba went on to suggest that the empowerment these women feel, positively impacted their happiness, financial position and also changed the perceptions of women in their community.

Although these responses represent how the female beneficiaries embodied the intended empowerment of the bicycle projects, the organizations still faced challenges when distributing
bicycles to this population because the females had to overcome how people in their community perceived them and had to demonstrate to others their ability to be resourceful.

**Empowerment as Individualism and Personal Responsibility**

The second empowerment discourse followed the ideology of neoliberalism, which was driven by these organizations encouraging the beneficiaries to use their bicycle to facilitate financial empowerment, increase their participation in the economy and drive themselves out of poverty. Bridgette* from BAP highlighted how the bicycle “is an income generating tool and it’s an opportunity for people in the most deep rural areas to get access to different places [...] and there’s a lot of autonomy” (Bridgette*, BAP). Other organizations had similar visions of the bicycle being used for work. According to David at P4P, the bicycles made the beneficiaries more productive as “the average recipient that gets one of my bikes has like a fifteen percent rise in income the first week they have the bike, just ‘cause they can get to where they need to go” (David, P4P). Other interviewees made similar comments, saying things like the “bicycle is like a kind of revenue” (Alfred, Amuru VHT).

FABIO highlighted the model they constructed to ensure that their beneficiaries would maximize the bicycle and become ‘self-sustaining’, independent individuals in the community:

> [W]e work in stages before a person actually receives bicycles, they have to go in steps. They have to concept, conceptualization step where we are just talking about development, where we are talking about things. Then we have another stage where we are talking about income generation, how a bicycle can be used for income generation. Then we have another stage of how do you prepare yourself to handle this bicycle, in terms of maintenance, in terms of what. So, by the time the person actually receives the bicycle, also knows how best to maximize its potential (Najjiba, FABIO)

This quote highlighted how the individuals receiving the bicycles were, according to interviewees, taught to become responsible – which meant using the bike to its fullest potential (to reap the most benefits) and to understand how the bicycle could help them develop and generate their income.
Dependent upon how the bicycle was donated, the representatives of the BFD organizations believed that there were different understandings about the impact and sense of ownership the beneficiaries would feel. Some founders and employees of BFD organizations (both CBO and international) believed that when the bicycles were sold instead of given freely, a sense of ownership would be felt by the beneficiaries, which they emphasized by speaking about the notion of personal responsibility. Additionally, these participants believed that when the beneficiaries contributed to the bicycle (i.e., offered some form of payment for the bicycle), it was more likely that they would take better care of it, which would contribute to long term use and sustainability.

Interestingly, BAP questioned whether micro-financing potentially excluded some beneficiaries that could benefit from a bicycle. I found this particularly interesting because out of the three organizations that sold bicycles (FABIO, BAP and P4P through co-funding/credit scheme, loans, or full purchase, respectively), only BAP questioned whether they were being exclusionary through their method of distribution. Bridgette* from BAP stated how “it’s hard just in general to think about is financing a bicycle the best way to leverage change” because “it’s pretty costly but then I think that there’s a lot of financial empowerment” (Bridgette*, BAP).

Similarly, Brian highlighted some tension between the clients and the organization:

You know when you think about being an NGO, serving a client base to improve their lives, our goal would not be to have 100% repayment. I mean that would tell me that we’re not meeting, we’re not reaching the clients who need us the most. Right? So, we wouldn’t, we don’t expect perfect repayment because [those are] the clients who are struggling and who stand to benefit the most from the bike loans (Brian, BAP)

Therefore, distribution methods can produce financial tension since micro-financing may, on one hand, provide individualized economic empowerment – and, on the other hand, may exclude and marginalize community members by not giving them the opportunity to participate in BFD in the first place.
The conversation here demonstrated that although the beneficiaries seemed to embody
the empowerment intended through the distribution of bicycles from these BFD organizations,
there may be a lack of critical analysis by these organizations—as some of them sought to alter
individuals’ lives without addressing the larger social structuring of gender roles and why people
were impoverished in the first place.

**Barriers to Changing Perspectives on the Bicycle**

FABIO highlighted the challenges of trying to change perspectives on the bicycle.
Interviewees in this organization noted that politicians and major stakeholders held the belief that
bicycles were ‘for the poor’, and that there was no (political) reason to incorporate bicycles into
policy planning—as such planning would apparently represent ‘backward thinking’ (Pojani &
Stead, 2015). Najjiba explained:

> [W]e still have challenges of attitude towards the bicycle usage in Uganda. People still
believe a bicycle is for a poor person and that is it. So, we still have that challenge. Even
the policy makers themselves, although they are slowly accepting, majority of them
think, how can we talk about a bicycle at this area? We should be talking about cars,
different models, so we have attitude and we have also culture barriers, especially for
women (Najjiba, FABIO)

Although FABIO succeeded in implementing a non-motorized transport (NMT) policy, Najjiba
highlighted the perceptions of the bicycle held by people in power, which made it difficult to
incorporate NMT into the national policy. She explained that ‘developing countries’ are “moving
from cars to bicycles” and that FABIO has been trying to make politicians and people in Uganda
“see a bicycle as a trend”. By borrowing ideas from other countries (and through the
organization’s European partnerships), FABIO intended to alter the mindset of politicians—and
hoped that this altered perception would transcend into civil society—so that the bicycle would
not just be seen as a tool for the poor.

FABIO was the only BFD organization that worked in the urban context and had political
connections. This domestic CBO looked to challenge and change macro-level issues of road
safety and bicycle perceptions. This was in contrast to overarching claims from some international BFD organizations, that were not as context-focused and seemed to be more oriented around promoting their BFD organization – as would be expected in the business model adopted by these BFDs. Additionally, as we have seen throughout this section, speaking to people on the ground provided insight into the BFD movement, contextualized how BFD projects played out, and drew attention to the challenges that occurred when bicycles arrived, and moved within, communities. These points begin to address issues that will be the focus of the next research question, on globalization and BFD-driven international development.

3.4 RQ (4) What can be learned from the BFD movement about globalization processes and the impacts of technologies traveling to and within the Two-Thirds World?

As previously stated, I spoke to people on the ground and attended to their experiences, with a focus on how their experiences—as either founders, employees or beneficiaries of CBOs or international BFD organizations—offered insight into features of globalization, and the global BFD movement. As will be especially evident, the global and local were not dichotomous but interacted and worked together to create the BFD movement.

**International Movement of Bicycles: Friction**

By talking to individuals directly involved with the shipment, local distribution and utilization of bicycles in Uganda, I discovered that bikes did not necessarily move in direct and/or smooth ways. Following Tsing’s (2005) concept of friction, bicycles moved in “awkward, unequal, unstable and creative” ways through “interconnections across difference” (p.4). Within the context of this research, I found that friction was created through the movement of bicycles to and within the Two-Thirds World—through cross-border movements and the power of the national government—and that there were power inequalities between the First-Third World and the Two-Thirds World.
Global/local Movement of Bicycles: Complexities and inequalities

Although this research focused on the national context of Uganda, I was especially interested in the movement of these bicycles, and how friction was encountered as bicycles moved to, and within, Uganda. I will begin with a comment made by David, from P4P, an American based not-for-profit that ships bicycles globally. He highlighted that:

[I]t [i.e., the movement of bicycles] really just doesn’t work in landlocked countries, Uganda, Malawi, Mali, South Sudan, Kyrgyzstanin, Afghanistan. Landlocked countries, it’s just, the cost is so prohibitive. As long as you’re on the water, you’re doing fine, water’s cheap, as soon as you get to moving on wheels and to an eighteen-wheeler […] Shipping costs change so much, like domestic costs have gone up. To ship a container to Uganda, first it’s thirteen hundred dollars domestic trucking, that’s every container […] Then to ship it from - on a boat - from Newark to Mombasa, is thirty-five hundred dollars. Which isn’t bad. But to bring it from Mombasa into Kampala, is forty-two hundred dollars. And then they charge about fifteen percent import tax and a BAT tax […] it’s just the sheer costs of the reality of logistics and shipping. You know people ask me, why do you ship where you ship to and my answer always is, I ship where the world will allow me to do it (David, P4P)

David discussed how different forms of transportation decreased or increased friction, such as water being cheap and easy, but land transportation was expensive and was known to produce various forms of friction—ultimately, these frictions influenced whether or not P4P delivered their bicycles to certain countries. Other interviewees also discussed how once the bicycles landed in Uganda, it was still very expensive to ship them throughout the country, especially for the organizations in the rural north—which, as we’ve seen, is where the majority of the BFD organizations were located.

The founders and employees of BFD organizations in Uganda provided insight into the local specificities of the movement of the bicycle and people who directly dealt with the importation of bicycles. They specifically discussed the trajectory the bicycle took and the associated costs and challenges within Uganda (i.e. restrictions and regulation put in place by the government). Moses highlighted that the cost of receiving a bicycle container from an international organization was about $12,000 to $13,000 US because it costs around $6,000 US
to ship the container of bicycles from America and another $6,000 US to clear the container in Uganda. He also elaborated on the additional costs for inland transportation to ship the container from Kampala to the communities for distribution. Domestic organizations, such as FABIO, Kara-Tunga and UOH, sometimes purchased bicycles in Uganda to distribute within the nation to avoid the costs associated with the bicycles entering the country (i.e., UOH’s MOU with Wheels 4 Life, which stipulates an annual monetary donation to purchase bicycles locally). In this way, the financial cost of transportation may also exclude organizations and individuals from participating in the BFD movement, as the friction caused by (lack of) financial capital impeded the movement of bicycles.

Another example was provided by Brian from BAP who described how the organization decided to become a supplier of their own brand by partnering with a manufacturer in India:

[B]ecause of availability, because of price fluctuation, because of supply and demand issues, we decided that we wanted to try directly importing bikes instead of going through existing channels and in Uganda, for the bikes that are currently here in the market place there are a limited number of supplies and so we decided to look at essentially becoming a supplier of our own brand (Brian, BAP)

In reflection then, and acknowledging the challenges associated with bicycles moving within Uganda, a larger challenge was associated to the bicycles entering Uganda. Brian specifically indicated that the trajectory of bicycles traveling through Kenya impacted the shipment of bicycles to Uganda. In this way, friction was also created by the political environments of the surrounding countries— as Uganda is geographically a landlocked country, which, as highlighted above, is associated to transport-related frictions as well.

**National Frictions**

The government of Uganda was discussed as one of the main actors that facilitated or impeded BFD projects. For the Northern CBOs, such as UOH, the government connected the organization with female VSLA groups who sought to have a group project. Amoli, a leader of a
VSLA group and a UOH beneficiary, highlighted this process by explaining that “[t]he parish chief was working with Moses […] Mr. Cameroon [from Bikes 4 Life] came, gave us bicycles”. Therefore, the VSLA was connected to the CBO through the government and this connection facilitated the community’s connection to the international organization Bikes 4 Life, through UOH.

Although the government provided connections for some organizations, the government also created challenges. An example of this was the taxes put in place by the government. Moses (UOH) highlighted how “it [i.e., importing bikes] has become a real source of income and revenue for the government” and because of the high tax, organizations have stopped or are discouraged from shipping bikes to Uganda since they could distribute bicycles to countries where it costs less, they are not taxed, and it’s easier to do so (i.e., less inland transportation).

To combat the challenges associated with bicycle taxation, FABIO discussed how they “tried to pursue tax exemption for bicycles especially for those that going to communities. But somehow with the government procedures and how they work, it was a little big lagging” (Najjiba, FABIO). The CBOs addressed how they were disappointed that they were unable to receive tax exemptions, unlike hospitals or large organizations such as World Vision, even though they believed that they were “doing the work for the government” (Moses, UOH).

Additionally, the international organizations believed that they were helping the local people, because the communities were not receiving social provisions from the government. For example, David from P4P highlighted that his organization had good intentions of helping civil society because he believed that the government wasn’t doing so. However, he noted that tensions and barriers arose:

[Y]ou say, ‘I'm coming here to help poor people you know, we're bringing in these goods and tryna help the poor people’ and the government quite boldly says, "look, you don't know nothing - we live here, we know what needs to be done and you pay the tax and
we're gonna help the poor people”. If you're importing goods, unless you know someone in the government, they slam you with tax (David, P4P).

It is important to acknowledge the perception that David had of the government, from his perspective as an outsider trying to ‘do good’ for the nation. However, it is just as important, and very interesting, to hear about the government’s perspective of international organizations ‘trying to help’, especially because Museveni has qualified “globalization as a form of oppression” (Njoh, 2006, p. 25). David also alluded to ‘exceptions to neoliberalism’ (Ong, 2006), that if the international organization had a connection to someone in the government, transport-related frictions could be reduced, which could make the importation of bicycles easier.

**Inequalities Between the First and Two-Thirds World: ‘Beholden to the Global North’**

The international relations—between individuals who occupied different positions in the BFD movement globally—were entrenched with power imbalances. The common themes that arose when speaking to beneficiaries was that the bicycles they received ‘made them hard working’ – but, as a beneficiary, they had no choice in the type of bicycle they were receiving. Additionally, there were also people in communities where there was a high-demand for bicycles, and where BFD organizations operated, who were excluded from receiving a bicycle during the distribution. Although the beneficiary CBOs—that had bicycle projects initiated by international organizations, such as Amuru VHTs, KWA and Hope 4 Humans—could not themselves facilitate the distribution of bicycles into the communities in which they lived, these international organizations relied heavily on the domestic CBOs for their projects to succeed.

---

7 The term Global North is used here intentionally because the phrase is entrenched with power relations (i.e., generalized understandings of Northern and Southern hemispheres, whereby the former is perceived to have wealth, power, and resources, and the latter is perceived to have less of each variable). Moreover, Robertson (1990) discusses the ‘mapping of the world’ as a vital ingredient of global-political culture, whereby discourses of mapping fuse geography “with political, economic, cultural and other forms of placement of nations on the global-international map” (p. 25).
Margaret from the CBO KWA explained the history of their bicycle project. She elaborated how individuals from their donor organization, Comic Relief in the One-Third-World, visited them to perform an ‘on-the-ground’ study in 2015, where they discovered that there was a need for transportation. As excited as the beneficiaries were to receive the bicycles, the shipment of bicycles into the community was not without problems because “a challenge, some got annoyed, some were got discouraged […] that is our community, we have nothing to do because there were only 100 bicycles and we have so many people, we cannot give everybody”. This experience highlighted one instance of how the international organizations held the power to determine when, why and how the bicycle moved to, and within, Ugandan communities.

International organizations also made the domestic CBOs take ownership of the BFD projects (i.e., it was up to the domestic CBOs to facilitate the importation of bicycles, and oftentimes they had to pay for the shipment, and coordinate in-land transportation, etc.). David used to ship to Uganda and has been in the process of establishing a new local partnership with Matthew, the founder of MOTF. David elaborated how “it’s up to our partners to live up to the agreement that they signed and distribute those bikes equitably and fair” (David, P4P). Through a free-market approach he stated that the success of the project was up to the local organization in charge of the project. However, Matthew addressed how his “organization lacks donor funding” (Matthew, MOTF) and that generating money locally was difficult. This led to delays around the bicycle project in his community—even though a high demand for bicycles existed.

The domestic CBOs often discussed funding challenges (or lack of funding) that impacted the sustainability of their projects. Margaret from KWA highlighted “when we do some proposals, we don’t go through and time comes when there is no funding. There is no funding, like now there is nothing”. Funding was the biggest challenge faced by organizations “[b]ecause most of our NGOs in Uganda, including us, we depend on so much on external sources of
funding. So that sustainability is a challenge” (Najjiba, FABIO). Najjiba noted the difficulty of sustaining a project after the donor pulls out. This was an experience shared by Amuru VHT in their relationship with the international organization Bikes Not Bombs. Bikes Not Bombs had the bicycles to distribute but could not cover the cost of the shipment. Although Amuru VHT tried to gather the money to pay for shipping by selling some of the bicycles that they had previously received, not enough people in the community made a purchase – which forced their BFD project to end and for no new bicycles to arrive. Anthony, a voluntary VHT from Amuru VHT, described how as an organization, they were financially weak and although there was a high demand for the bicycles that they received from international organizations, as beneficiaries from a small rural CBO in Uganda, they were passive players on the periphery of the global system – where they relied on larger international organizations to initiate their participation and contribute to project longevity.

Throughout this research, the positioning of the Two-Thirds World as ‘passive and grateful recipients of aid’ has been evident. Alum, a beneficiary of UOH, highlighted how they accept what was brought to them, as they are not able to make choices regarding the bicycles. Similarly, Anthony from Amuru VHT discussed how:

[A] beggar has no choice. Most times when organizations come, they already have a drawn plan, a drawn budget on whatever work they are coming to do. So, even when they start, discrepancy in their thoughts, in the need, the people in the community have a different interest, the organization come with a different interest. That has to be organized. The people in the villages have no choice. You have to go with whatever plan the organization comes with, you have to embrace it and support it and see that the work goes on well (Anthony, Amuru VHT)

There were clear power differentials of who got to choose when and how these beneficiaries participated in this global BFD movement, which illuminated the localized and embodied friction embedded within BFD. The results here have highlighted that the beneficiaries were aware of the unequal power relations (and they highlighted the inability to change this), and
that free markets and open borders did not necessarily facilitate the direct movement of bicycles globally—and in fact there were many unexpected barriers that arose, which the organizations had to work through and overcome.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

In the following discussion, I provide a brief overview of my main findings and connect them to pertinent literatures. The discussion will be structured by the following headings: sport and development organizations, context of development matters, power relations in development and sport, and localizing global BFD. As I attend to the nuanced ways that BFD in Uganda has taken place, each of these sections will highlight how my findings complement, inform and in some cases contradict what other authors have said in related literatures on these topic areas.

4.1 Sport and Development Organizations

There were a variety of BFD organizations that were included in this research, and although I tried to discretely categorize them as a way of helping me explain the relevance of key features and differences, one of the main findings about the structure of these organizations was that they existed along a spectrum. The above results also highlighted how the BFD organizations had similar mandates and organizational goals, however, they approached their projects differently, varied in size, interorganizational networks and global prominence. The results of this research also demonstrated that domestic CBOs were more focused on local/community needs, whereas the international organizations were concerned with global issues and economic growth (a point which will be returned to below).

This research was a response to Wilson and Hayhurst’s (2009) call to explore the structuring, organization and perspectives of SDP NGOs. More than this though, Wilson and Hayhurst (2009) were interested in how the introduction of a ‘new’ technology (in that case, Internet communication) to the SDP sector was reflected in the day to day operations of some of
those in the sector. Although my study was about a very different kind of technology, I also found a range of reasons that it mattered that the bicycle itself – as a form of technology that was obviously central to BFD – was necessary for this form of development work, and that it mattered differently for different organizations. In this way, by understanding the features of these organizations, I also came to better understand the key role of a technology (and development tool) across contexts, like Wilson and Hayhurst did – although their technology was a communication technology, and the one I focus on was a form of transportation.

As I continued to explore the structure of these organizations, I found that all of the domestic organizations were CBOs that took a bottom-up approach and all of the international organizations took a top-down approach. This finding builds upon and aligns with those outlined by Black (2017) because the bottom-up actors addressed inequitable social structures, in culturally respective ways, and were concerned with sustainability and project longevity – whereas international organizations, on the other hand, attended more to the global economy and seemed to embrace principles associated with neoliberalism and free market ideologies. This research was different than Black (2017) though because it highlighted how an organization’s location (as domestic or international) influenced the structuring of the organization.

Black (2017) also discussed how SfD actors perceived that they needed each other in more systematic and sustained ways than other actors in global development and addressed how the relationship between top down and bottom up is “symbiotic; but it is also, very obviously, an unequal symbiosis, with top down actors and interests routinely predominating” (p. 14). The findings of this research demonstrated that unequal power relations were never completely eliminated – although the balance of power in different phases varied. The research here demonstrated that top down actors had the power to initiate a BFD project and were necessary to facilitate success, but that some of the CBOs determined how the projects would play out on the
ground; therefore, both types of organizations relied on each other to carry out the BFD projects and each type of organization held power at different points in their relationship. Therefore, although Black (2017) stated that these organizational relationships were an ‘unequal symbiosis’ he did not necessarily explore how power was transferrable and moved between organizations throughout their partnerships.

The different organizations also had different perspectives about the bicycle and their utilization as an international development tool— with CBOs focusing on community development efforts (i.e. decreasing HIV/AIDS, providing health access, female empowerment), and the international organizations being more concerned with adopting strategies to ‘make a more equitable society’ or ‘increase standard of living’ (with the underlying objective of economic growth). It was mostly through partnerships with CBOs that international organizations indirectly addressed local initiatives. Black (2017) highlighted that SfD activities are focused on immediate, practical and individualized development objectives, that are less attuned to transforming social structures. Like Black (2017), I found that BFD projects captured these three development objectives, as overarching claims of ‘cycling out of poverty’ insinuated that a bicycle could help the beneficiaries change their social and financial position. Also, like Black (2017), I found that BFD practitioners were not always well positioned to address (or even consider) the social barriers that may contribute to social exclusion in the first place, which left a gap in transforming the current social order. However, different from Black (2017), the global location of the organizations determined the approach that they took to their projects—such that local BFD CBOs demonstrated a deeper understanding of community needs and were better situated to address social barriers than larger, more powerful, international BFD organizations.

Additionally, the context of this research, exploring BFD, was programmatically different than SfD initiatives that typically involved ongoing participation (such as, but not limited to the
SfD projects referred to by Hayhurst, et al., 2014; Forde, 2015; Carney & Chawansky, 2016, and many more). BFD projects provided beneficiaries with a bicycle to become actors unto themselves and alter their own lives—i.e., the delivery of bicycles, with no long-term program initiatives. Therefore, BFD’s attempt to alter the current social order took an extremely individualized approach to development, which could make it more difficult to facilitate ‘transformative development’, to use Black’s (2017) term.

Additionally, the BFD organizations included in this research took different approaches to distribute their bicycles into the communities – three out of ten organizations sold their bicycles through different methods (instead of freely giving them away, as the other BFD organizations did). Howe (2003) mentioned that “mainly aid organizations, have partial credit/hire-purchase schemes that increase the nominal cost of a bicycle by about 25%” (p. 173) to make the bicycles more affordable to a wider population. These BFD organizations reiterated this point, that co-funding and subsidization made bicycles more affordable. However, what we are seeing here is evidence of differences across organizations—i.e., some took a more private business model that aligned with neoliberal principles, a point I return to below. Additionally, contradicting Howe (2003) who stated that aid organizations made bicycles more affordable, BAP addressed how their distribution method (through micro-financing) may actually exclude beneficiaries who could benefit from a bicycle, but do not have the initial financial capital to apply for a loan. Therefore, distributing bicycles through sales methods can still exclude certain individuals from participating in BFD development initiatives.

These larger international BFD organizations also shared similarities with international aid organizations, as both dealt with concerns about interorganizational competition in the global environment that they worked in (Chouliaraki, 2010). Some organizations have begun to, or are considering, branding their bicycles, to increase their organization’s recognition and to market
themselves as their bikes move through communities across the nation. It is also noted that bicycle ownership varied across the country, with approximately 1.7 million bicycles in Uganda—with the majority imported from China and India (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2001, as cited in Howe, 2003). The focus and desire to brand the bicycles speaks to the competitive neoliberal milieu in which these organizations co-exist, and how, through branding, international donor organizations (re)produce the global in the local. This demonstrates how these BFD organizations are tied to neoliberal globalization, because they foster “an environment where various non-state actors congregate to promote market-oriented approaches to development” (Hayhurst, et al., 2010, p. 319). BFD organizations did this by encouraging individuals to become actors upon themselves to increase their productivity and participation in the market—without addressing the social factors that may contribute to why the participants of BFD initiatives are impoverished in the first place. Additionally, these BFD organizations were also concerned about marketing their product to obtain funding, and clients, in a competitive environment where they are eager to ensure that their organization endures.

This critique is similar to other scholars that have criticized SfD NGOs for the application of market-solutions that do not effectively target historical and social inequalities, within a neoliberal environment (Wilson & Hayhurst, 2009). Coalter (2010) addressed this ‘new paradigm for development’, marked by NGOs linking sport to the politics of civil society and development to fill the lacuna created by a neoliberal state – where NGOs are then needed to encourage community participation, facilitate social development and strengthen democracy. My findings aligned especially well with Coalter (2010) in this case, as I found that those that I interviewed from large-scale BFD international organizations, in most cases, offered some critique of national governments for leaving gaps in social provision – but seemed to have limited or no reflection on the fact that by filling these gaps they may be (re)producing the
reduction of state responsibility. This might well be considered a form of ‘ironic activism’, to use Wilson and Hayhurst’s (2009) terminology – as existing inequalities seemed to be in some ways perpetuated. Consider also here that, although the donations of bicycles to and within communities have increased community and economic participation, there are still privileged groups that maintain a position of power “over others through social negotiations, making development a key site of political practice and critical inquiry” (Darnell, 2010, p. 57).

4.2 Context of Development Matters (location, class and gender)

As I spoke to people who worked in different parts of Uganda, it became extremely evident just how much context mattered. I found that the meaning of the bicycle was unstable, as people’s perspectives tended to vary depending on their location—i.e., differences between rural or urban settings were especially stark, for reasons outlined in my results (e.g., related to income levels, access to other forms of transportation, and the need to travel longer distances). Recognizing that the needs around bicycles differ, Ugandan BFD CBOs determined the location of their bicycle distributions based off of the social characteristics of the communities—with the class and gender of the beneficiary populations often determining how the bicycles were actually used. My research, in turn, highlighted that these BFD organizations were responding to discrepancies in levels of ownership that varied across the country, as bicycles were donated to people in the rural north where there was less availability of, and opportunity to, purchase a bicycle compared to central Uganda.

Building upon Porter (2014), who addressed the need to explore issues of affordability, accessibility and the socio-political environment—of where and how bicycles were being used— I focused on how bicycles entered and moved within communities through donations made by BFD organizations. In the Ugandan context, I found that different variables, such as urban and rural positionality, mattered. Most of the organizations donated bicycles to people in the rural
regions of the country— which was not surprising, as bicycles have previously been studied as a mode of transportation to increase access to key services and markets, with evidence supporting that they have been “vital for poverty reduction and rural economic and social development” (Starkey, n.d., para. 1).

Starkey (n.d.) and Porter (2014) also acknowledged the poor cycling infrastructure and the need for transport in rural areas. However, these authors did not look in much depth at the impact that bicycles could have on health, community development and education. Additionally, this research explored how the goals of the BFD organizations uncovered in this study could be a product of the BFD organizations responding to, and being influenced by, global discourses, such as the UN’s SDG. This association could only be explored when the context of development initiatives was explicitly considered—as this study did by exploring the global network of BFD and the local context of Ugandan BFD. This research also contradicted previous work and demonstrated that the meanings associated with bicycles changed in different contexts at different times, such that the bicycle could have negative connotations too – and be known as a village bicycle, a tool for the poor, a signifier of illness (HIV/AIDS) and more. In this way, my study offered some nuance to the generally accurate claims about how bicycles were understood and taken up in rural settings, since the political climate and attitude of transportation in urban settings – and of course class dynamics too – are relevant factors. Since these will not be uniform across urban or rural settings, it would make sense that understandings and usage of bicycles would not be uniform either.

Additionally, both rural and urban areas had context-dependent bicycle related challenges. For example, urban areas lacked cycling infrastructure and were congested, which has led to safety concerns, whereas rural regions had impassable roads and large distances
between resources. Therefore, the relationship that individuals had with their bicycle was considerably dependent upon, and highly influenced by, cultural context, such that societal perceptions (attitudes, safety and infrastructure) of the bicycle and socio-spatial factors (physical environment, etc.) of the region impacted usage (Oke et al., 2015). Put simply then, and as stated above, context mattered.

My research built upon Oke et al. (2015)—who explored global bicycle household ownership by comparing and analyzing national and international surveys. However, by utilizing semi-structured interviews in this thesis, I explored societal perceptions and socio-spatial factors in the context of Uganda, whereby the participants contextualized the variables that impacted their bicycle usage (i.e. infrastructure, environmental conditions, bicycle availability and affordability, perceptions on gendered usage, etc.) and spoke to how economic prosperity across the nation produced discrepancies in bicycle ownership. This was different from Oke et al. (2015) who did not comprehensively explore the social variables that could influence ownership, which, as we’ve seen, were important to consider when attempting to understand the importance of this technology—how and why bicycles were used, and factors that could constrain individual ownership (i.e. gender, class, etc.).

Other key findings from my study that inform literature on the context of development pertained to the fact that many of the organizations donated bicycles to women – with the specific goal of giving women the opportunity to participate more fully in society, and thus reducing gender inequality related to transport exclusion, and economic participation. These findings are related to Porter’s (2011) transportation study in Sub-Saharan Africa, which discussed how cultural discourses constrained women’s use of bicycles, due to gendered stereotypes and that “ownership and use is widely male dominated as a result of economic and/or
sociocultural factors” (p. 75). The findings of this research aligned with Porter (2011) and acknowledged the importance of considering how the issue was not only female’s access to bicycles, but also the barriers that impact how bicycles are used. However, Porter (2011) explored accessibility and the utilization of bicycles by females, whereas my study differed because it explored development initiatives that were created to make bicycles more available and accessible for females, which oftentimes also had the goal of challenging the gendered usage of bicycle.

This research contradicted previous work that has stated that local gender-based constraints may discourage women from personal mobility and the utilization of a bicycle as a means of transportation (Starkey & Hine, 2014; Porter, 2011) because the findings presented above demonstrated that (according to interviewees) if women were given a bicycle, not only did they use the bicycle in a variety of different ways, but they shared their bicycle with other females and together challenged the perceptions of women in their communities. Although BFD organizations may be reducing gender barriers to accessing bicycles, I advocate for them to consider how they may by contributing to the reproduction of gendered roles (i.e. males using their bicycles for work and agriculture and females using their bicycles for domestic and family duties). A main contribution of my research here then is that I showed how even attempts to respond to bicycle-related inequalities (that reflect broader inequalities and cultural norms that restrict girls and women in social and economic realms) may have, again, ironically and unintentionally perpetuated some of these same inequalities. This is not to suggest that many BFD organizations were not also, clearly, operating in ways that would begin to undermine the conventional power structures – but, I would certainly assert based on my findings that this is complex and context dependent. By speaking directly to beneficiaries and individuals working in the local Ugandan BFD context, this research has highlighted the importance of the
experiences of those ‘on the ground’ in order to explore how the global BFD movement has been (re)produced in the local and how local experiences shape, and are shaped by, global forces (Lindsey, et al., 2017).

4.3 Power Relations in Development and Sport

This research demonstrated the importance of gathering the experiences and perspectives of those in the communities who are beneficiaries of SDP driven humanitarian work – as it was through this sort of ‘on-the-ground’ research that nuances around power differentials entrenched within SDP (and in the case BFD) were illuminated and could be understood – and the particular relevance of local contextual factors (like those uncovered in my study in places where bicycles were being distributed). With my own experiences and findings in mind then, I echo Lindsey et al.’s (2017) argument for the value of attending to how SDP projects are not only influenced by global discourses, such as SDG, but that there is the need to attend to how projects are taken up in local contexts—and that international organizations disseminating BFD projects in numerous countries in the Two-Thirds-World can results in the bicycle being taken up and used in different ways in different communities.

Of course, alongside such research ‘on the ground’, I have attempted also to show, through my results, the benefits of more macro-level thinking (connecting local experiences to global systems). For example, it was evident from my findings that there were networks within BFD between people that occupied various positions in the global movement (i.e. stakeholders, inter-organizational, and intra-organizational relationships between beneficiaries, employees and founders). These relationships were globally and locally connected, as bicycle projects were often initiated by foreigners who had spent time as volunteers/ tourists in Uganda and realized the need for transportation, which prompted them to establish connections with local CBOs. For
example, Dr. Mike traveled to Uganda, helped in the IDP camps and initiated the BFD project for Amuru VHT through Bikes Not Bombs; and Ebony, the founder of Bikes 4 Life, decided to start shipping bicycles to UOH after she spent time in the Northern regions of Uganda producing a film about the insurgencies.

However, the reliance that the beneficiary CBOs had on the international organizations was not simply one-sided, as the international organizations relied on the communities and their domestic CBO partners for their projects to succeed but friction “makes global connection powerful and effective” (Tsing, 2005, p. 6). It is important here to consider historical trajectories and post/colonial legacies that exclude and particularize, and which make global power something that individuals in the One-Third-World control (through the ability to create the projects) and for people in the Two-Thirds-World to contribute to once the project is in their community.

Aligning here then with Darnell and Hayhurst (2011), who argued for the need to balance on-the-ground research with theoretically informed understandings of macro (and micro) level power dynamics, I suggest that my findings and approach demonstrated how more nuanced understandings of power relations can be discerned when considering macro/global level issues and cultural flows in relation to and in conversation with in-depth and ethnographic findings. For example, I would argue that my findings left me well-positioned to comment on aspects of the geo-politics of BFD – and especially on how some BFD organizations worked with assumptions about who was and who was not developed. The organizations portrayed and discussed donors in the Global North as the “benevolent and civilizing force” and the beneficiaries in the Global South spoke about their understanding and experiences within BFD as “passive, deficient, and grateful recipient[s] of aid” (Forde, 2015, p. 960). This aligned with broader concerns about SDP as outlined by Hayhurst & Darnell (2011) – who looked at sport as
a neo-colonial endeavour and a force perpetuating global inequalities in other SDP industries. Darnell (2010) “suggest[ed] that while sport does offer a new and unique tool that successfully aligns with a development mandate, the logic of sport is also compatible with the hegemony of neo-liberal development philosophy” (p. 54). This hegemony re-inscribed social relations and experiences, which in the context of my work in Uganda, was a hierarchy from donors to recipients, whereby the beneficiary domestic CBOs were ‘beholden to the Global North’ and excluded from neoliberal policies that served those who had the connections, access and resources to participate in the global market.

For example, the domestic CBOs struggled to finance their organizations and BFD projects, as they discussed the difficulty of generating money locally. Although there was a high demand for the bicycles CBOs received from international organizations, beneficiaries from small rural CBOs in Uganda spoke of themselves as passive players on the periphery of the global system (Omobowale, 2016). These domestic CBOs demonstrated how the flow of commodities was determined externally to their organization, as they often relied on larger international organizations to initiate their participation.

In this way, my research was also similar to work by Hayhurst et al. (2014) – who conducted research exploring SfD and gender violence in Uganda. Like Hayhurst et al. (2014), I highlighted the importance of looking at the socio-political contexts that projects are carried out in. Providing females with skills (such as martial arts in the case of Hayhurst et al., 2014) or a technology (such as the bicycle in this research) highlighted how there are unintended consequences to global-local projects that need to be considered—i.e., the bicycle became a signifier of HIV/AIDS and there were concerns that the bicycle would get stolen when parked in certain areas. In both research contexts, it remained important to look at the long-standing impact of these projects to ensure that the participants would not be targeted in their communities for
their links to SfD work. With this in mind, a recommendation of my research is for BFD organizations to be sure to think through and respond to consequences, such as these, in order to ensure that their beneficiaries are safe, and not singled out through their participation in a development initiative.

Relatedly, my findings showed that free markets and open borders did not necessarily facilitate the smooth movement of bicycles globally. Five of the ten organizations interviewed discussed the Ugandan bicycle taxation regime as something that challenged their projects continuity and sustainability. Wilson and Hayhurst (2009) similarly discussed how some SDP NGOs have in some ways come to operate as a trojan horse for global neoliberalism – by opening global flows of information and commodities through new circuits of cooperation and collaboration that stretch across nations and continents. Similar to, but in some ways different from (and more nuanced than) Wilson and Hayhurst (2009), I found that neoliberal principles seemed to be applied selectively (see Ong, 2006), as there were only sometimes circuits of cooperation and collaboration that opened these global flows to facilitate the movement of bicycles.

Along with the global movement of bicycles, I also found that conflicts arose as the government increased bicycle taxes and made border control difficult. Therefore, within the BFD movement there remained an internal/national contradiction, because people were in need of the bicycles in their localities but the barriers to accessing them were high—due to the Ugandan government’s decisions to resist globalization processes, such as BFD—which some have speculated could be the result of Uganda’s Museveni government qualifying “globalization as a form of oppression” (Njoh, 2006, p. 25). However, the results of this study have demonstrated that through globalization processes—i.e. global media of publicized political and cultural unrest and turmoil—humanitarian aid arrives and SfD, and BFD, organizations can oppose the
government (i.e. international organizations that provide aid can encourage domestic CBOs to participate in globalization through the formation of international partnerships).

4.4 Localizing Global BFD

Building on this last point, I have shown throughout my results and discussion how the global and local were intertwined in the (re)production of SDP and the BFD movement – and that frictions emerged when global ideologies and initiatives were taken up in local contexts. Put simply, the global movement of bicycles was messy – and although Appadurai (1996) provided me with the insight to conceptualize the 5 ‘scapes’ in which the bicycles moved, it was less clear in Appadurai’s account how activities at the micro-level influence, and were influenced by, the structural conditions of the global community (Wilson, 2012). Additionally, Appadurai (1996) did not address how friction occurred within and between these scapes, which Tsing (2005) so nicely articulated and accounted for, and which provided insight for how objects moved in the BFD movement.

For example, FABIO struggled to implement a national NMT policy because there was resistance from people with political power. This has been noted as part of a wider trend, as Pojani and Stead (2015) have aptly stated that politicians and major stakeholders consider “cycling a sign of backwardness” (p. 7792). Although many countries in Europe have promoted bicycle usage through the construction of bicycle lanes, bike sharing schemes and traffic management measures, many countries in Africa have not received the same support for NMT (Starkey & Hine, 2014). The lack of transportation infrastructure has been noted as a legacy of colonial rule, as “Africa’s position in the international economic arena” (p. 28) was diminished through European colonization, which has been coupled with the continued lack of support for infrastructure development from post/colonial authorities (Njoh, 2006). FABIO addressed this global trend and explored how these discourses influenced local authorities and persons of power
in constructing the socio-political environment that impacted individuals on the ground, beneficiaries of BFD projects and NMT mobility. This research demonstrated that local NGOs can advocate for local people and communities—especially domestic CBOs that understand local context and transform their projects based on the community’s needs—and can simultaneously work towards changing more macro level issues, such as the socio-political environment by altering the perceptions of policy makers to prioritize sustainable transportation and NMT policy.

Following the three tenets of Burawoy’s (2001) global ethnography, I explored how the global was (re)produced in the local and that the “‘local no longer oppose[d] but constitute[d] the global” (p. 158). I found that most of the BFD projects would not have been possible if it was not for foreigners visiting Uganda and initiating projects, and that the global was produced in the local through the branding of bicycles. Burawoy (2001) also stated that globalization is the “production of (dis)connections” (pp. 157-158), which was evident in the domestic CBOs lack of funding capacity and ability to initiate BFD projects—and the politics and friction that occurred when bicycles moved to and within Uganda (i.e., shipping, travel, distribution, choosing locales/beneficiaries, and partnerships, etc.). Additionally, although there was a communal element to the bicycles, exclusion still occurred when they were given freely or through micro-financing programs, which caused tensions to arise between people in the community. Clearly then, BFD projects can benefit some individuals but not all.

This research responded to Kuhn and Woog’s (2011) call for SDP research by addressing “the complexity and wedged reality of social issues within the locality of manifested existence” (as cited in Burnett, 2015, p. 388). By speaking to those on the ground doing BFD-related work in one context in the Two-Thirds World and following the tenets of Burawoy’s (2001) global ethnography, I explored the local experience of individuals in the BFD movement as multi-layered and multi-faceted and found that the bicycle and its associated development projects
were perceived differently by differently positioned people. The uneven spread of BFD projects across Uganda was illuminated when exploring the prominence of rural projects over urban projects/initiatives—this research also found that it may be easier to just distribute bicycles to individuals rather than to challenge the social structures and conduct transformative development. I also considered how I, as a researcher, was implicated in globalization processes through my participation in research that explored global-local (dis)connections.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

In many respects, this research began as a response to the UN Habitat’s commissioned report that claimed “[bicycles] provide crucial mobility access to markets, healthcare, schools…[and] employment opportunities” (Starkey & Hine, 2014, p. 3). This research offered important context and complexity to this rather sweeping statement, as I found that the meanings assigned to the bicycle shifted and were sometimes contradictory, depending on the context that the bicycle moved within and were understood in. In fact, by speaking to people who occupied different social positions, and who were directly involved in BFD in Uganda (as organizational founders, employees, volunteers, or beneficiaries), I found that the way the bicycle was talked about was oftentimes aligned with the common way that the value of sport has been over-stated. It’s not that I found that bicycles were not useful. But a key finding here was that the concept of friction highlighted how the BFD movement is messy and complex. This is an important counterpoint, in light of the sweeping claims made by the UN and many BFD organizations, that a bike can be used to solve a whole range of development issues—when it was clear from my study that the ‘bikes solves problems’ narrative was one-sided and that the BFD organizations donated bicycles in a neoliberal milieu that encouraged individual productivity, empowerment and economic participation, which I argue does not target the root cause of the problems that these NGOs and activists were trying to respond to. Relatedly, in this thesis I discussed how
inequalities were both addressed through and reflected in the BFD movement. By speaking to people directly involved in BFD, I gathered their experiences and recommendations.

In this conclusion, I will now offer some practical reflections that may lead to improvements in the work of these various organizations and other stakeholders in the movement. Firstly, I found it important to talk to people in the local communities that received aid about what bicycles would work best for them in their environment. There were practical matters too. For example, it was also important to ensure that the local communities had access to a knowledgeable mechanic (and that individuals in the community were trained) and that the donation of spare parts could contribute to the longevity of previously donated bicycles. Various organizations also spoke about establishing a revolving fund, which could contribute to the sustainability of domestic CBOs and their BFD projects. BFD organizations should think through considerations, such as these, that could contribute to project longevity and bicycle sustainability. As highlighted above, all of the organizations should communicate with their beneficiaries to understand their communities’ social and environmental needs, and international organizations should monitor their projects and facilitate an ongoing conversation with their CBO partners about BFD projects and what could be done better next time. Additionally, with this in mind, the BFD organizations should attend to, think through and respond to complexities related to the socio-spatial environment in order to ensure that their beneficiaries are safe, and not singled out through their participation in a development initiative.

Secondly, due to the fact that the importation of bicycles could be very costly, some organizations donated money to purchase bicycles locally. The friction created during the importation of bicycles was discussed as a variable that prohibited the recycling of previously used bicycles and therefore decreased the potential environmental impact that the global BFD could have—i.e., recycling bicycles that were no longer being use that are contributing to waste.
Interestingly, it was not common that BFD organizations spoke about the environment, even though the bicycle has been touted as an environmentally-friendly mode of transportation. Instead, the bicycle was often talked about in relation to social and economic variables. Additionally, from a post/colonial lens, it is important to consider the implications of donating previously used bicycles from the One-Third-World to communities in the Two-Thirds-World, as these second-hand bicycles may be more likely to break-down and deteriorate quicker than newly purchased bicycles due to previous wear-and-tear.

In addition to these recommended practices gathered from the BFD organizations, I wanted to include advice from Chilembwe (2017) regarding the sustainability of bicycle transport developments. The opportunity to utilize a bicycle as a form of transportation should not discriminate against those in lower SES brackets, and sustainable initiatives should be concerned about health and equity within and between generations. As highlighted in the results of this research, bicycles can be affordable through subsided projects and co-funded initiatives, or can be distributed freely through donations, which decrease barriers to financial and social resources. Additionally, it is important for BFD organizations to think through how their distribution method may be exclusionary, which can cause tension between community members.

Although this research has acknowledged opportunities that can enable BFD organizations, I have also highlighted challenges associated with working in a number of environments with different beneficiaries – challenges which may constrain smaller CBOs with fewer resources and may be associated with the perpetuation of power differences between organizations (i.e., who gets to determine when, why and how BFD projects get initiated). By speaking directly to beneficiaries and individuals working in the local Ugandan BFD context, this research has highlighted the importance of the experiences of those ‘on the ground’ in order
to explore how the global BFD movement has been (re)produced in the local and how local experiences shape, and are shaped by, global forces (Lindsey, et al., 2017).

By having the opportunity to travel to Uganda and interview people, I was able to contextualize aspects of the BFD movement in Uganda – by learning about what was actually going on from those living with and working with the bicycles. The method of interviewing allowed me to gain a deeper understanding of BFD in Uganda to explore the various perspectives of the BFD industry and work of these organizations. By interviewing individuals that occupied various positions within the BFD movement (i.e., organizational founders, employees, volunteers, beneficiaries, etc.) I gathered a variety of perspectives. The wide range of participants was a strength of this research because these differently positioned individuals discussed what the BFD movement was, how their associated organization was structured, how the bicycle moved on the ground, the various ways that bikes were utilized as a development tool and their experiences with the BFD movement.

The data collected here was combined and connected through the process of crystallization, which recognized “that there are far more than ‘three sides’ from which to approach the world […] provid[ing] us with a deepened, complex, thoroughly partial, understanding of the topic” (Richardson, 1998, p. 358). By interviewing various individuals involved in the movement, and including an analysis of websites and online documents, I explored how BFD organizations portrayed themselves, how BFD was interpreted and perceived by those involved in the movement, and the myriad of ways that bicycles were utilized as an international development tool—recognizing that there are multiple ‘truths’, and that I was only able to gain the insight from a few organizations involved in the movement in the national context of Uganda. Additionally, I had the support of Janet Otte and enculturated informants who helped to contextualize the culture of the regions within the nation.
I also recognize that traditional understandings of generalizability were not particularly useful for my project. As such, I was sensitive to intersectional generalizability—meaning respectfully working with communities to track “patterns across nations, communities, homes, and bodies to theorize the arteries of oppression and colonialism” (Fine, Tuck & Zeller-Berkman, 2008, p. 440). In light of my goals and sensibilities, this way of seeing my data helped me recognize how nuances that existed at the global and local were simultaneous and interconnected and reflective of global patterns that exist in other localities (Fine et al., 2008). I also recognize that my research may not be representative of other countries involved in the BFD movement – however, by exploring multiple regions (and contradictions) in one nation, and connecting my findings to patterns of SDP, globalization, post/colonialism and the neoliberal deployment of aid, I hope that I have related my findings to broader issues and patterns that extend well beyond Uganda, while having remained highly cognizant of, and accountable to, place.

Following Porter (2014), I call for more research that focuses on bicycles and looks at the socio-political landscape of transportation—as it was not only having access to a bicycle that impacted transportation but also the infrastructure in place, the (dis)connectivity between villages/towns and how these variables were related to power. Specifically, I call for research to continue to contextualize BFD, and other forms of SfD that use technologies to encourage individualized/community development—as opposed to larger scale initiatives with regular programming. Lastly, I call for public sociology of SDP, to consider the politics of academia and development following Donnelly, Atkinson, Boyle and Szto (2011) to further examine why the proliferation of mobility research, in relation to the bicycle in Africa, has not been incorporated into local policy—i.e., why this disconnection exists and persists, and to explore ways that
research can positively impact NMT by perhaps working with domestic CBOs who understand the local context.

The next steps for the BFD SSHRC grant are as follows. Firstly, the relationship between humans and non-human actors within the BFD movement will be explored by the application of actor-network-theory. Secondly, Janet Otte will continue to examine the BFD projects that are focused on HIV/AIDS and micro-financing in Uganda. Thirdly, an international comparative piece across multiple sites (between India, Nicaragua, South Africa, Uganda and Canada, etc.) will conceptualize BFD linkages across contexts, using a relational comparison of the Global South and Global North as de-colonizing methodology. Lastly, I will reflect deeply about the methodology that I employed throughout my thesis and continue to interrogate my positionality as a White Canadian female graduate student ‘dropping in’ for a month and partnering with Janet Otte on a Canadian funded grant.
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APPENDIX A: Interview Guide

Hi ____,

Before we get started, I wanted to thank you for taking the time out of your schedule to meet with me to chat about (NGO) and BFD. As the consent form states, my research is interested in exploring how bicycles are used as a development tool, perceptions people involved in the movement, such as yourself, and how organizations involved in BFD are structured, in addition to the successes/challenges they have experienced.

Specifically, this interview will consist of 4 subsections (1) your involvement in BFD (2) the structure of the NGO (3) how bicycles are used for development and (4) the successes/challenges/barriers that you/the NGO have experienced.

I also just want to let you know that if I look down during the interview, it is just because I am referring to the interview guide to ensure that I ask all that I need to. Additionally, if I am writing anything down, it is because you have answered a related question or you have reminded me to address something later on in the interview.

Before we get started, do you have any questions for me?

Rapport
1. Can you tell me a little bit about yourself?
   a. What is your position in this NGO?
   b. How long have you been in this position?
   c. What does ‘development’ mean to you?
   d. How did you (personally) get involved in bicycles-for-development work?

NGO
2. Can you tell me about (NGO) that you are involved in?
   a. How many people are part of this organization?
      i. What are their roles?
      ii. Are these paid positions or volunteer? If paid, how are they paid?
   b. Can you describe the structure (hierarchy) of the organization? Has this structure changed over time?
   c. Does the organization collaborate or work with any other NGOs/Ugandan organizations/ foundations (partnerships)?
      i. How are these relationships formed?
   d. How does the NGO obtain funding?
3. What are the key goals of the organization?
   a. What initiatives has the organization implemented? What new initiatives, if any, are they planning on implementing?

Bicycle
4. I was wondering if you could share a little bit about the ‘life of the bicycle’?
a. Where do the bicycles come from? Are they shipped? Are they given out freely or sold for purchase?
b. Who gets to use the bicycles?
c. What are the bicycles used for?
d. How, if at all, does the bicycle contribute to development?
e. What are some of the roles that the bicycle plays in the communities where you work?
   i. Challenges? Benefits? Examples?

Successes/ Challenges/ Barriers
5. How do you define success with regard to your work? Can you provide some examples?
6. Can you describe some of the barriers your organization has faced in attempting to reach its goals?
7. What challenges have your organization faced? What challenges are typical with this type of work?
8. If you were to give advice to another BFD NGO just starting out, what would you tell them? Why?
9. For those who study sport and development, it is well known that many organizations are doing important work that is clearly helpful for local populations. It is also known that positive impacts are not guaranteed—as some groups don’t have great relationships with those in local communities, and that programs don’t always have their desired impacts, or even that some organization’s goals aren’t always aligned with the goals of locals. As someone who works in this industry, do you have any thoughts that might help us work through these tensions?

We have covered all the content that I wanted to talk about; the goal of the interview was to discuss how bicycles have been used as a development tool, your perceptions of the movement, the organizational structure of the NGO and barriers/ challenges experienced. In saying so, is there anything that you feel is important that we have not yet discussed? Is there anything else that you would like to add?

How was this interview process for you? Do you have any questions for me?

I want to sincerely thank you for participating in this study, your contribution has made a difference.
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Study Name: Bicycles for Development: Perception and Intentions of NGOs
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Purpose of the Research: The purpose of this research is to learn more about how the bicycle is used for development purposes, the characteristics of the various organizations involved in bicycles for development work (e.g., the activities, structure, and goals of these organizations), the perspectives of those involved in bicycle-driven development on their work and industry, and about how technologies (like a bicycle) move around the world to support international development work.

What You Will Be Asked to Do in the Research: You are invited to participate in this study because you are a staff member of an organization that works in bicycle-focused development (BFD) programming. Your participation will consist of one semi-structured interview (via Skype, telephone call, or in person) that will last approximately 1 to 2 hours. The interview questions will mainly concern your organization’s experience with BFD programs, your knowledge of the funding of BFD programs, and your opinions regarding the utility, successes and broad operations of BFD programs. The time commitment related to the interview will vary depending on how much time you can give to this project, but will likely not exceed 3 hours in total. After the interview, we will transcribe the interview and then email it or mail it to you for you to review and to edit as you deem necessary. The review can take about 30-60 minutes. Transcripts that are not reviewed within two weeks, will be deemed as acceptable and will be used in the study.

Risks and Discomforts: We do not foresee any risks or discomfort from your participation in the research.
**Benefits of the Research and Benefits to You:** Your participation in this study will include contributing your knowledge about the role that the bicycle for development movement plays in Uganda, which could help foster stronger relationships with the non-governmental organizations involved in bicycle for development programming.

**Voluntary Participation:** Your participation in the study is completely voluntary and you may choose to stop participating at any time. Your decision not to volunteer will not influence the nature of your relationship with York University or The University of British Columbia either now, or in the future.

**Withdrawal from the Study:** You can stop participating in the study at any time, for any reason, if you so decide. Your decision to stop participating, or to refuse to answer particular questions, will not affect your relationship with the researchers, York University, or The University of British Columbia, or any other group associated with this project. In the event you withdraw from the study, all associated data collected will be immediately destroyed wherever possible. Should you wish to withdraw after the study, you will have the option to also withdraw your data up until the analysis is complete.

**Confidentiality:** You will be assigned a pseudonym (a made-up name). Furthermore, all identifying characteristics will be altered to promote anonymity. The research findings will be disseminated primarily through the bicycle for development organizations involved in this study (and other interested stakeholders that are mutually agreed upon), and through academic conferences, and publications, but your anonymity and confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law. We do, however, recognize the importance of crediting sources of expert knowledge; as such, if you would like to be credited by name and position for your contributions, we will be glad to do that.

All data, including final transcripts and audio-recordings, will be retained in a locked cabinet in Dr. Hayhurst’s office and Dr. Wilson’s office. A copy of all data will be kept with Dr. Hayhurst at York University and with Dr. Wilson at or The University of British Columbia. Furthermore, all electronic data will be stored in encrypted files whose access keys will be known only to the researcher, the co-investigators, and the research assistants. The data, including final transcripts and audio-recordings, will be stored on Dr. Hayhurst’s computer and locked filing cabinet for 25 years (which will begin at the commencement of the research), as well as on Dr. Wilson’s computer and locked filing cabinet for 20 years. This material will not be made available to anyone other than the researcher, the co-investigators, and the research assistants. No other persons will have access to the data without ethics approval. After 25 years, Dr. Hayhurst will shred hard copies and securely delete digital copies.

**Questions About the Research?** If you have questions about the research in general or about your role in the study, please feel free to contact Madison Ardizzi at The University of British Columbia, or contact Dr. Brian Wilson at The University of British Columbia or Dr. Lyndsay Hayhurst at York University. Also, Janet Otte, the Co-Principal Investigator in Uganda.

This research received ethics review and approval by the Human Participants Review Sub-Committee, York University’s Ethics Review Board and the Mbale Hospital Research Ethics Committee Guidelines on Research in Uganda. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this study, please contact the Mbale Hospital Research Ethics Committee Chair – Mr. JSO Obbo. You can also contact the Sr. Manager & Policy Advisor for the Office of Research Ethics, 5th Floor, Kaneff Tower, York University.

This research has also received ethics review and approval by the Research Ethics Board at The University of British Columbia, The Research Ethics Committee at Mbale, Uganda and conforms to the standards of the Canadian Tri-Council Research Ethics guidelines. If you have any questions about this process, about your rights as a participant in the study or have any concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, please contact Research Participant Complaint Line in the UBC Office of Research Ethics.
Legal Rights and Signatures:

I (______________), consent to participate in Bicycles for Development: Globalization and Perceptions of NGOs conducted by Madison Ardizzi, University of British Columbia; Lyndsay Hayhurst, York University; Robert VanWynsberghe, University of British Columbia; Brian Wilson, University of British Columbia; and Bradley Millington, University of Bath. I have understood the nature of this project and wish to participate. I am not waiving any of my legal rights by signing this form. My signature below indicates my consent.

Signature _______________________________ Date _______________________________
Participant

Signature _______________________________ Date _______________________________
Principal Investigator

☐ I waive my anonymity and would like my name included in any final reports/publications involved in this research.
Mbale Informed Consent Form Template

Study Name: Cycling Against Poverty? Researching a Sport for Development Movement and an ‘Object’ in/for Development

Version Date: Version 1 - August 8th 2017

Mbale Regional Referral Hospital Research Ethics Committee Number: MRRH – REC IN – COM 0100/2017

York University Ethics Review Board Number: 2016 - 269

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
<th>Co – Principal Investigator - Uganda</th>
<th>Co-Investigator</th>
<th>Co-Investigator</th>
<th>Collaborator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lyndsay Hayhurst</td>
<td>Ms. Janet Otte</td>
<td>Dr. Robert VanWynsbergh</td>
<td>Dr. Brian Wilson</td>
<td>Dr. Brad Millington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Mavuno Ministries</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Educational Studies</td>
<td>School of Kinesiology</td>
<td>Department for Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Health Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>University of Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of the Research: We are doing a research project about the ‘bicycles for development’ (BFD) ‘movement’ – a movement of organizations, governments, and communities where bicycles are thought to play a key development role. The reasons we are doing this project are to try to better understand how individuals experience bicycles for development programs and how the ways that this program works impacts social change through sport and bicycles in your community. Overall, the information for this study (funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada) will be used to better understand the BFD movement and the day-to-day experiences and lives of those involved in it (such as yourself). We can also learn about how BFD initiatives might be improved and help foster stronger relationships between partners and communities. The information gathered will be used in various publications and to improve BFD programming.

What You Will Be Asked to Do in the Research: We are asking for residents of participating communities in the BFD movement who use the bicycle in their day-to-day lives to take part in this study. We would like to invite you to participate in a focus group, a photovoice activity where you will be asked to take photographs (for example, photographs of the barriers and benefits of participating in bicycle for development programs) and follow-up interview, personal journaling of your experience in the BFD program, and digital storytelling where you will use photos from the photovoice to co-create a digital compilation such as an online video. We are asking you to take part in this research because you are a person who has had experience in the bicycle for development program. If you accept this invitation, we will find a time when you are available. Time commitment of photovoice, journaling, and digital storytelling activities will vary depending on how much time you would like to give to the project. The interview will be audio recorded and will last approximately 1 hour. The focus group will be audio recorded and will last approximately 1 to 1.5 hours. If, however, you do not want the focus group or interview to be recorded, there will be no audio recording and we will take notes instead. You can withdraw from the focus group at any time. You may be quoted or you can choose to remain anonymous, which means that your name will never be used in the research.

Your participation will be a big help. You will be reimbursed 20,000Shs for your time, as well as receive refreshments such as a drink and a snack for an interview. In addition, for participating in photovoice activities, the camera used in such activities will be yours to own after the completion of the research. The information you share with us will help to understand your experience with the BFD program. The program
will then be able to offer better programs and overall experiences to help in the development of your community and of future individuals who will participate in the program. We do not foresee any risks or discomfort from your participation in the research.

**Benefits of the Research and Benefits to You:** Benefits may include contributing your knowledge and having the opportunity to tell your story in your own words, and having your story documents and integrated into the broader discussions on the bicycles for development movement and community development initiatives. Benefits to broader society include having a better understanding of what people using bicycles and community development initiatives mean to those involved.

**Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal:** Your participation in the study is completely voluntary and you may choose to stop participating at any time. Your decision not to volunteer, to stop participating, or to refuse to answer particular questions will not influence the nature of the ongoing relationship you may have with the researchers or program staff, or the nature of your relationship with York University either now, or in the future. In the event you withdraw from the study, all associated data collected will be immediately destroyed wherever possible.

**Confidentiality:** Unless you choose otherwise, all information you supply during the research will be held in confidence and unless you specifically indicate your consent, your name will not appear in any report or publication of the research. All data, including handwritten notes, video and audio tapes, and photographs, is strictly confidential. No records which identify you by name or initials will be allowed to leave the Investigators’ offices. A code number will be used to identify you. The information will be stored in a locked file cabinet and computer files will be password protected, and only research staff/research team members will have access to this information. The data will be stored for 25 years after the completion of the study, and then destroyed by deleting all computer files and shredding all paper data. Confidentiality will be provided to the fullest extent possible by law.

**Translator**

Please note that, with your consent, a translator will be present during your interviews. Before the interview, the translator will sign an ‘Oath of Confidentiality’. This oath means that they agree to keep all information collected during this study confidential and will not reveal by speaking, communicating or transmitting this information in written, electronic (disks, tapes, transcripts, email) or in any other way to anyone outside the research team. You may ask the translator to leave at any time if you wish.

**Questions About the Research?** If you have questions about the research in general or about your role in the study, please feel free to contact Dr. Lyndsay Hayhurst in Canada or Janet Otte in Uganda.

This research has received ethics review and approval by the Human Participants Review Sub-Committee, York University’s Ethics Review Board and the Mbale Hospital Research Ethics Committee Guidelines on Research in Uganda. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this study, please contact the Mbale Hospital Research Ethics Committee Chair – Mr. JSO Obbo.

In Canada, you may also contact the Sr. Manager & Policy Advisor for the Office of Research Ethics, 5th Floor, Kaneff Tower, York University.

**Legal Rights and Signatures:**

- I have read and understood the consent form.
- I have been given a copy of this consent form.
- I have had sufficient time to consider the information provided and to ask questions, and have received satisfactory responses to my questions.
- I understand that all of the information will be kept confidential and will only be used for scientific purposes.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am completely free to refuse to participate or to withdraw from this study at any time, without the quality of care that I receive being affected in any way.
• I understand that this study will not provide any direct benefits to me.
• I understand that I am not waiving any of my legal rights as a result of signing this consent form.
• I have read this form and freely consent to participate in this study.

I (fill in your name here), consent to participate in the study, Cycling Against Poverty? Researching a Sport for Development Movement and an Object in/for Development, conducted by Dr. Lyndsay Hayhurst. I have understood the nature of this project and wish to participate. I am not waiving any of my legal rights by signing this form. My signature below indicates my consent.

Name of Participant (printed) ________________________________

Signature or Fingerprint* of Participant __________________________ Date __________

Name of Study Staff Administering Consent (printed) __________________________

Position/Title __________________________

Signature of Study Staff Administering Consent __________________________ Date __________

Name of Translator (if necessary) __________________________

Signature of Translator __________________________ Date __________

*If the participant is unable to read and/or write, an impartial witness must be present during the consent discussion. After the written informed consent form is read and explained to the participant, and after he or she has orally consented participate in this study, and has either signed the consent form or provided his or her fingerprint, the witness must sign and personally date the consent form. By signing the consent form, the witness attests that the information in the consent form and any other written information was accurately explained to, and apparently understood by, the participant, and that consent was freely given.

Name of Person Witnessing Consent (printed) __________________________

Signature of Person Witnessing Consent __________________________ Date __________

I, (fill in your name here), agree to allow video and/or digital images or photographs in which I appear to be used in teaching, scientific presentations and/or publications with the understanding that I will not be identified by name. I am aware that I may withdraw this consent at any time without penalty.

Signature __________________________ Date __________

Participant
☐ Check this box if you would like to receive a summary of the study findings (and please print your contact information in the space below).

If you do not check any of these boxes, you can still participate in the current study. You can also check these boxes off but decide in the future that you do not want to participate.

E-mail Address (please print): ______________________________

Mailing Address: ______________________________

____________________________________________

Telephone # (or where we can leave a message): _____________________

Copies to: Investigator’s files, study participant